

Date: Monday, June 4, 2007
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

R. Jenkins Assistant Director, Current Planning (Chair)
T. French Assistant Director, Central Area
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 (arrived at 3:15 PM)
J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry
H. Hung Representative of the General Public
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public

Regrets

D. Chung Representative of the General Public
M. Braun Representative of the General Public
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

M. Thomson City Surveyor
A. Molaro Development Planner
P. Huber Project Facilitator
S. Hein Development Planner
J. Greer Project Facilitator

1012-1238 SEYMOUR STREET

P. Sysoev Applicant

175 ROBSON STREET

J. Chow Relative Form Architectural Studio
Z. Bhatia Mayfair Properties
D. Lee PWL Landscape Consultants

1 ATHLETES WAY - PARCEL 11 (SEFC)

W. Francl Walter Francl Architects
N. Milkovich Nick Milkovich Architects Inc.
I. Smith City of Vancouver
P. Kreuk Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of April 23, 2007 be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 1012-1238 SEYMOUR STREET - DE411186 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Peter Sysoev

Request: Interior alterations to relocate the stair and construct a 110.0 sq. ft. addition to the existing mezzanine in Suite #1012 of the existing Multiple Dwelling/Residential Unit with Artist Studio - Class A building on this site, thereby requesting an increase in the Floor Space Ratio using a Heritage Density Transfer. The applicant has indicated the purchase of heritage density will be 110.0 sq. ft. from 640 West Pender Street.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mr. Jenkins presented the applications for Suite 1012 being an application similar to numerous previous applications for heritage density transfers to suites in this building.

Applicant's Comments

The property owner, Mr. Sysoev, accepted the conditions in the Staff Report.

Questions/Discussion

None.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

The members all recommended approval.

Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor suggested a summary of suites still in violation be presented with the next application.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE411186, in accordance with the Staff Report dated June 4, 2007.

**4. 175 ROBSON STREET - DE411173 - ZONE DD
(PRELIMINARY APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Relative Form Architecture Studio

Request: To construct a mixed-use retail/hotel/residential complex in a 20 storey tower with a 2 storey podium on the Robson Street side stepping up to 3 stories to the northeast. The residential lobby and hotel functions including conference facilities, spa and amenities are located in the podium. Small retail units at street level are proposed along both Cambie and Robson Streets. The tower accommodates 108 hotel suites in the seven lower floors and 73 residential units on the upper eleven floors. Three levels of underground parking are proposed with access off the lane.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced this application for a mixed-use hotel/retail/residential complex at the corner of Robson and Cambie Streets. The lower two floors will contain retail with the hotel on levels three through level nine of the tower. Levels ten through twenty will be residential units. The basic maximum height permitted is 150 feet however the Board may permit a height up to 450 feet. Ms. Molaro noted that there is a view cone for Cambie Bridge to Crown/Grouse Mountain which restricts the height of the tower to 206 feet. The applicant is asking for a height of 201 feet which staff are supporting. Staff are also supporting an increase in the FSR with the use of a heritage density transfer.

Ms. Molaro noted that staff are asking the applicant to slim the tower in order to achieve a maximum dimension of 90 feet and are recommending further design development to the hotel lobby on Cambie Street to distinguish between the hotel and residential use entry points.

Ms. Molaro reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated May 9, 2007. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, with advice and comments provided.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The application is consistent with the level of recommended design development in a Preliminary Application;
- There are opportunities to absorb the density with the slimming of the tower;
- The purpose of the set back is to widen the pedestrian space Robson Street;
- The view cone is from the Cambie Street Bridge to Grouse Mountain;
- There are no current guidelines instructing applicants to include sustainable measures in their projects; and
- The applicant's proposed overall width of the floor plates is 100 feet.

Applicant's Comments

Joys Chow, Architect, advised they had no concerns with the Staff Committee Report. With respect to Condition 1.1 and 1.3, Ms. Chow noted that they are already working on resolving the tower massing. She added that they are also working on the slimming the tower but noted that it will be hard for the client to go below 96 feet for the floor plate as there are hotel programming considerations. Ms. Chow said that it was important for the hotel to have a

Robson Street address for marketing purposes. Ms. Chow had some concerns regarding two separate lobbies; one for the condo residents and one for the hotel guests noting the Terminal City Club shares the same address and a common entrance.

Questions/Discussion

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

- Staff is looking for greater distinction between the residential entry and the hotel entry and to keep the residential and commercial uses separate;
- The applicant would like to have Robson Street for the hotel address;
- The vitality of retail on Robson Street is important;
- The hotel staff will have access to the residential portion of the tower; and
- The orientation of the tower is on a skew as a way of acknowledging the CBC tower.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall said that the development planner had highlighted the concerns of the Urban Design Panel. He noted that the Panel had supported the height, form of development and the architecture as well as the Robson Street public realm interface. The Panel debated the issue of the bulk of the tower and the rotation of the tower off the grid. Mr. Wall stated that the Panel also had a discussion about the set back and how to handle it and noted that continuing the street wall would address the Panel's concerns. Mr. Wall said that the entry and hotel uses were a point of discussion with the Panel. He added that the conditions address the concern of the Panel. He agreed that it was a challenge regarding the residential and hotel entries but thought it could be resolved although some further study was warranted. Regarding the Terminal City Club, Mr. Wall stated that it is a private club and the suites were mostly owned by club members who rent them out through the hotel manager. He added that he didn't think the proposal would have the same relationship. Mr. Wall also noted that retail vitality was a critical issue and the condition should be separated out from the entry condition (Condition 1.3).

Mr. Tatomir thought the architectural expression was fine but had some concerns regarding the public realm adding that some design development should be done on the parking level. He noted that it would be important how the applicant programs the use of the retail space. Mr. Tatomir suggested the applicant look at including more sustainable measures in the building. Mr. Tatomir said he was in support of all the conditions except 1.3 regarding the double entrance.

Mr. Stovell supported all the conditions. He suggested refining the design of the heavy podium and supported the vitality of the retail on Robson Street noting the retail might be a struggle. He also suggested that careful consideration should be given to having a separate entry for the residents and the hotel and suggested there could be less of a lobby on Robson Street and then have it expand further into the building.

Mr. Shearing agreed with the conditions put forth in the Staff Committee Report. Mr. Shearing thought that a 10 foot difference in the floor plate wouldn't make much of a difference and suggested relaxing the language in the condition to allow for some other solutions. He noted that cutting back the building would result in a lot of density that had to be found elsewhere on the site which could result in other problems. Regarding the entries, Mr. Shearing agreed

that it would be important for the hotel to have a Robson Street address and thought it should be tied into the residential entry. He suggested that the residential entry could be shifted down Robson Street so that the retail was kept as a piece and enlarged by moving further up Robson Street. He also thought that having the entry on the corner of Cambie and Robson Streets would also work. Mr. Shearing thought the skewing of the tower should be rethought as he felt it didn't work.

Ms. Nystedt supported the recommendations in the Staff Committee Report. Ms. Nystedt thought it was a question of programming regarding the entrances and thought more attention should be given to the issue as the hotel frontage would be very important.

Mr. Hung supported the development and the recommendations in the Staff Committee Report. He thought there should be some flexibility around the massing and thought a 96 feet floor plate was workable. He also agreed that the design on Robson Street was important and thought the residential and hotel entrances should be distinguished for security reasons and have separate entrances.

Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor thought the development was a good match for the area and agreed with the applicant that it was important to have their business address on Robson Street. He noted that this was a Preliminary Application and should come back to the Development Permit Board as a Complete Application.

Mr. Timm agreed that the building fits well on the site and that some work still needed to be done on the architecture. He thought the retail frontage on Robson Street needed to be strengthened. He agreed that there were some reasons to consolidate the residential and hotel entries.

Ms. French agreed with the proposed amendments to the conditions adding that she thought it was a very interesting building and would be a good addition to the city. She added that it was more of a background building and would not compete with the CBC building currently under construction. Ms. French thought that Condition 1.2 would be the key to the success of the building noting there was still some work to be done with the architecture.

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 in Principle No. DE411173, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated May 9, 2007, with the following amendments:

Amend the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.1 by deleting "*a maximum width dimension of 90 ft.*" and adding "*less than 100 feet width*", to read:

Note to applicant: This could be achieved by reducing the floor plate overall dimensions to *less than 100 feet width* along the Robson Street frontage. To further reduce the sense of bulkiness, design development should also enhance and articulate blank portions of the façade with window openings.

Amend Condition 1.3 by deleting "*greater distinction between the hotel and residential uses*" and adding "*more retail opportunities and clarify entrance function*", to read:

design development to enhance the streetscape continuity and vitality of the Robson Street and Cambie Street frontages while also providing *more retail opportunities and clarify entrance function*;

Amend the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.4 by deleting the second sentence, "*Along Cambie Street, this can be achieved by orienting the hotel street entry to this frontage.*" to read:

Note to Applicant: Along Robson Street, this can be achieved by maximizing the retail frontage with a minimum retail depth of 30 ft. To further maximize pedestrian interest and visual permeability of the hotel lobby by relocating the internal hotel lobby stair away from the hotel lobby street frontage.

Amend Condition 1.7 be adding "*consideration of*" at the beginning of the sentence to read:

consideration of design development to incorporate principles of sustainability within the proposal;

Add Condition A.2.25 to read:

arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and Director of Legal Services, for the dedication of the south 7 ft. of the site for road purposes; and

Add Condition A.2.26 to read:

arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and Director of Legal Services, to secure a right-of-way over an additional 8 ft. (2.44 m) setback along the full Robson Street frontage to allow for pedestrian access.

5. **1 ATHLETES WAY - PARCEL 11 (SEFC) - DE411198 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Walter Francl Architecture

Request: To develop a 3-storey Community Centre which includes a restaurant, non-motorized boating centre and 69-space child daycare facility all over one level of underground parking.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Scot Hein, Development Planner, introduced the application for the community centre in South East False Creek. Mr. Hein asked the Board and Advisory Panel to convene at the model where he described the plans for SEFC and the Community Centre. Mr. Hein also commended staff and the proponents for their work thus far in the precinct as the site is important from an urban design consideration and will be an important edge onto the public plaza. Mr. Hein noted that it was a challenging site being long and narrow as well as double sided. He noted that the applicant will be pursuing LEED™ Platinum and that it was an exemplary design for the Community Centre with a restaurant overlooking the plaza. Mr. Hein also noted the park on the east. He added that the application is requesting a height increase of approximately 8 feet and will be applying for a CD-1 text amendment for the additional height which is subject to Council approval.

Mr. Hein reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Team Report dated June 4, 2007. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, with advice and comments provided.

Questions/Discussion

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

- There is an opportunity to reduce energy requirements and achieve LEED™ Platinum;
- LEED™ Platinum will trump the amount of glazing;
- The Council rezoning approval did anticipate a careful look at signage in the whole precinct of South East False Creek that doesn't conflict with the Sign By-law;
- The Community Centre will be managed by the Park Board; and
- A height increase of approximately 8 feet is sought.

Applicant's Comments

Walter Francl, Architect, thanked the team and City Planning Staff for the collaborative effort noting that they were mandated to develop a building form that was legible from a distance. The building is as transparent as possible and speaks to that mandate. He added that they were in agreement with all of the conditions.

Ian Smith, Manager, Southeast False Creek and Olympic Village Project Office, said he was happy with the process noting the project will work well for the future tenants. He added that the project is coming in on budget. Mr. Smith was concerned with Condition 1.12 noting the strategy should be for the building rather than the development. He added that they are a long way from having a tenant for the restaurant. Mr. Smith noted that the proposal does not include the design for the docks adding that there will be a public process for the design in the next few months.

Tilo Driessen, Park Planner, Planning and Research, described the Park Board's plan for the boating facility noting that there are several other facilities around False Creek and they are looking at having the facilities work together. He added that the dock will be for the public but will be gated and locked at night. There won't be any boat repair or boat access to the dock through the Community Centre building.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The applicant plans to hold the glazing areas at a percentage of 40% or below as getting above that will make it difficult to meet the energy model;
- There will be a 100 parking spaces below the Community Centre; and
- There will be a public report going to Council regarding the cost of the Community Centre.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall noted that the Urban Design Panel strongly supported the project and thought the building was dynamic, created a potential for a new landmark on the south shore and the development will be a great legacy for the Olympics. The Panel didn't have much concern regarding the glazing or the neighbourliness and they thought it fitted well with the

community. The atrium was seen as an important feature of the building and would bring the activities out to the public realm. The Panel had some concern regarding the private/public interface and that there could be more consideration given to the public realm interface particularly between the plaza to the north, the seawall and the waterfront. Mr. Wall agreed that the conditions address the issues and would be supported by the Panel.

Mr. Tatomir commended the architects for their work on the project. He said he would like to see metal cladding on the south side that could be angled in such a way that the sunlight would reflect back to the north façade of the residential building across the street and would add more light into the area. Mr. Tatomir stated that he would like to have seen a bit of a theme for the building and suggested the roof could have a sharper angle. Mr. Tatomir supported all the conditions in the Staff Team Report.

Mr. Stovell thought the east elevation needed some work as well as some of the waterfront elevation. He noted that the park would be important and the Community Centre needed to be inviting to the park.

Mr. Shearing thought it was a great building and would be one of the first LEED™ buildings that begins to perform and respond to addressing the energy model. He added that the building was impressive and that he supported the conditions in the Staff Team Report. He supported having Condition 1.12 be deleted. Mr. Shearing suggested the Sign By-law be tied into the signage concept for the precinct.

Ms. Nystedt was really excited about the Community Centre and the boating centre and thanked the applicant team for their hard work. She supported the recommendations in the Staff Team Report adding that she loved the green walls and suggested using timber ship elements to pick up on the theme of the Shipyard Precinct character.

Mr. Hung commended the architects on the design of the facility and the huge green roof. He suggested making it available for general public use as he felt it was a waste of space otherwise.

Board Discussion

Mr. Timm noted that the building would be a centre piece to the Olympics. He added that he thought the development was a little constrained and the Community Centre would offer some relief. Mr. Timm thought the building was refreshing and would be different from the rest of the neighbourhood and commended the architects for their design. Mr. Timm recommended the deletion of Condition 1.12 and 1.13.

Mr. MacGregor thought the Community Centre would function well and suggested that staff needs to get the design completed for the boating centre, as it was an important design element, and needed to get approved before people started living in the area. Mr. MacGregor thought that achieving LEED™ Platinum would be wonderful for the city and congratulated everyone who had worked on the building.

Ms. French congratulated the architects noting that it had been an ongoing challenge and thought there had been a lot of flexibility from everyone involved. She added that the Community Centre would compliment the neighbourhood.

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. DE411198, in accordance with the Staff Report dated June 4, 2007, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.8 by adding at the end of the sentence "*while balancing, achieving a building envelope that reduces the energy requirement and achieves LEED™ Platinum*" to read:

clarification of glazing systems into active recreational spaces and enclosure for exposed stairways/elevators to ensure maximum transparency *while balancing, achieving a building envelope that reduces the energy requirement and achieves LEED™ Platinum*;

Delete Condition 1.12;

Delete Condition 1.13;

Amend Condition A.1.1, second bullet by deleting "*loading*", to read:
Parking, and bicycle parking.

Amend the Note to Applicant in Condition A.2.7 by adding "*of Salt Street*" at the end of the sentence to read;

Note to Applicant: Redesign the driveway to provide a minimum distance of 9.7 meters from the east curb line *of Salt Street*.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:32 PM

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

R. Jenkins
Chair