

Date: Tuesday, March 25, 2008  
Time: 3:00 p.m.  
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

---

**PRESENT:****Board**

D. McLellan Deputy General Manager, Community Services Group (Chair)  
R. Jenkins Assistant Director - Current Planning Division  
J. Andrews Deputy City Manager  
P. Judd Deputy City Engineer

**Advisory Panel**

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

**Regrets**

H. Hung Representative of the General Public  
D. Chung Representative of the General Public  
S. Tatomir Representative of the Design Professions

**ALSO PRESENT:****City Staff:**

S. Brodie Civil Engineer  
S. Hein Senior Urban Designer/Planner  
M. Rondeau Development Planner  
J. Greer Project Facilitator  
S. Barker Project Facilitator  
C. Baber Project Manager, Neighbourhood Energy Utility

**1890 SPYGLASS PLACE - DE411805 - ZONE FCCDD**

W. Francl Walter Francl Architects  
G. Eckford Eckford & Associates  
S. Robb Pechet & Robb Studio  
D. Mitchell Sandwell

**99 WEST 2<sup>ND</sup> AVENUE - DE411230 - ZONE CD-1**

J. Bingham Howard Bingham & Hill Architects  
M. De Cotiis Pinnacle International (West First) Plaza Inc.

**1700 MANITOBA AVENUE - DE411797 - ZONE CD-1**

J. Bingham Howard Bingham & Hill Architects  
M. De Cotiis Pinnacle International (West First) Plaza Inc.

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

---

**1. MINUTES**

It was moved by Mr. Jenkins seconded by Mr. Judd and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of March 10, 2008 be approved.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

**3. 1890 SPYGLASS PLACE - DE411805 - ZONE FCCDD  
(FOR ADVICE)**

Applicant: Walter Francl Architects

Request: To develop this site with a public utility building (South-East False Creek Energy Centre).

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Scot Hein, Urban Planner, introduced the application for a public utility building in South-East False Creek (SEFC). The site is under the Cambie Street Bridge at the south bridge head and will have a number of pedestrian and bicycle routes through the site. There has been a great deal of interest from the residents to the west of the bridge, and they have been involved in the public consultation process with City staff and the applicant. There had been a lot of interest in the nature of the energy systems as well as some concerns regarding the height of the stacks. Mr. Hein noted that the promenade on the east side of the Cambie Street Bridge will extend to False Creek as well as a diagonal line through the site that recognizes the Canada Line Station to the west. The site will be well lit at night for both pedestrians and cyclists. To the north of the site there are still some recreational programming to be worked out with the neighbours and the Park Board.

Mr. Hein reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated February 27, 2008. 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:

- The flat sloping roof will be visible to the residents across Spyglass Place.
- Safe guards will be put in place to restrict access to the roof from the Cambie Street Bridge. The roof is 4 metres from the deck of the bridge. The roof covers the flues that come out of the facility and is part of the design to conceal the mechanics.
- The top of the stacks are a reasonable distance from the Maynards building redevelopment.
- The stacks will be 11 metres above the Cambie Street Bridge and will be between 15 and 22 metres in height.
- Natural gas will be combusted through the stacks.

**Applicant's Comments**

Walter Franci, Architect, thanked City staff and the stake holder groups for their participation that have help form the building. Mr. Franci noted that they have addressed the comments from the Urban Design Panel (UDP). He added that he was in agreement with the conditions in the Staff Committee Report and would be able to work with staff to move the application forward.

Stephanie Robb designed the stacks and noted that they connect to five different pieces of equipment in the facility. LED lights are proposed for the tips of the flues and will be activated when the flues are in operation and will register the energy output. The stacks are to be clad in stainless steel and perforated metal. She added that they are looking at materials that will be durable and low maintenance.

Chris Baber, Project Manager, Neighbourhood Energy Utility, noted that there will be five separate stacks. One of the stacks will be for the emergency generator and will be fuelled by natural gas. Another stack will connect to an odour control centre using an activated carbon filter system. The other three stacks are to be connected to the natural gas boilers. The stacks will be used less than 50% of the year so most of the year there won't be any emissions from the stacks.

**Comments from other Speakers**

Arthur Brock, President, False Creek Neighbourhood Association spoke in favour of the application. He noted that they had been involved very early in the process and will continue to be involved. He thanked Chris Baber for his involvement in the process.

**Panel Opinion**

Mr. Wall noted that the Urban Design Panel had unanimously supported the project and congratulated the applicant team on an interesting scheme. Most of the Panel's concerns related to how the details of the project would be worked out relating to the public realm as well as some CPTED concerns. Mr. Wall added that the Panel's concerns were covered in the conditions in the Staff Committee Report. Mr. Wall also noted that the Panel felt a more direct connection to the promenade along Cambie Street would be an appropriate urban design response. The Panel liked the public realm concept and the inclusion of public art.

Mr. Shearing congratulated the design team as he felt it was a quality building. He said he was disappointed in the quality of some of the Canada Line buildings and felt this project demonstrated that a utility building could also be well designed. Mr. Shearing added that he fully supported the project.

Mr. Stovell said he was in support of the project and the conditions in the Staff Committee Report and encouraged the applicant to continue their diligence for a quality design of the stacks.

Ms. Maust said she had looked at the proposal in relationship to the three heritage buildings that are in close proximity to the site. She liked the design of the building as she felt it was modern and would be a welcome addition.

Ms. Nystedt thought it was a wonderful design of form and function and congratulated the design team on their positive work with the community. She added that she supported the staff recommendations in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Braun recommended support for the application. He felt it was very well done and said he hoped the concrete facades were more architectural in design than the concrete on the Cambie Street Bridge.

#### Board Discussion

Mr. Judd complimented Chris Baber and his team for the interpretive elements in the building so that the public can see some of the operation and also for the sustainable measures. He thought it will be a landmark facility and hoped it would become a model for other similar buildings in the city. He added that it was a tremendous improvement over standard sewer pump house buildings. Mr. Judd moved approval of the application.

Mr. Andrews thanked Mr. Brock for being part of the process and encouraged him to stay with the project to help navigate it through to the finishing stages. Mr. Andrews also thanked City staff and the design team for their work adding that he thought it was an exemplary building and would be a unique and special building when completed. Mr. Andrews seconded the motion of approval.

Mr. Jenkins supported the application and thought the public involvement had been very good. He added that he hoped that value engineering didn't diminish the quality of the design and encouraged the applicant to ensure that the elements of the design remained.

#### Motion

It was moved by Mr. Judd and seconded by Mr. Andrews and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board SUPPORT Development Submission No. DE411805, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 27, 2008.

#### 4. 99 WEST 2<sup>ND</sup> AVENUE - DE411230 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Howard Bingham Hill Architects

Request: To develop this site with a mixed-use retail, residential and live-work project containing a total of 131 units; comprised of a 12-storey west tower and a 6-storey east tower all over a common three-level underground parking garage.

#### Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mary Beth Rondeau, Development Planner, introduced the application for a parcel on the private lands in SEFC that was rezoned to CD-1 in 2006. The building is primarily residential with live-work spaces on West 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and some retail uses on Manitoba Street. This development is at the main entrance to the retail village area in SEFC. Ms. Rondeau noted that the Urban Design Panel (UDP) asked for more details on how the retail meets the street. Parking and loading is addressed from the lane. There is a shared amenity space and urban agriculture proposed for the roof of the mid block mass. Ms. Rondeau added that the project is linked to the development across the lane through the design of the outdoor amenity spaces which will be shared by the residents in both buildings.

Ms. Rondeau noted that the site is well laid out and meets the intent of the SEFC Official Development Plan. Ms. Rondeau noted that there is an issue with the architectural resolution of the building which was discussed at the UDP. They felt the building needed to express a more distinctive SEFC character and that the colour palette was too subdued. Ms. Rondeau also noted that the project needs to incorporate some public art into the project that relates to the character of the area.

Ms. Rondeau reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated February 27, 2008. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

#### Questions/Discussion

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

- The proposed materials are painted concrete and glass on a wood framed structure.

#### Applicant's Comments

John Bingham, Architect, agreed that the issues that had been raised by the Planning Department were manageable. He added that they are working on the issue of colour and that the buildings had more colour during the rezoning process with a stronger emphasis on solar shading and sustainable response. Mr. Bingham agreed that there is an opportunity to make the building more distinctive.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect noted that they are exploring ways to incorporate art into the project through the detailing on the gates and railings.

#### Questions/Discussion

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

- The two spaces on the lane between the projects are functionally different although they will be shared by the residents in both projects. On the north side there is to be a swimming pool with the support elements including solar panels for heating the pool.
- There is a five to six foot grade change on the lane and as a result, the design incorporated the change by adding stairs, a children's play area, water elements and a large amenity space.
- The old shoreline plays a big part in forming the two spaces.
- The retail level is to have canopies that indicate a water element.

#### Comments from other Speakers

None.

#### Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall noted that the project came to the Urban Design Panel twice. The design team took the advice of the Panel regarding colour, simplicity and form from the first meeting. The applicant simplified the architecture but made the colour on the project too muted. The Panel thought the applicant should put some of the colour and ideas that were initially presented back into the application. Mr. Wall added that the Panel thought it was important for the applicant to take the two projects in context and felt the applicant team was going in the right direction. It was important that the colour and material express the character of the neighbourhood and that the two buildings should talk to each other. One of the main concerns

of the Panel's, was the tower rotation on the corner of Manitoba Street and West 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. They suggested it should be reduced or have a stronger expression. Also the Panel thought the public realm interface needed more richness and that the retail needed further design development. They saw a stronger language of retail expression at 1700 Manitoba Street and thought this should be considered for this project to give it a stronger sense of base. The final concern of the Panel's was regarding the issue of the quality and character of SEFC as an emerging neighbourhood which is still being defined. Mr. Wall thought that having an all white building wasn't speaking to the character of SEFC but to another neighbourhood in the city. Mr. Wall added that with the conditions in the Staff Committee Report and because of the willingness of the applicant and staff to work together, he was in support of the project.

Mr. Shearing thought the project would bring diversity and texture to the neighbourhood and supported the applicant going forward with the colour palette. He thought the project had a strong corner at Manitoba Street and West 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue but fell apart as it turned the corner. He thought it became cluttered with different approaches and needed some discipline and design development. He also thought the low rise on West 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue worked for the first six floors but that the top two floors fell apart in their complexity and needed to be simplified. Mr. Shearing thought the retail component also needed some improvement and to be made as important an element in the project as the residential.

Mr. Stovell said he was somewhat confused by the project. He said he liked the strong pure white of the colour palette but worried that it wouldn't look good over time when moss and mildew grew on the sides of the building. Mr. Stovell said he was confused by the architecture and wasn't sure where it was going but said that he would trust staff and the applicant to work it out.

Ms. Maust stated that she was not going to add to the confusion.

Ms. Nystedt said that the project in general conforms to the CD-1 guidelines but that the project needed significant design development. She added that she was generally in support for the application but felt that there was something not quite right.

Mr. Braun recommended support. He noted that the adjacent developments will be very colourful and encouraged the applicant to set some goals as to where they want to go with the project. He added that he hoped the plaza between the lanes will be done with the same high quality as seen on the model in order to make it a great space.

#### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Jenkins noted that both staff and the UDP were in support of the proposal. However, there were some strong comments and concerns regarding changes, adjustments and refinements. Mr. Jenkins thought it was incumbent upon the Board to provide clarity as to what is needed so that the applicant and staff can proceed with the application. He added that there was support for the uses which will include retail, residential and live-work spaces. Also there was support for a number of sustainability measures, liveability elements and the handling of the open space and amenity spaces. There was also general support for the massing and height, including the increased height achieved through the recent rezoning amendment. With that support there was also a number of concerns raised regarding the resolution of some architectural elements. Generally the building should make a more unified and possibly a more bold architectural statement and that it should respond to the emerging SEFC character. Mr. Jenkins moved approval of the application with an amendment to Condition 1.1.

Mr. Jenkins added that the recommended changes will be addressed at the staff level and will include the architect's team and senior planning staff as required to provide the necessary clarity so that the project can proceed. Mr. Jenkins noted that in a recent SEFC application, the Board directed the project be sent back to the UDP after approval. The Director of Planning may go to the Panel in the future, if necessary, depending on the progress of the design development, but Mr. Jenkins did not feel it was required for this application, at this time.

Mr. Andrew supported Mr. Jenkin's amendments to the Condition 1.1 and seconded the motion of approval.

Mr. Judd also supported the application.

### Motion

It was moved by Mr. Jenkins and seconded by Mr. Andrews, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE411230, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated February 27, 2008, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.1 to read:

1.1 significant design development to improve the architectural resolution;

**Note to Applicant:** This can be achieved by creating a more distinctive response to the Southeast False Creek history, creating a contemporary industrial character and response to solar orientation, specifically including;

- *for the West Tower, further emphasis and strengthening of the rotated corner element and for both buildings the emphasis and strengthening of the retail ground plane;*
- *for both buildings, simplifying and clarifying the architectural composition, noting that this may require alterations to unit floor plans and balcony locations, framing elements and exterior design expression of variations in unit types;*
- *and continue to consider focussing on a legible passive solar response to the buildings as a primary architectural concept; and*
- *more colour variation and unique architectural treatment.*

### 5. 1700 MANITOBA STREET - DE411797 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Howard Bingham Hill Architect

Request: To develop this site with a mixed-use retail and residential project containing a total of 178 units, comprised of a 9-storey west tower, a 4-storey centre building and a 10-storey east tower all over a common 2 ½ level underground parking garage.

### Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mary Beth Rondeau, Development Planner, introduced the application for a parcel on the private lands in SEFC at the corner of West 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and Manitoba Street. Ms. Rondeau noted that there are no major issues related to the proposal.

The development will be primarily residential use with the exception of retail on Manitoba Street which creates a corner plaza. The design of the plaza includes a large covered outdoor area in front of the retail space and will be tree lined. The plaza will also be the site of the public art component and a street car station is planned directly to the north of the site. Ms. Rondeau noted that the plaza design will change before the issuance of the permit because the other part of the plaza which is to be a public park component has not yet been designed. The other aspect is that there are several plazas planned for Manitoba Street and they need to be incorporated into the entire plaza system. There will be a corner plaza near the Salt Building and another plaza to the north on Manitoba Street. If the design work of the total coordinated plaza area is not completed prior to permit issuance, it is staff's intention that the applicant would have to come back to the Development Permit Board (DPB).

The proposal follows the concept of strong massing on each end of the site with a mid rise in the middle of the site and those elements are considered to be well resolved. On the west building, the solar orientation and response to passive solar have been used as an architectural feature. Staff believe the applicant has used the materials and detailing to define the character of SEFC. Ms. Rondeau noted that there has been a change on the west building to allow for an additional storey which meets the intent to the CD-1 zoning. That was presented to the Urban Design Panel and was supported. The mid rise and the easterly tower have taken on a different architectural expression. The original shoreline of False Creek goes through the site and is represented in the curve of the building. There are a lot of service areas in the lane which makes for a long blank wall. Staff are asking the applicant to adjust the entries off the lane to break up the length of the wall.

Ms. Rondeau reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated February 27, 2008. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

#### Questions/Discussion

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

- There is an expectation that trucks will pull into the garbage and servicing area. The area is not intended to be shared with the building opposite.
- Condition A.1.2 is meant for the maintenance of the public plaza and less for the design of the plaza.
- Legal arrangements can be set out to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering Services which will allow for the issuance of the permit, if necessary, before the plaza is completed.

#### Applicant's Comments

Mr. Bingham, Architect, noted that they are still working on the lane development with respect to Condition 1.2 as there are some elements that still need to be refined. Mr. Bingham added that their only concern is the issuance of the permit if in fact the plaza hasn't been finalized in terms of its design. He said that they want to make sure the plaza is well designed and the project is not held up.

#### Comments from other Speakers

None.



**Panel Opinion**

Mr. Wall stated the Urban Design Panel supported the project enthusiastically. They thought it represented one of the better projects on the private lands in SEFC. The project is successful in terms of its massing and the spirit of the detailing which incorporated public art. The public realm treatment and private spaces are the joy in the project. Mr. Wall noted that SEFC is meant to be a community that relates to different people and relates back to the industrial quality of the area. Mr. Wall stated that any criticism of the Panel's had been picked up in the conditions in the Staff Committee Report. One of the Panel's concerns was the blank wall with all the loading bays and Mr. Wall felt this area needed a second look and further design development. He noted that the plaza design is more of a place holder than an official concept and said he was looking forward to see how the design developed and how it ties in with the overall public space concept for the area. The final concern for the Panel was with the placement of the solar passive design devices. Mr. Wall challenged the applicant to take a second look at the solar shading devices and see if they could be further rationalized. Mr. Wall recommended support for the application.

Mr. Shearing congratulated the applicant team for a well designed project and recommended approval for the applications and the conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Stovell recommended approval for the application.

Ms. Maust said she liked the metal work on the building and recommended approval for the application.

Ms. Nystedt recommended approval for the application.

Mr. Braun recommended approval for the application.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. Andrews thanked the applicant team for a great project and said he was looking forward to it being built. Mr. Andrews moved approval of the application.

Mr. Jenkins supported the project and thought it was well done in the context of SEFC. Mr. Jenkins thought the design was responding well in terms of detailing the elements and that he had an expectation on behalf of the staff and the applicant that the key components were not lost through further refinements or value engineering. Mr. Jenkins seconded the motion of approval.

Mr. McLellan noted that there was a small amendment to Condition A.2.4.

Mr. Judd was in support for the application.

**Motion**

It was moved by Mr. Andrews and seconded by Mr. Jenkins and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE411797 in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated February 27, 2008, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition A.2.4 to read:  
arrangements shall be made to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and the Director of Legal Services for a public utility right of way over the *south* 1.5 m of the site;

**Note to Applicant:** This is required for the lane lighting, and to allow the City access to deliver energy to the lighting.

**6. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:52 PM.

---

L. Harvey  
Assistant to the Board

---

D. McLellan  
Chair