

Date: Monday, June 20, 2005
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall for 821 Cambie & 1277 Melville Street
Reconvene at Plaza 500 Hotel for 1055 Canada Place

PRESENT:

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)
L. Beasley Co-Director of Planning
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager
T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

L. Adams Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
R. Acton Representative of the Design Professions
J. Scott Representative of the Development Industry
C. Henschel Representative of the General Public
K. Hung Representative of the General Public (present for Items 1 to 4 only)
G. Chung Representative of the General Public (present for Items 1 to 3 only)

Regrets

J. McLean Representative of the Development Industry

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

M.B. Rondeau Development Planner (821 Cambie Street)
D. Robinson Project Facilitator (821 Cambie Street and 1277 Melville)
R. Segal Development Planner (1277 Melville and 1055 Canada Place)
V. Potter Project Facilitator (1055 Canada Place)
K. Magnusson Engineer, Engineering Services - Projects (1055 Canada Place)
M. Thomson City Surveyor

821 Cambie Street

J. McLean Developer
J. Hancock Hancock Bruckner Eng & Wright Architects

1277 Melville Street

P. Busby Busby Perkins & Will Architects
M. Nielsen Busby Perkins & Will Architects
J. Laxton Developer

1055 Canada Place

R. Anthony Vancouver Convention Centre Expansion Project Ltd.
K. Grassi Vancouver Convention Centre Expansion Project Ltd.
F. Musson Musson Cattell Mackey Architects
J. Brown LMN Architects

Recorder: C. Hubbard, Raincoast Ventures

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. MacGregor, 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 9, 2005 be approved following correction of minor typographical errors.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 821 CAMBIE STREET - DE409233 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Hancock Brückner Eng & Wright Architects

Request: To construct a 23 storey residential tower with 145 dwelling units on a three storey mixed use podium containing 5 general office live-work units, retail, office, and restaurant uses, with 6 levels of underground parking accessed from the lane.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mary Beth Rondeau, Development Planner, presented this application, noting it follows after a rezoning process which established the basic parameters of use, massing and density. The development application deals largely with design development issues, as outlined in the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated June 8, 2005. Ms. Rondeau briefly described the proposal and the refinements recommended in the prior-to conditions. She also tabled a recommended addition to the Note to Applicant to in 1.5, to bring the podium to the corner of Robson Street to provide a stronger massing and enclosure of the open space boulevard in front of the Catholic Charities Building. A correction to p.10 of the report was also noted in a memorandum from Doug Robinson, Project Facilitator, which identifies some text missing from the report. In general, staff consider the proposal responds well to the conditions of the rezoning and note the recommended conditions of approval are minor in nature and represent refinements to the scheme. Staff consider the requested density of 7.55 FSR has been well absorbed into the site. The recommendation is for approval, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley regarding the proposed landscaping off the rear lane, Ms. Rondeau referred to recommended condition 1.3 which calls for improvements to the lane environment.

Mr. Beasley sought confirmation from the applicant that the recommended addition to condition 1.5 was acceptable. Mr. McLean confirmed they can address the issue by moving the entrance lobby out.

Mr. Scobie asked for clarification of the item under condition 1.2 which refers to provision of rolled rim concrete pots. Ms. Rondeau explained that free-standing pots are intended. While the project does satisfy the Library Square Streetscape Guidelines, the sidewalk in this location

is wider than usual and staff believe it can be improved with the addition of pots and planting punctuating the building columns at the face of the building.

Mr. Scobie questioned condition 1.6 which calls for back-lit window pattern in the elevator penthouse. Ms. Rondeau explained that articulation of the elevator penthouse, especially at night, was a condition of the rezoning which has been brought forward to the development application.

Mr. Timm questioned the need for a legal agreement to secure the public bicycle spaces, as called for in condition A.1.8, suggesting it might be better as a condition of the development permit.

In response to a question from Mr. Henschel regarding condition 1.4, Ms. Rondeau briefly explained the simplification in the architectural expression that is being sought, which largely arises from the comments of the Urban Design Panel.

Applicant's Comments

Jim McLean, Developer, confirmed they can meet all the recommended conditions. He noted the architectural expression has already been simplified to some extent, which is better represented in the model than the renderings. Mr. McLean added that the 7.55 FSR approved by Council at the rezoning was based partly on a contribution to the Affordable Housing Fund. Jim Hancock, Architect, noted they are seeking a diverse series of elements in the project. He confirmed that rolled rim planters can be provided, as called for in condition 1.4, and that they have no concerns with providing glazing in the penthouse (condition 1.6).

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley questioned the appropriateness of the tree at the corner of the podium level. In discussion, it was noted that bringing out the corner, as called for in condition 1.5, will likely address the concern.

Mr. Hancock confirmed they have no concerns with the Building By-law and Fire Department issues identified in Appendix C.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Adams advised the Urban Design Panel had no major concerns with this project. The Panel reviewed it twice and found it considerably improved since the rezoning stage. Mr. Adams recommended approval, subject to the recommended conditions.

Mr. Acton commented that the recommended conditions seem fairly detailed but noted the applicant's concurrence. With respect to condition 1.5, Mr. Acton said he believed the choice of concrete or stone is best left to the architect.

Mr. Scott noted the requirements of Council for achieving the requested density are met and it is a good project. He added he would consider leaving the simplification of the exterior to the architect but he agreed it seems somewhat "busy" which might prove very difficult for a contractor to realise.

Mr. Henschel agreed the architectural expression needs some massaging but should be left to the architect. Mr. Henschel said he thought the small amount of brick on the live/work

component on Cambie Street should be either removed or enlarged, preferably the latter. He suggested condition 1.6 should be a consideration item.

Ms. Hung agreed it should be left to the applicant to decide whether or not to punctuate the penthouse. Ms. Hung was pleased to see the range of uses on the site which will liven up this part of Robson Street. She also thought the elevations would provide a lot of interest.

Ms. Chung strongly supported the inclusion of live/work in the scheme which will be a much needed and interesting addition to this area. She recommended approval.

Board Discussion

Mr. Timm said he believed the range of uses and varied architectural expression will fit well in this location as a transition between the Downtown and Yaletown. He recommended approval, subject to a number of minor changes to the conditions.

Mr. MacGregor said he was quite impressed with the design and he concurred with Mr. Timm's suggested amendments to the conditions. He said he believed it is important that the provision of the public bicycle spaces is noted on the development permit. Mr. Timm concurred.

Mr. Beasley also supported the application. He agreed that the condition calling for some refinements at the lane is appropriate. He added that, in general, the conditions are more detailed than he would expect but noted the applicant has indicated agreement. He said it is a very good project.

Mr. Scobie said he believes it is a great design that should work very well in this location.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 409233, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated June 8, 2005, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.4, *to consider* design development to simplify the architectural expression of the building and clarify details of proposed finishes;

Amend the Note to Applicant in 1.5 to add:

The podium should be brought to the corner to provide a stronger massing and enclosure to the open space boulevard in front of the Catholic Charities Building (150 Robson Street);

Amend 1.6 to read:

design development to the elevator penthouse to provide articulation and interest. Consider introducing window pattern to be backlit at night as a means of achieving this.

Amend A.1.8 to read:

provision of 14 additional Class A bicycle parking stalls for use by the public;

Add B.2.6:

14 Class A bicycle parking stalls shall be provided for use by the public.

4. 1277 MELVILLE STREET - DE409236 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Busby Perkins & Will Architects

Request: To construct a 28 storey mixed-use (retail/residential) building containing a total of 52 dwelling units, on a townhouse/commercial podium base over four levels of underground parking accessed from West Pender Street (over the adjacent site at 1211 Melville Street), and incorporating a transfer of 736.8 m² (7,931 sq.ft.) of heritage density from a vendor site.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ralph Segal, Development Planner, began with a brief description of the history of this project, previously addressed as 1280 West Pender Street and known as the flatiron building. An application for the site was approved by the Board on November 8, 2004 with a number of conditions requiring a reduction in the building width and height as well as shifting it well back from the Jervis Street corner. The tower massing and its location on the site were the principal issues. Mr. Segal noted the site is an unusual and challenging wedge shape and staff's analysis confirms that it is appropriate for two towers to be developed on this block. He briefly reviewed the immediate site context, including the Ritz (1211 Melville), the Pointe Claire directly behind this site (1238 Melville), the Palladio (1228 West Hastings), the Evergreen Building (1285 West Pender), Coal Harbour Park at the foot of Broughton and Jervis Streets, Harbourside Towers (1301 West Pender), the Classico (1310 West Pender), the Venus (1239 West Georgia) and C-Side building (1280 West Cordova).

The Board's conditions of approval for the previous application would have located the tower 54 ft. back from Jervis Street, and the height was restricted to 270 ft. with no more than 8 ft. allowance for mechanical appurtenances. Before the applicant was able to submit a revised application which met the Board's conditions, the approval was appealed to the Board of Variance (BOV) by some residents of the Pointe Claire. On January 26, 2005, the Board's approval was overturned by the BOV which made reference to other options that might be investigated in respect to improving views from the Pointe Claire, in particular an option that had been discussed by the Development Permit Board (identified as Option 3A) which would have shifted the tower another 25 ft. or so to the east. Mr. Segal said the subject submission is a direct response to a number of the issues raised by the Pointe Claire residents as well as to the BOV decision.

Mr. Segal described the current submission, noting it also responds to other, less substantive, conditions applied by the Board in its November 2004 approval. The tower is now shifted east a further 21 ft. for a total of 75 ft. from Jervis Street. The tower width is 81 ft.-9 in. along the Melville frontage, which is a slight improvement over the Board's previous condition for a maximum width of 82 ft. The height has been reduced to a total of 270.7 ft., which is lower than the Board's required maximum of 278 ft. There is an articulation of the northwest corner of the tower which angles upwards and outwards slightly to give it some architectural prominence. This causes minimal view impact on the Pointe Claire. Referring to posted view diagrams, Mr. Segal reviewed the view analysis and the improvements achieved as a result of the tower reconfiguration which open up the northwesterly view for the west-facing units in the Pointe Claire. In the discussion, it was noted the building has a very small floorplate of

3,381 sq.ft. Mr. Segal described the view analysis in detail, focussing on the view improvements achieved for the front west units of the Pointe Claire.

Referring to the Development Permit Staff Committee report dated June 8, 2005, Mr. Segal briefly reviewed the other issues, which he noted they are not substantive. There is a parking shortfall which is addressed in condition 1.2 and Mr. Segal noted the site is restricted in how the parking can be achieved. The provision of loading also requires further work. A corner open space has been provided on the site and retail space is indicated at the corner. Noting that the Board had previously suggested replicating the existing Crime Lab restaurant in this location, Mr. Segal said staff are concerned that the outdoor dining character will be lost and recommend maintaining the potential for a restaurant including outdoor seating. Other refinements being sought relate to articulation of the elevator core on Melville Street, improvements to the ground plane around the townhouses, and a reduction in the southeast corner balcony to address privacy concerns. The recommended 80 ft. tower separation is substantially met with the exception of a small corner of the elevator core. Mr. Segal noted that Engineering Services is willing to consider applying Coal Harbour parking standards on this site which are less demanding than in the Downtown.

In summary, staff believe this is a very good solution and a good response to the Board's previous conditions as well as to the BOV conclusions. The recommendation is for approval, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Timm sought clarification with respect to parking and suggested adding "including relaxation of the number of residential spaces and relaxation of required loading" in condition 1.2. Mr. Scobie noted the condition does not indicate a specific number of parking spaces to be approved, so that the extent of the relaxation is somewhat vague. 80 parking spaces would be required by the Coal Harbour standard but this would still be contingent on an acceptable design given the site constraints. Mr. Timm said Engineering Services would prefer not to indicate a specific number given the difficult site conditions, but would prefer that it be left to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services.

Mr. Beasley referred to a June 17, 2005 e-mail which expresses strong support for the application. Copies of the e-mail, from Shane Strachan, resident of suite 2206 of the Pointe Claire, were previously circulated to Board and Panel members. Mr. Segal explained that Mr. Strachan's suite is on the east side of the Pointe Claire, adding he believes that residents in this location would likely be very concerned if the tower were to shift significantly closer to the easterly property line as suggested by residents of the west side of the Pointe Claire, represented by Castle Management. He said staff have concluded that the currently proposed tower location affects the least number of units in the least significant way. Mr. Beasley noted the residents on the west side of the Pointe Claire had indicated they were less concerned about losing some view due north because their optimal view is to the northwest. They had argued that while shifting the building further east would block their northerly view, it would open up their views to the northwest. Mr. Beasley said he believes the proposed solution has honoured that judgment without necessarily intruding on the views due north for the residents on the east side of the Pointe Claire. Mr. Segal confirmed that staff believe the tower has been shifted as far to the east as possible without starting to negatively impact the residents on the east side of the Pointe Claire. Mr. Beasley said he was also concerned about potential view impacts on the Venus, noting that their views start to be affected as well if this building is moved further to the east. In discussion, it was noted there would be marginal impact on the Classico. Mr. Beasley also noted that the Banffshire building depends on views to the north and the current proposal improves those views compared to the previous scheme.

Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding the commercial space at the westerly ground floor of the building. Mr. Segal confirmed that while the difficulties of achieving the loading are acknowledged, staff do not believe the option of a restaurant should be precluded.

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor, Mr. Segal confirmed that staff believe two towers should be permitted on this block. He also confirmed the floorplate of 3,381 sq.ft. is about half the size of typical floorplates in the downtown.

Mr. MacGregor noted the Coal Harbour Community Centre at the foot of Broughton Street is shown on the drawings as parking, with no reference to the approved 11 - 12-storey non-market building to the west of the community centre. Mr. Scobie agreed it is very important to include information on potential development so that purchasers are able to make informed decisions. In discussion, the Board instructed staff to ensure this information is provided in future.

Mr. Thomson offered some clarification with respect to the parking. Parking may be relaxed under the DD parking regulations. Given the significant challenge of achieving parking on this site, staff have requested from the applicant a full rationale for a parking relaxation, which has not yet been received. Staff have found that the parking standard in Coal Harbour is much closer to the actual use in this area than the DD standard which requires units over 1,000 sq.ft. to have two parking stalls. Staff strongly believe that 104 residential spaces required by the DD parking standards would be excessive and that the Coal Harbour standard would be more appropriate for this site. The Coal Harbour standard is based on 0.9 spaces per unit, plus one stall for every 200 m² of gross floor area. Analysis is ongoing to confirm the amount of gross floor area in this proposal but since the total number of units will not be determined until the final submission it is not yet possible to make the necessary calculation to arrive at the number of parking stalls required under the Coal Harbour standards. Mr. Thomson added that Engineering Services is not concerned about establishing a specific number of parking stalls at this stage.

In response to a question from Mr. Henschel, Mr. Segal confirmed that, on a typical floor, the currently proposed tower location improves views for three suites on the west side of the Pointe Claire and modestly reduces views for one suite on the east side of the Pointe Claire.

Doug Robinson, Project Facilitator, provided some clarification about the location of the suite occupied by Shane Strachan. He also noted there were other letters of support for the application from two residents of the east side of the Pointe Claire.

With respect to condition A.1.12, Mr. MacGregor questioned whether there was an alternative to seeking approval from the BOV for the portions of the underground parking beyond the building line, possibly seeking a full dedication from Council as an alternative. Mr. Thomson added that Council approval could also be sought to close, stop-up and convey an air space parcel. Mr. Scobie expressed some concern that the dedication approach would in any event still require a by-law amendment to remove the building line. He also recommended that condition A.1.12 should more properly be in the A.2 standard engineering conditions.

Applicant's Comments

Peter Busby, Architect, said it is very clear that two parking stalls per suite are not required, noting it is also contrary to recent directions from Council as well as the general trend in the marketplace. He agreed with staff that the Coal Harbour standard would be more appropriate

and it was used in their calculation in arriving at 75 spaces. This also allows for some residents to have two spaces.

Referring to the BOV decision to overturn the Development Permit Board's earlier approval, Mr. Busby respectfully requested the Board to attach clear direction attached to its approval to avoid a similar outcome. Mr. Scobie expressed surprise that the Board's previous intentions were not clear given it had approved what was a preliminary submission as a complete application. In discussion, Mr. Busby said they believe they have gone as far as possible in balancing all the competing interests and it should satisfy the BOV.

Mr. Busby confirmed he was in agreement with the recommended conditions.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley noted that an alternative referred to as Option 3A was discussed at the November 2004 Board meeting and Mr. Segal confirmed it was also referenced at the BOV meeting in January 2005. Mr. Beasley noted that Option 3A is very close to the subject submission in meeting the needs of the appellants at the BOV. It was noted the BOV decision was not unanimous and members did not provide reasons that might give direction to a re-submission that would address the majority decision.

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor with respect to the parking, Mr. Busby confirmed he can meet the necessary requirements for parking design and provide 75 parking stalls.

Mr. Busby said he had no concerns with the Building By-law and Fire Department issues identified in Appendix C. Mr. Martin Nielsen, Architect, also confirmed that the issues can be resolved.

Comments from other Speakers

Richard Lui, Castle Management Ltd., was opposed to the application, based not only on the location of the tower but the requested density which is the maximum possible for this site. He added that if the density was lower, achieving sufficient parking would not be an issue. Mr. Lui also objected to the small floorplate which results in a taller than necessary building. He was also concerned about the potential impact of the redevelopment of the Evergreen site in conjunction with this proposal, which appears not to have been considered. Mr. Lui agreed that locating the tower at the easterly perimeter of the site would impact the far east units of the Pointe Claire but there is still more room to manoeuvre on the site without impacting these units. Mr. Lui commented that views from the Venus will be significantly impacted by the Evergreen redevelopment. He said they would recommend a tower height of 230 ft. for the subject proposal given its proximity to the Pointe Claire and noting that towers further to the north are typically 225 ft.

Mr. Scobie noted that Mr. Lui's letter dated April 13, 2005 is included in the Staff Committee Report as Appendix I.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, Mr. Lui said he represents about a third of the Pointe Claire building which is approximately 70 units, including the penthouse suite. He was unable to provide details of the location of the units he represents but suggested they are dispersed throughout the floorplate on various floors and include units on both the east and west side of the building. Mr. Lui noted that since the earlier application there has been a reduction of 8 - 10 units in the total number of units he represents.

In response to a question from Mr. Timm, Mr. Lui confirmed that he manages properties for individual owners. He does not represent the Strata Council. Mr. Timm questioned Mr. Lui's objection to the small floorplate, noting that taller, slender buildings are generally preferred because they maximize opportunities for slot views. Mr. Lui said he did not believe a larger floorplate would result in a wider building and noted the proposed design has its widest dimension, which includes stair and elevator, in front of the Pointe Claire along Melville Street. He suggested it could be designed differently if located adjacent the easterly property line and have a narrower dimension along Melville Street with the stair and elevator located elsewhere. Mr. Scobie noted that if the building is shifted further to the east it would impinge on the 80 ft. tower separation unless it is also pushed further north from the Melville Street property line. In discussion, Mr. Segal noted there is a small setback on West Pender Street.

Mr. Beasley sought further clarification from Mr. Lui that his preference would be for a larger floorplate, a lower building and no transfer of heritage density. Mr. Lui agreed, provided the building has a narrow dimension along Melville Street. Mr. Beasley noted that the amount of heritage density transfer being sought is about 8,000 sq.ft. which equates to approximately two floors. Mr. Lui confirmed he also represents Pointe Claire owners below the 15th floor. Noting that units below the 10th floor inevitably will be blocked, Mr. Lui said he is trying to preserve northwesterly views for units above the 10th floor. In discussion, it was noted the floorplate of the Pointe Claire is about 7,000 sq.ft. and its largest width is 80 - 85 ft. Its height is 315 ft. and the site achieved 6.0 FSR.

Mr. Timm sought clarification from staff regarding Mr. Lui's recommendation to move the tower further to the east. Mr. Segal advised it would need to be set back about 12 ft. from the Melville Street property line in order to maintain the 80 ft. tower separation. In response to a question from Mr. Timm as to whether it would be possible to move the building further east, enlarge the floorplate and stay within the 80 ft. separation, Mr. Segal said staff conducted extensive analysis of all the options and concluded that while the site depth increases towards the east it is not enough to significantly increase the floorplate and respect the 80 ft. separation. If the building was located directly opposite the Pointe Claire some site depth would be gained but it would cause serious privacy issues vis-à-vis the front units of the Pointe Claire.

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor regarding the townhouses which front on Melville Street, Mr. Segal advised they are strongly supported by staff because they contribute to the residential character of Melville Street and are a continuation of the townhouses in the Pointe Claire and Ritz developments. Nevertheless, the townhouses have not been a factor in determining the tower location because they could be located on the west side of the site if the tower was moved to the east. Further discussion ensued and it was noted that staff's conclusion is that the more the building is shifted to the east the more it is necessary to move it north to the Melville property line. While in principle extra site depth is achieved, the consequence of maintaining the 80 ft. separation results in the width of the building being no narrower than is currently proposed. Mr. Segal confirmed that staff believe the proposal represents the optimal floorplate arrangement if the tower is not shifted significantly to the east.

Noting that much of the debate depends on how many units on the east side of the building that Mr. Lui represents, Mr. Beasley sought confirmation of the number from Mr. Lui, who left the meeting to obtain the information.

Frances Walker addressed the Board, representing about eight property owners and tenants of the Pointe Claire, between floors six and 19 on the northeast side of the building (suites 03, 04

and 05). These residents are very concerned that the further east the building is shifted on the site the more their northerly views are affected. They would prefer to maintain their northerly view than to gain an oblique westerly view.

Mr. Lui returned to the meeting and confirmed that he represents the following suite owners in the northeast corner of the Pointe Claire: 404, 804, 904, 1104, 1204, 1304, 2004, 2104, 2404, 2503, 2603, 2703, and 3502 (the penthouse). He confirmed that these owners would prefer the building to be located directly in front of them, to the east on the site, because their northerly views will be blocked in any event by the C-Side building and the redevelopment of the Evergreen building site. Mr. Lui added that privacy is also a concern.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Adams advised the Urban Design Panel has twice unanimously supported the design of this building, the last time having very few comments. He confirmed that the recommended prior-to conditions represent the Panel's advice, especially 1.4. Given the acceptance of the tower form in a community of towers, Mr. Adams said he believes the applicant has mitigated view impacts to the greatest extent possible. He added, the Pointe Claire is not a waterfront property and some view blockage must be anticipated as development occurs. Mr. Adams said there are also urban design objectives that are important in terms of corner definition and creating a striking building and it would be unfortunate if these were lost by moving the building significantly further to the east. The Panel's main response was disappointment at the loss of the original strong flatiron form but it was also acknowledged that the architect has done an excellent job of maintaining the striking character of the building and believe it will prove to be a good addition to the city. Mr. Adams recommended approval. He confirmed the Panel considers the current location of the building to be the best that can be achieved in consideration of overall private views and proximity of buildings.

Mr. Acton said that while he did not see the previous submission he thought the direction of the Board and the Urban Design Panel at that time was correct and it is unfortunate that the original design will not be built. He said there are considerations that must be taken into account that are above and beyond a reasonable response to a neighbouring building that is somewhat upland. Mr. Acton said that the revised design, while not as strong as the original scheme, is still strong, but has reached the breaking point to where it can be moved until a total redesign becomes necessary. Mr. Acton supported the relaxation of parking requirements. With respect to the 04 suites of the Pointe Claire, Mr. Acton said he could not understand why these owners would wish the building to be moved to the east which does not appear to be the obvious or natural solution. He recommended approval.

Mr. Scott said this is a very important site for the city. He expressed disappointment that after all the work that has been done to try and mitigate the view impacts there are still some dissatisfied neighbours. At the same time, the very good architecture of the first scheme has been lost. Mr. Scott supported the reduction in parking in this location. He recommended approval, but with disappointment that the shape of a building that was already approved has been changed.

Mr. Henschel commended the applicant team for arriving at this scheme for this challenging site. He noted the 04 suites in the Pointe Claire would suffer much more by having this building directly in front of them than by maintaining a chequerboard pattern of towers, which is preferable. He added, the main views for the 03 and 04 suites is to the north and moving the building any further to the east would be an error in judgment. He therefore strongly supported the current tower location and massing. With respect to the treatment of the elevator core, Mr. Henschel suggested condition 1.4 should be a consideration item, noting it

should be left to the architect to integrate the core into the building. He also thought condition 1.5 should be a consideration item and left to the architect to work out. He recommended approval.

Ms. Hung also commended the applicant team and noted this is a very special site in the downtown which offers the opportunity for a spectacular building. She said she was very pleased and impressed with the building elevations which are elegant, simple and graceful. Ms. Hung stressed that shifting the building any further to the east will further compromise the intent of the flatiron design. She supported the townhouses, and the treatment of the elevator core as shown. She also supported a reduction in parking and questioned whether car co-op spaces had been considered. In closing, she said it is a fabulous project and she strongly supported it.

Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor commented that in these situations it is impossible to satisfy everyone about views and at some point a decision has to be made. He said staff have done a good job in their analysis and provided the Board with all the necessary information. He agreed with an earlier comment that this is not waterfront property but several blocks back from Coal Harbour. He added, he believed this building has one of the smallest floorplates the Board has ever approved and on this difficult site it is a tribute to the developer to want to proceed with it. Mr. MacGregor said he supported the proposed location of the tower, which also achieves a better configuration with the townhouses and gives a strong prominence to the corner. With respect to parking, he felt the Board should indicate the number of spaces to be provided rather than leaving it open, noting, however, that a case for hardship could be considered if it is ultimately found necessary to go to another level of parking for provision of a few spaces. He moved approval of the application, with a number of amendments to the conditions.

Mr. Beasley noted that at the Board's meeting in November 2004, neighbours representing the west side of the Pointe Claire advised the Board that they preferred the building to be moved further to the east, which caused him some concern about impacts this would have on the residents on the east side of the Pointe Claire and for the Venus and other neighbouring buildings. However, the Board of Variance came to the conclusion that there were benefits to moving the tower further to the east, which gives some guidance about the direction a new building design should take. Therefore, the current submission, which does move the building significantly to the east, appears to be consistent with the Board of Variance decision and with the wishes of some of the owners on the west side of the Pointe Claire.

Mr. Beasley said it is clear from Mr. Lui's presentation that the owners on the west side of the Pointe Claire believe the building should be moved still further to the east, and since there were no other delegations from the west side of Pointe Claire who argued to the contrary, he accepted Mr. Lui's representation as probably the majority view of those on the west side of the Pointe Claire. Mr. Lui has also suggested the building should be moved even further to the east and perhaps the floorplate reconfigured and the height reduced. Mr. Beasley said that while he accepts that opinion as being representative of the owners Mr. Lui represents, there was the presentation of Ms. Walker who represents approximately the same number of residents on the east side of the building, indicating that while they accepted the move to the east as proposed, they were very concerned about any move further to the east because their northerly views are very important.

In considering other aspects, Mr. Beasley said it appears to have been concluded that as the building is moved to the east, maintaining the 80 ft. separation, not much more floorplate depth can be achieved. Therefore, the building cannot be reconfigured to either reduce height

or width significantly. It could be achieved if the 80 ft. separation is disregarded. However, this would impact privacy, which Mr. Lui has indicated is also an important consideration. Mr. Beasley said he also came to the conclusion that reducing the height of this building significantly would result in widening the building and he could not accept that residents up to about the 15th floor of the Pointe Claire would appreciate having both their west and north views completely blocked in order to bring the building down so that the residents above would have unobstructed views. Mr. Beasley added that if the building were moved further to the east, then a group of citizens not represented here, namely those in the Venus, begin to be affected in a significant way. He said he believed the safest conclusion for the majority of those affected by this development is to support the building in the location it is now proposed, and at the width and height it is now proposed.

Mr. Beasley said it is difficult to make any judgment about the Evergreen site because the proposal has not yet been evaluated. However, it will have to take the conclusion on the subject building as a given, and the impacts on the Venus, the Pointe Claire and the subject building will be taken into consideration.

With respect to the design of the proposal, Mr. Beasley said he did not believe the architect has given up on good architecture by having to re-shape the building, noting there are many other factors besides its floorplate that give it distinction. Mr. Beasley said he believed the building as now proposed has greater distinction than the earlier scheme and it appears to be a very elegant solution, even in the revised circumstances. It is a great design that appears to better balance the interests of the neighbours. Mr. Beasley said he also preferred the ground plane treatment of this scheme and was hopeful a way would be found to locate a restaurant at the corner, both as a memory to the Crime Lab and to help animate the street. Mr. Beasley supported the conclusion on parking, noting this is the strong message from Council as well as advice from Engineering Services that it better represents the actual demand in this location.

With respect to the heritage density transfer, Mr. Beasley said he considered the fact that this site might have more density than it should, but the additional density concerned equates to about only one or two floors and this variable is so modest that it outweighs the benefit of attracting the heritage density. Mr. Beasley seconded Mr. MacGregor's motion of approval.

Mr. Timm concurred with Mr. Beasley's comments and supported the Board's decision. He said the building is obviously going to be an impact on the building behind but there is a right to develop the site. He noted the scheme has now gone through two iterations and staff have worked very hard to reach a balance to minimize its impact. Mr. Lui has contended that moving the building further east would have certain benefits to those people he represents. However, Mr. Timm said he was not convinced the reduction in width of the building was achievable because it has been shown that no additional floorplate depth would be gained by moving further to the east. Further, Mr. Timm said he did not believe it would be improving the oblique westerly view for the 04 suite because it already has its view impacted. Mr. Timm suggested the benefits suggested by Mr. Lui are likely theoretical and would not be achievable because there are conflicting objectives. Mr. Timm was also concerned about the residents of the Venus who are not represented at this meeting. In summary, said he did not believe anything more could be done to improve the current situation in terms of siting and massing.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 409236, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated June 8, 2005, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.2 to add, after "parking" in the first line:
layout for at least 75 parking spaces (residential and commercial combined);

Amend the penultimate line of the Note to Applicant in 1.2 to add, after "parking spaces":
to be more aligned with the parking standards for Coal Harbour;

Delete A.1.12;

Amend A.2.11 to add, after "establishment":
/dedication;

Amend the Note to Applicant in A.2.11 to add:
This can be achieved by obtaining Council and Board of Variance approval for the portion of the underground parking proposed beyond the building line or Council approval only and, if necessary, by-law amendments with respect to the building line.

Delete A.2.12.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Referring to the earlier decision of the BOV to overturn the Board's original approval, Mr. MacGregor further moved that:

In the event the Board of Variance allows an appeal of the Board's approval of Development Application No. DE409236, the Development Permit Board requests the Board of Variance to provide written reasons for its decision.

Seconded by Mr. Beasley
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The meeting adjourned at 6.25 p.m. and reconvened at 7.00 p.m. at the Plaza 500 Hotel for consideration of 1055 Canada Place.

When the meeting reconvened, the Chair noted the Board's procedures indicate that meetings will generally adjourn no later than 10.00 p.m. In discussion, the Board agreed that on this occasion the meeting should continue until such time as a decision is reached.

5. 1055 CANADA PLACE - DE408490 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE AFTER PRELIMINARY)

Applicant: Vancouver Convention Centre Expansion Project Ltd. (VCCEP)

Request: Construction of a convention centre with approx. floor area totaling 78 871 m² (848,988 sq.ft.), including exhibition hall, associated ballrooms and meeting rooms, retail/service area, parking (442 cars) accessed off Canada Place, loading (24 bays along north water side of site) accessed off Waterfront Road, a perimeter walkway/bikeway, a partial lower level walkway (northwest portion of site), a major public plaza at the west part of the site (foot of Thurlow), and a landscaped transition area to Harbour Green Park.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ralph Segal, Development Planner, presented this complete application, referring to the project model and Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated June 8, 2005. He briefly reviewed the site context and the various project components, noting that the water-oriented uses will proceed later and are part of an RFP process already underway by VCCEP. The preliminary submission was approved in principle by the Board in September 2004. Staff consider that since the preliminary stage the design has evolved to the extent that all significant design issues have been substantially resolved or are well on the way to being resolved. The remaining issues are design refinements that staff believe will bring the proposal to achieving a significant project for the city. Along with the design development conditions recommended in the report, Mr. Segal noted there are numerous legal and jurisdictional matters to be resolved, including the creation of a single parcel for the VCCEP site and a variety of road dedications and rights of way, and securing public use of Port Authority lands.

Mr. Segal briefly reviewed the design details referred to in the report, noting a major issue relates to the roof edge. While the overall design of the 6 acre green roof is supported, the Urban Design Panel and staff believe the continuous vertical form treatment of the roof edges should be reconsidered, particularly on the south side of Canada Place where the project meets the city. Refinements are also sought to the walkway/bikeway route around the entire perimeter of the site, including the northwest corner where staff believe the commercial vertical edge should be reduced to improve the viability of the space. Mr. Segal briefly summarized the refinements that are also sought on the Thurlow Plaza, the Transition Zone, Burrard Plaza and the Exterior Building Treatment, as outlined in the conditions contained in the report.

In summary, Mr. Segal confirmed that the recommendation is for approval and commented that the design of the convention centre is noticeably better than most others. It is also acknowledged that it provides elements in the public realm that are quite outstanding and which meet a series of very important public objectives.

Mr. Segal noted VCCEP had provided an amended version of the DPSC's recommended conditions of approval, indicating changes it would prefer and would be addressing in its presentation. These were circulated to the Board and Advisory Panel, and staff were prepared to respond to the requested changes should that be desired.

Discussion

Mr. Beasley sought clarification with respect to the screening around the loading dock and questioned whether there was a simpler and possibly less expensive but equally effective way

to deal with it. Mr. Segal agreed there are a number of solutions. The translucent glass panel currently proposed is an optimal solution but other methods could be considered. Mr. Beasley noted the screening will be particularly important once the waterfront activities are in place. Mr. Segal confirmed that VCCEP's suggested revision to condition 1.15 is acceptable.

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor about the specificity of some the conditions, Mr. Segal confirmed they are no more stringent than is typically required for other developments. With respect to the provision of washrooms, he said staff accept that these cannot be provided in the convention centre itself but believe there are a number of opportunities to provide them elsewhere. Staff think it is important that this be determined early in the design.

Mr. MacGregor sought clarification about the approach being taken with respect to the additional parking generated by the commercial uses, noting that the additional commercial space was added on the strong recommendation of staff as a means of animating the walkway via incorporation of more commercial space. Mr. MacGregor was concerned that the applicants should not be unnecessarily penalized given the site restrictions. Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, noted the preliminary approval included 442 parking stalls, 420 of which are for the convention centre. The balance of 22, heavily discounted, was accepted by staff as being sufficient for the amount of retail space then proposed (4,000 m²+). The complete submission includes over 9,000 m² of retail. Using the same heavily discounted parking rate for the retail, staff calculate the need for an additional 28 parking stalls. Six required disability spaces have been double counted, which reduces the number to 22, bringing the total number of required retail parking spaces to 44 (compared to the 117 required by the CD-1 by-law). Mr. Thomson said staff are satisfied that the additional 22 parking stalls can be provided off-site and are also open to discussion about them being provided prior to occupancy of the additional retail space. Mr. Thomson provided some alternative wording to condition A.1.1 in this regard. He noted the total project requirement under strict compliance with the by-law would be 848 parking stalls.

Applicant's Comments

Russ Anthony, President & Project Director, VCCEP, introduced the applicant team. He noted they have been working closely with staff for over two years in an effort to reach a balance between making sure they achieve a successful, world class convention centre while paying close attention to the resources available on this publicly funded project. He stressed that they also share with staff the interest in making it a landmark building on the waterfront. Mr. Anthony noted the many challenges and successes that have been achieved during the process. He said he believes the project is now an exciting statement for Vancouver. It is now time to confirm the scope of the project and thereby the schedule and budget. The proposal now expands the public spaces, adds to the public amenities, adds a series of design features to enhance the quality of the building, creates added opportunity for the waterfront masterplan development yet is contained and respectful of the development envelope and view corridors. Mr. Anthony requested the Board to approve the complete application, stressing they need to make some very important, long-term and irreversible decisions in the very near future.

Mr. Anthony referred to a list of VCCEP's requested amendments to the conditions, copies of which were previously distributed to Board and Panel members. He briefly reviewed the suggested changes to those conditions which they believe may have implications on what they can deliver, and noted that other concerns can be dealt with in further discussions with staff. In closing, he noted that this is a very important milestone for VCCEP.

Discussion

Noting the discussion on the conditions could be quite lengthy, and they are generally of a detailed technical nature, Mr. Beasley suggested that the Board adjust its normal procedure by hearing first from the public delegations. Board members concurred. Mr. MacGregor added, the public input may also guide the Board in its deliberations.

Comments from other Speakers

Gerry Sieben, Coal Harbour Resident, sought confirmation with respect to the relocation of the float plane terminal. Mr. Anthony stressed they are committed to relocating the terminal to an area to the north of the convention centre by November 2007. There are also some walkway connectors that need to be relocated, the details of which are tied to the additional waterfront development and the timing for this is as yet unknown.

Jim Schallenberg, Transport Canada, stated the Navigable Waters Protection Act regulates the placement and construction of works built within a navigable waterway. Their mandate is to protect the public right of navigation and their intent is to ensure that all works built remain within the water lot, forward of the harbour headline. Mr. Anthony confirmed there is nothing in the proposal that extends beyond the harbour headline.

Gordon , Sculptor, said he has a proposal for a large scale sculpture that he would like to be considered for the project. It was recommended that the delegation contact the proponents who in turn should determine whether the landowner has an interest in pursuing it through the City's public art program.

Clark McKee, Coal Harbour resident, asked if consideration had been given to the fact that Thurlow Plaza is in the middle of a residential area and whether there would be any restrictions on its use.

Mr. Segal advised that careful consideration is given to the kinds of events that can occur in the plaza, and is addressed in the proposed Plaza Agreement. Mr. MacGregor stressed that the plaza is adjacent to, but not in the middle of a residential neighbourhood. It has always been intended to have a plaza in this location with some entertainment on it, at times, and there will undoubtedly be noise, similar to other events that occur elsewhere throughout the city from time to time. Mr. Beasley agreed that it has always been planned for a public plaza for events, as indicated in the original Official Development Plan. However, while it would be unrealistic to expect there would be no noise, there should be a managed approach which includes input from the neighbours about how the events occur. Mr. Anthony confirmed that VCCEP would be prepared to include public consultation as part of the process. In discussion, Mr. MacGregor cautioned about being too prescriptive on what has always been intended as a major public plaza. Mr. Scobie concurred that this location has always been contemplated as a public plaza, not a local neighbourhood plaza. It is intended to serve the public at large in the city and the region as a venue for both formal and informal events and it would be a disservice to that broader public if it were to be so heavily regulated to limit its potential as a public plaza. Mr. Scobie added he believes condition A.1.21 provides sufficient scope to allow for the kind of public consultation suggested by Mr. Beasley.

Sorin Tatomir commended the City and VCCEP on what has been achieved to date on this project. He said it will be a landmark building. Mr. Tatomir recommended that lighting and public art be added to the model to give the public a better indication of how it will look.

Discussion arising from the Applicant's Presentation

Returning to the amendments to the conditions recommended by the applicant, each item was reviewed in turn and determined whether they were acceptable, with further changes being made during the discussion. Some of the points that arose included:

1.1: Mr. Anthony stressed that their analysis of the engineering consequences of not making any changes to the roof overhang is that it would result in a very severe cost penalty for very little aesthetic gain. Mr. Grassi added, it involves refining the edge detail and amounts to about 20,000 sq.ft. Mr. Beasley agreed that the details can be worked out with staff and he has no opposition to the reduction, but adding "possible reduction" to the condition indicates that it is not actually being requested by the City.

Following the discussion on the amendment to services to be provided in "Bon Voyage Terrace" (1.4 h), Mr. Timm voiced a general concern that many of VCCEP's requested changes provide less specificity in some areas, including electrical services, public washrooms and Waterfront Road exhaust fans. Referring specifically to 1.4 h), Mr. Beasley said he had some sympathy for the applicant given this terrace was added fairly recently and its programming is not yet determined. He was therefore comfortable with the generality being suggested by VCCEP in this condition.

1.6: Mr. Beasley said it was well understood at the preliminary approval stage that there is an expectation for public washrooms to be provided to serve the public plaza. It was accepted that they could not be provided in the convention centre itself but would be integrated with the commercial development. He suggested the logical time to provide them would be at occupancy of the open spaces. Mr. Anthony concurred, provided there is the flexibility to explore the option of locating them in the transition area.

1.17: Mr. Segal advised that staff are concerned that the public access to the future water-based uses may not occur until after the 2010 Olympics. Mr. Beasley commented that he did not believe that "date of substantial completion" was essential and suggested "before occupation of the facility" as an alternative. Mr. MacGregor said he also had some concerns about the timing and would consider the addition of "or such other agreed upon date", noting it is critical that the work is done.

A.1.1: Mr. Beasley indicated he did not want to be specific about the additional required 22 parking spaces, noting that relaxations may be considered under the Parking By-law. Mr. Thomson noted there are many locations around the site where the additional parking could be arranged, and added that a considerable reduction is already being supported by Engineering Services. Mr. MacGregor explained the history of the transition zone parking area and said he did not believe the extra spaces were necessary because patrons of the waterfront retail are most likely to be existing pedestrians rather than destination patrons in any event. He remained satisfied with the 442 spaces indicated at the preliminary stage and added he was grateful to VCCEP for responding to the City's request to introduce additional retail to animate the waterfront. Mr. Timm said he believed the additional retail space would generate additional parking demand, and his understanding from discussions with VCCEP was that VCCEP would provide it, although not in the main parking structure. He also noted there will be a demand for retail employee parking. Mr. Beasley said his concern was that if provision of the additional parking proved to be a severe financial constraint, the retail might be removed, to the detriment of the public realm. Mr. MacGregor concurred.

A.2.16: Mr. Timm noted it was a condition on the original landowner (Marathon) to construct the waterfront viaduct. When VCCEP acquired the site it assumed all of the former owner's legal obligations. The viaduct structure was conveyed to VCCEP and the exhaust vents are an

integral part of the viaduct. Karen Magnusson, Project Engineer, confirmed the Canada Place Viaduct is contained within the Burrard Landing rezoning services agreement. Traffic signals on Canada Place at Burrard and at Thurlow are also required and staff recommend that they are also included in the condition. Mr. Anthony said he was not aware that provision of exhaust fans was their obligation and did not believe they should be responsible for the general air quality along Waterfront Road. He had no objection to providing the traffic signals which he believes is reasonable. Mr. MacGregor agreed there was likely no specific reference to exhaust vents in the original agreement but they will have to be included in the design of the viaduct in accordance with engineering standards. Mr. Timm reiterated his concern that specific items are being removed from the conditions before this Board that will nonetheless need to be addressed via the various legal agreements that are required before issuance of the development permit.

A.2.17: Mr. Thomson illustrated the amount of public right of way that it will be necessary to secure from the Vancouver Port Authority. Mr. Anthony explained that VPA will not grant perpetual rights although VCCEP will do everything they can to meet the requirement. Since it is beyond their control VCCEP does not believe it should be a condition of approval. In discussion, Mr. Anthony said he believed the risk of not being able to obtain the right of way was minimal, given the levels of senior government involved in the project. Mr. Beasley agreed with the applicant's concern that the condition should not require something outside the control of VCCEP which would preclude issuance of the development permit. He recommended adding "preferably for the life of the building" which would acknowledge the intent but not prevent issuance of the permit.

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor concerning the date VCCEP anticipates receiving the development permit, Mr. Anthony said they hope to have the permit by the end of December 2005.

Mr. Beasley sought clarification from the applicant that they intend to further refine the roof edges in consultation with staff. Mr. Anthony concurred.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding the issues identified in Appendix C, Mr. Grassi confirmed they have no concerns about addressing the issues.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Adams said that notwithstanding that there are some wonderful ideas and there will be some dramatic spaces in the project, the Urban Design Panel remained generally disappointed with the proposal. The Panel had hoped for a very iconic structure but think the opportunity has been missed. There are, however, some areas in which the Panel would still wish to exert some influence, namely, the roof, the skin of the building, and the ground plane. Mr. Adams agreed that the recommended conditions with respect to the roof adequately reflect the concerns indicated by the Panel, noting that from the outset the Panel found the roof edge too clumsy and heavy. The Panel also had concerns that at the pedestrian level the experience of the building would be its skin, and urged that it be of the very highest quality. As well, the ground plane requires a very high quality of materials and detail. Mr. Adams added he believed staff has done an admirable job of incorporating the Panel's advice in the conditions. The Panel was also concerned about areas beyond the purview of VCCEP, namely, the Park Board restaurant, the float plane terminal and the retail component, all of which will be crucial to the success of this project. Mr. Adams urged that the City put those components under the same scrutiny as the convention centre. In summary, he recommended approval, subject to the conditions.

Mr. Acton concurred that the areas identified by staff are the key issues. He commented that the living roof is a very strong concept and while there is still much work to be done to improve it, it is achievable. He agreed very strongly that the roof edge needs attention and was disappointed that while concerns about it have been raised since the outset, it seems to have remained the same throughout. He did not believe the living roof needed to extend to the edge and saw no problem with adding other materials to the roof to provide some articulation. Mr. Acton saw the north end of the building to be a great opportunity in terms of its vertical circulation systems and stressed that this is a critical elevation. He strongly supported the use of concrete for the walkway/bikeway. Mr. Acton was also concerned that some of the service issues are not yet tied down and said it is important that they are addressed in the conditions. Public washrooms are critical and the transition zone may be the best location. Mr. Acton agreed with the suggested solution for the structural glass system and for the loading docks screening. He also agreed that 1.17 should indicate some date or milestone and should offer some flexibility. With respect to parking, Mr. Acton said retail employee parking is more important than customer parking. An appropriate number of bicycle parking should be determined. With respect to A.2.21, Mr. Acton said it should be clearly stated that accessibility by non profit organizations is part of the programming.

Mr. Henschel complimented the proponents on the progress made on the programming and functioning of the facility. However, some serious issues remain outstanding such as the Vancouver Port Authority access which must be resolved for at least the life of the building otherwise the building will have to change to accommodate that lack of access. As a representative of the community, Mr. Henschel said he was not very pleased with how the proponents are dealing with the public facilities and public access and he noted that many of the changes to the conditions sought by VCCEP seem to be reducing opportunities for the public to interact with this facility, which is a big mistake. He stressed that this building is not just for convention centre users but its success will be in how it is experienced by the general public. Mr. Henschel urged the Board to take special care that the broad interests of the public are taken into account. With respect to the design, he said it will be a very public building that will be a major part of Vancouver's image. Unfortunately, he found its architectural expression has not developed in a way that he hoped and there is some hesitancy on the part of the proponents to make it a truly iconic building. It seems awkward and clumsy, not only at the roof edge but in the way it folds into the walls and the structure of the walls. Mr. Henschel said he could not support the proposal as a complete application, believing insufficient progress has been made since the preliminary stage.

Mr. Scott said this is one of the most significant buildings of this decade and every effort should be made to get it right. He noted there have been impressive changes made already. It also must be recognized that it is a joint venture of provincial and federal governments and public money must be spent properly. Mr. Scott agreed with the proponent that the conditions should not be too prescriptive but to give staff and the proponent the flexibility to work things through and have faith that everyone has the goal of producing a significant and impressive building for the city. Referring to the design, Mr. Scott said most people will view this project at ground level rather than the roof and he commended the proponents for the addition of the commercial space. The roof edge is a significant element and Mr. Scott said he thought it should be sloped and for the glass to be well lit at night. Thurlow Plaza is an excellent opportunity for some significant public art as a focal point. As well, the plaza space must be flexible because needs will change over the coming years. Mr. Scott said he believed the encroachment of the roof edges into the view corridor demands that a very significant edge be provided to compensate the public for that loss of view. Mr. Scott thought the requirement for additional parking for the commercial space should be forgiven, noting there is already a substantial amount of parking and a lot of arguments can be made for joint use. In closing, Mr.

Scott urged that there be some back-up plan for solving some of the issues and having some alternatives in the event some of the negotiations fail. He supported the application.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley said the City and the proponents have worked on this project for several years, and it has generated many aspirations as well as issues. He acknowledged that everything he had hoped for has not happened, but much that he doubted would happen, has happened. On balance, he said he felt quite positive about the outcome and found it interesting that the focus has been on details. Compared to other convention centres all over North America, Mr. Beasley noted there is an extraordinary public realm being proposed that other centres do not have. It achieves the continuation of the waterfront walkway, a four acre plaza that will become one of the most important meeting places in the city, the seamless park extension, the Burrard Plaza, and the continuity of the bike routes - all these are exceptional public realms. With respect to the roof, Mr. Beasley said he had always hoped for the building, in profile, to have a more iconic roof but this roof is not iconic. However, it is still a very extraordinary roof. It is a six acre nature reserve and, if it is realized in the way illustrated by the landscape architects, will be among the top ten largest green roofs in North America, which is an extraordinary achievement. It will be viewed by many thousands of citizens who look down on the building. Mr. Beasley was pleased to see the inclusion of additional retail and he hoped the project could aspire to places like Darling Harbour in Sydney, with many active restaurants in order to create an active destination. He said he was confident the RFP process now underway has set the foundation for this to occur. The water uses in the master plan are also a great achievement, and will include the relocation of the float plane terminal which will provide assurance to the neighbours to the west. The project maintains the view corridors with some very modest intrusions. As well, the building has a very positive treatment of the outside edges, unlike most other convention centres, which is an extraordinary achievement given the program.

Mr. Beasley said he was happy to give the application a very firm and enthusiastic approval. The conditions recommended by staff address many of the details and these will be refined with the adjustments previously discussed. Mr. Beasley added, he takes it as given that the applicant team is in agreement with all the conditions with the exception of those where they suggested changes. There is still work to be done on the roof edge which needs to be refined together with all the edges. The public realm finishing needs to be enhanced and finalized. There must be washrooms in the public space to serve the thousands of people who will be there. Mr. Beasley said he was pleased there is now agreement about the screening of the loading docks which has always been a concern. There must be security on the delivery of vertical access from the lower walkway to the top. It is essential that the retail is included, for which Mr. Beasley said he is prepared to relieve the applicant of the obligation for a few extra parking spaces to achieve this. He stressed that everything must be done to make sure the retail space - which is hoped would be restaurants - occurs. It must be clear that there will be public uses in these areas for which the infrastructure must be secured. Mr. Beasley said we have to be reasonable about the access over the Port lands and he agreed with Mr. Scott that we must have some faith that a deal will be struck. Nevertheless, he urged VCCEP to provide staff with as much information as possible.

Mr. MacGregor complimented the design team which has been working on this project for many months and he noted that this submission represents the culmination of over a decade of discussion on the need for the convention centre expansion. It is critical that it should now proceed so that the city can compete with other centres. While the public realm items are very important, it is also critical that it also works for conventions. With respect to Thurlow Plaza, Mr. MacGregor stressed that this has always been envisaged as a key public plaza for a variety

of activities. Regarding the design, he said he considered the roof to be iconic and unlike anything built elsewhere. To achieve this level of sustainability is commendable and bringing it down in places to where the public can see it is also unique. Mr. MacGregor supported Mr. Beasley's amendments to the conditions and seconded the motion of approval, adding that he is confident that all that is required can be achieved.

Mr. Timm said the project has come a long way and a few of the elements are particularly well done, including the walkway/bikeway which has been very well resolved. He also supported the waterfront frontage and the addition of the retail in this location. Mr. Timm also acknowledged that the applicant team has a very difficult job to do with a very tight schedule and budget, and including the City's very high expectations for the building. Commenting on the concerns he voiced earlier, Mr. Timm noted they are raised from the perspective of protecting the City's interests and a concern that, because of the competing interests faced by the applicant, some of the difficult issues are being postponed. He said he was not comfortable with some of the amendments to the conditions given the issues will still need to be addressed before the development permit is issued. Nevertheless, Mr. Timm said he supports the direction the project has taken and is pleased to support its approval. He did not support the deletion of the additional parking spaces, which he said equates to the City subsidizing the waterfront retail. He sought further minor amendments to Mr. Beasley's motion, which Mr. Beasley and Mr. MacGregor accepted.

Mr. Scobie expressed appreciation to staff for providing specificity in the conditions, which makes it easier for the Board to deal with. He also thanked the applicants for the clarity of their presentation with respect to requested amendments. Mr. Scobie also commented that he found it unusual that there were very few public speakers for such an important civic project. He concurred with Mr. Timm about the budget and time constraints of the project, and with Mr. Beasley that this project has not met the challenge of producing an iconic building. However, he said he was confident its functionality would be exceptional and the public realm elements are tremendous. He said the green roof saves the building; otherwise it is not a signature building, which is disappointing for such a major public facility. Mr. Scobie thought that a reasonable compromise had been made with respect to the parking, noting it is in the city's interests for the extra retail space to be included to animate the public environment.

Mr. Beasley added that staff have done an extraordinary job under severe time constraints and they are to be commended. Mr. MacGregor concurred on the substantial amount of work that has been required to bring this forward, by both staff and the applicant. Mr. MacGregor also commented that if the Development Permit Board had existed in 1935, it is likely that City Hall would not have been approved. He said he believed that, in time, the convention centre will prove to be an iconic building.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 408490, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated June 8, 2005, with the following amendments:

Edges/Roof

Amend 1.1 to read:

design development to the treatment of the various roof edges (including the plaza restaurant roof edge), *including possible reduction of roof overhangs*, to achieve a more dynamic, articulated, less relentless expression;

Amend the third bullet item under the **Note to Applicant** to read:

- in addition to articulating the edge of the uppermost roof over the ballroom/mechanical area, refining the mechanical louvre treatment, *and appropriateness of adjacent living roof, having regard for compatible colour of roof areas that are not "living roof"*; and;

Amend 1.4 a) to read:

visually enhanced surface patterning, materials and planting;

Amend 1.4 h) to read:

at the northeast corner ("Bon Voyage Terrace"), providing one *electrical* service location *and appropriate related services, to the satisfaction of the Director, Office of Cultural Affairs*;

Amend 1.6 to read:

agreement to the satisfaction of the City manager in consultation with the Director of Legal Services and Director of Planning for provision of adequate public washroom facilities to serve the public open spaces prior to the occupancy of those spaces;

Amend 1.8 to read:

design development to Thurlow Plaza to maximize the flexibility of the space for public events programming and its use as a major civic gathering space on the waterfront, including the provision of *an appropriate number of* service points *that includes services appropriate for the projected use which will likely include* electrical service for stage, sound, lighting, water service and waste disposal (including grey water disposal), to be spaced throughout the plaza, and accessibility to garbage facilities for Plaza *events* and an indication of how these facilities are serviced, to the satisfaction of the Director, Office of Cultural Affairs and the General Manager of Engineering Services (see also condition A.1.21);

Amend the first sentence of 1.9 to read:

design development to the Transition Zone landscape between Harbour Green Park and the southwest portion of Thurlow Plaza, to *achieve* the quality of materials and integration of landscape elements, *reflective of that of Harbour Green Park*, including the following

Amend 1.13 a) to read:

the proposed structural glass system, including architectural elements such as sun-shading *devices that respond to improved energy performance*; and;

Amend 1.15 to read:

submission of details of screening of the loading docks, with consideration given to simplifying its treatment as a *clean and simple* background element to the project's overall north façade;

Delete the **Note to Applicant** in 1.15;

Amend 1.17 to delete "by the date of substantial completion of the Convention Centre" and replace with: *before occupancy of the facility or such other date as the City Manager may agree upon*;

Amend A.1.1 to delete "provide 22 additional parking spaces and details of" and begin the sentence with "all *required 442*";

Amend the Note to Applicant in 1.1 to delete the first two sentences;

Amend A.1.2 to read:
provide Class A and Class B bicycle spaces for convention centre staff, as an integrated facility giving consideration for this building type (note: adjustments will be required to Technical Analysis table), to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services;

Amend the Note to Applicant in A.1.2 to add:
The requirements for the retail/service component will be provided by the masterplan developer.;

Amend the Note to Applicant in A.1.21 to read:
*Acknowledging the special parameters of the convention centre use, the Agreement will include the right of access to all areas intended for public use (walkway/bikeway), Thurlow and Burrard Plazas, plaza restaurant roof, lower waterfront walkway, etc.) and arrangements for community use of the plazas, establishing a minimum number of hours *annual hours at a schedule to be agreed upon* that the Thurlow Plaza will be made available *which may, for some groups, be* at no cost to Vancouver based non-profit community, cultural and recreational organizations for community programming and animation. Community use to include access, *in some instances*, at no cost for services (power, water, etc.) and support areas (public washrooms, loading, garbage).*

Amend A.2.4 a. to add *and/or* after way finding and to
A.2.4 b. to change PE2 to *PE3*;

Amend A.2.16 to add:
, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and Director of Legal Services;

Delete the Note to Applicant in A.2.16;

Amend A.2.17 a) to add:
provided that any rights and interests which may be granted to the City as contemplated in this condition A.2.17 a) and in Conditions A.2.17 g), h) and i) below may be limited by rights and interests actually available to the Applicant from Vancouver Port Authority;

Amend the Note to Applicant in A.2.17 to read:
This may include, if available from the Vancouver Port Authority, rights of public passage, preferably for the life of the building, at approximate 3.5 m and 13.0 m elevations;

Amend the Note to Applicant in A.2.17 g) to read:

This *may include, if available from the Vancouver Port Authority, rights of public passage, preferably for the life of the building*, at approximate 3.5 m and 13.0 m elevations;

Amend A.2.17 h) to read:

easement *or other rights as to* anchor rod installation securing and supporting the sheet pile wall proposed for installation of unsurveyed Bed and Foreshore of Burrard Inlet adjacent to Lot 11, LMP20247.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

C. Hubbard
Raincoast Ventures

F. Scobie
Chair