

Date: Monday, April 4, 2011
Time: N/A
Place: N/A

PRESENT:

788 JERVIS STREET - DE414347 - ZONE DD

Minutes
Motion

1075 WEST HASTINGS STREET - DE414347 - ZONE DD

Minutes
Motion

Board

C. Warren Director of Development Services (Chair)
B. Toderian Director of Planning
S. Johnston Deputy City Manager
P. Judd General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

S. Romses Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel) [Alberni Street]
F. Rafii Representative of the Design Professions
J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry
K. Maust Representative of the Design Professions
M. Biazi Representative of the General Public
S. Bozorgzadeh Representative of the General Public
C. Chung Representative of the General Public
J. Miletic-Prelovac Representative of the General Public
P. Sanderson Representative of the General Public

Regrets

M. Pez Representative of the Development Industry

ALSO PRESENT:

City Staff:

B. Boons Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
P. Storer Engineering Services - Projects Branch
R. Thé Engineering Services - Projects Branch
A. McLean Development Planner
G. Papers Development Planner
R. Segal Senior Architect/Development Planner
D. Autiero Project Facilitator
M. D'Agostini Heritage Planner

788 JERVIS STREET - DE414347 - ZONE DD

W. Leung W.T. Leung Architects Inc.
B. Krause W.T. Leung Architects Inc.

1075 WEST HASTINGS STREET - DE414163 - ZONE DD

M. Whitehead Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
J. Chaiken Kohn Pedersen Fox
M. Cote Oxford Properties

CLERK TO THE BOARD: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Toderian seconded by Mr. Judd, and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on January 10, 2011 with minor typographical errors.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 788 JERVIS STREET - DE414347 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Austeville Properties

Request: Interior and exterior alterations, including the conversion of the ground floor amenity to retail and the relocation of in-suite residential bulk storage area's to the second floor (common storage), thereby requesting an increase in the Floor Space Ratio using a Heritage Density Transfer.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ann McLean, Development Planner, introduced the application for heritage density transfer and interior and exterior alterations to an existing building on Jervis Street. The Downtown Official Development Plan (DDODP) allows that a transfer of 10% may be permitted by the DP Board.

The transfer of heritage density will not translate into additional building form and as well the form of development will not change. The previous hotel use contained excluded amenity areas that exceed those that may be excluded now as a rental residential and retail use.

The change of use to retail at Robson Street furthers retail use continuity which is supported and encouraged by this ODP. Overall, the proposal brings the building into greater conformity with current policy.

Ms. McLean reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Report dated April 4, 2011. 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. McLean:

- The initial permit had storage in the units and it is now being relocated to make more room in the units for the residents.
- The actual size of the units will not change.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Leung had no concerns with the contents of the Staff Report.

Questions/Discussion

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

- There will be more active uses on the street as a result of the renovation.
- The exterior elevations on Robson Street will be renovated and a new glass canopy will be added.
- There will also be improvements to the public realm.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

None.

Board Discussion

Mr. Johnston thanked the applicant and moved for the approval of the application.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE414347 in accordance with the Staff Report dated April 4, 2010.

**4. 1075 WEST HASTINGS STREET - DE414163 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership

Request: To construct a 35 storey mixed use office/retail tower on the existing University Club (formerly 'Quadra Club') site at 1021 West Hastings Street, this site to be consolidated with the westerly existing Guinness Tower. The 'University Club' facade to be retained with retail spaces constructed on the ground floor. New construction will integrate the parking and services of the existing Guinness parking with the structures below grade.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Garry Papers, Development Planner, introduced the application for a tower on the site to the west of the Marine Building. Mr. Papers described the context for the surrounding area noting the other towers adjacent and the spacing between them. This project is going to consolidate with the Guinness Tower site to become one parcel and the parking underneath will also be consolidated. The project will be retaining the Heritage B-listed facade for the University Club and it will be integrated into the base of the tower. He noted that staff believe this is an optimization of views and the best retention of the key component of the heritage facade.

The tower will be set back about twenty feet to retain the corner of the heritage building. The basic uses on the ground floor facing Cordova Street will be a retail component and both floors of the retained heritage volume will have retail and the rest of the tower will be office use.

Mr. Papers noted that the shape of the tower was driven by view considerations and the height of the tower is to be 450 feet to the top of the elevator room. The total height of the tower will be 470 feet with the last twenty feet or so being a roof top decorative piece that fully encloses all the mechanical equipment. However, this means there is a slight height encroachment into two view corridors. This additional height does trigger the Higher Building Policy which requires the building to go through a more rigorous review process which has been done. It also received Council advice that these two small encroachments were not significant enough to warrant concern. A further review with the Higher Building Urban Design Panel to verified that the design represented an example of architectural excellence.

Staff are pleased to say that after the second review by the Urban Design Panel, they gave unanimous support to the project. The façade design on the tower is extremely sophisticated and represents state of the art for sustainable façade design. Mr. Papers noted that it was the intent of the applicant to create a quiet backdrop that is respectful of the Marine Building.

Mr. Papers reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated March 23, 2011. 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 Mr. Papers.

- Council comments made it clear that it wanted to see the Higher Building Review Panel's comments satisfied.
- Council also stressed how important slight penetrations into the view cone are to it and as well took the challenge of architectural excellence seriously.
- There were two local architects who sat on the Urban Design Panel meeting when the application was reviewed.
- The new City Policy that has just been created for taller buildings raises the bar regarding view cone intrusion.
- The driveway/ramp could be improved to make the pedestrian sidewalk continuity stronger. Since the plans call for widening the ramp the area will be modified.
- Staff is encouraging at lease one beverage kiosk on the ground level.
- The triple glazing at the top of the tower would not allow for radio waves to penetrate so it would be unlikely that cell phone towers would be added to the top of the tower.
- The applicant intends to be part of the programming for the retail when the retail tenants are selected.
- Residential towers are typically 80 feet or more apart from neighbouring towers. Office towers are usually only 30 feet and separated by an alley. Office to office separation is around a minimum of 40 feet.
- The plaza will be animated with permanent seating along the landscape wall and different elements will be added in the plaza.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Cote said they were excited about the project and thought it was a great design that would animate the plaza. They are planning on having a café or food type uses off the plaza. They are currently talking to some restaurant owners but no contracts have been signed at this point. There is enough space for a restaurant to occupy two levels in the tower which would occupy the space behind the heritage façade and utilize the outdoor space off the third floor. They are also looking at an outdoor amenity for the space that could be used by the entire building. He noted that the whole plaza has been designed to create an enjoyable experience for pedestrians.

Mr. Cote stated that they will likely be required to have satellite and cell equipment on the tower but since they want to keep the purity of the tower top it would be enclosed in the cap. He also noted that the window washing equipment would not be visible other than when it is being used. They have an official public art program and have a consultant on retainer. They will be going through a process where they will be interviewing artists so that they can have an art component in the project. Mr. Cote added that they haven't gotten to the stage where they know what that will look like.

Josh Chaiken noted that the roof material will be a metal with a specific finish. They are currently looking at a couple of options but they want to make sure it is durable. Mr. Chaiken added that the window washing equipment will be concealed under the roof-top profile.

Mark Whitehead stated that they took the energy performance of the building seriously and the first step was using a superior envelope of triple glazing. It will have a ceramic frit that reduces the amount of sunlight penetration into the building. As a result of the envelope the building won't require any interior perimeter heating and they will be using an air cooling system which will have small openings on the west wall for fresh air intake and exhaust. This system works with heat exchangers and is very efficient. Mr. Whitehead noted that they are close to LEED™ Platinum rating for the application.

Mr. Cote confirmed that they are prepared to work with City staff regarding the conditions.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The applicant is targeting a LEED™ designation and although they will achieve LEED™ Gold they are striving for LEED™ Platinum. The project will also be certified.
- The applicant team is trying to retain as much of the west wall as possible in the heritage building.
- There is a gesture at the top of the building on the southeast corner that creates a framing element.
- The top of the tower transitions with a white frit pattern on the west and south side that becomes more dense during the day and has a subtle glow at night.
- One of the aspects of the design is the extruded form that offers a predictable floor space for office use.
- The applicant team spent a lot of time interviewing tenants in buildings on the block as well as prospective tenants to get their reaction to the design.
- The applicant is confident that the triple glazing approach will survive the value engineering process.
- The owner intentionally puts retail in their buildings at grade and they are pursuing food and beverage use on the ground floor.

- The project responds well to the environmental conditions. The fins on the east façade are shallower and on the south and west they are deeper. The applicant team plans to continue to enhance the solar features on the tower.
- The design hasn't been developed on how the floating skirt at the base of the tower will be supported. It will be a challenge for the structural engineers to come up with a design that will look good and supports the skirt.
- Part of the sustainable strategy will include a storm water capture system as well as a cistern for landscape irrigation and heat exchangers.
- There will be an electric car charging station in the garage for cars as well as for electric bikes.
- Motion detectors on each of the floors will turn the lights off and on at night.
- The applicant team is looking to add a public art element in the project.

Comments from other Speakers

Francesco Schiavon who is a resident of the Shaw tower, said he thought the building looked beautiful but was not thrilled about more construction across the street and was concerned with shadow impacts. He reminded the Board that Cordova Street is a viaduct and was concerned about digging a hole through the parkade. He also thought the trucks would have some difficulty turning into the loading bay on Cordova Street.

David Godin thought the design had advanced and would be a great addition to the city. He had some concerns regarding signage and lighting and how that would be represented on the tower.

Questions/Discussion

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

- There will be signage for the retail and the restaurant but there are some restrictions as to what can go on the heritage façade. The applicant is not looking at significant signage for the building.
- The lighting needs to be sensitive to the Marine Building and the applicant is proposing a soft glow on the tower top as a strong lantern expression.
- The shadow analysis shows shadows on the Shaw Tower half way up the building between March and September. In the summer the shadow only impacts the lower floors for an hour or so between 11:00 and 11:30 A.M.
- The owner may look at roof top signage if it were a consideration to secure a tenant. However, given that it is a small floor plate building it is likely that only smaller companies would occupy the building.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Romses said the application was a success story. It was reviewed twice by the Urban Design Panel which looked at the application very carefully. The Panel gave some difficult commentary on the first review in the interest of having a superior building. He said the Panel was happy to see the design come back the second time with improvements that had been suggested by the Panel and it received strong unanimous support. Mr. Romses said he thought the applicant had done a masterful job of respecting the neighbours and found a balance that allows the building to stand on its own.

Mr. Rafii agreed with the recommendations in the staff report. He added that he would like the window washing equipment reviewed by staff so that it doesn't affect the exterior of the building.

Mr. Stovell thought it was a fabulous building and that everything was going to be about the curtain wall skirt was very important, as would the execution of the tower. He noted that the skin of the building will be important as well as the roof. He added that the sculpting and the quality of the materials needed to live up to the promise.

Mr. Sanderson thought it was a very exciting and elegant office building. He said he liked the shape of the building and the roof line and as well that that the heritage façade would be retained. He also thought there were some interesting public realm amenities. He encouraged the applicant to include public art in the outdoor environment noting that it will be adjacent to one of the most celebrated buildings in Vancouver.

Mr. Biazi said he supported the application for approval.

Ms. Maust noted that the Heritage Commission had a close look at the project and approved it unanimously with a number of recommendations that have been picked up in the conditions in the staff report. She said she was particularly pleased that this is the first instance in her eight years on the Commission where heritage density has been absorbed by office use. The tower design is complimentary to the two heritage buildings it sits between and given the conditions set out in the report Ms. Maust said she was pleased to recommend support.

Ms. Miletic-Prelovac said she recognized that the application was a huge addition to the downtown skyline but appreciated all the considerations that had been taken regarding the view cones. The result is a very sophisticated and delicate shape to the top of the tower. She thought it would be another landmark building in the downtown area. Ms. Miletic-Prelovac added that it will have a strong presence in its surroundings and would be admired from afar. She added that she would like to see the applicant go further with the public realm and include public art.

Mr. Chung congratulated the applicant, the Urban Design Panel and staff for their work in producing an important building. He noted that public art was important but the architecture could also be considered public art as it compliments both the Marine Building and the Guinness Tower.

Ms. Bozorgzadeh said she was concerned with the tight adjacency of the proposed building to the neighbouring buildings. She thought it would set a precedent for an exceedingly denser downtown. As well she was concerned with the seismic impacts noting that the building were very close to each other and in the case of an earthquake could have serious implications. Ms. Bozorgzadeh suggested a study on liveability as well as considerations regarding seismic impacts and air turbulence should be undertaken.

Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian thanked the applicants and staff for their work. He said he thought this was one of the best COMMERCIAL projects that had come to the Board in recent years. The fact that it is an office building is truly exciting. We are known as a city for our urbanism and public realm and city-planning but the architectural dialogue has been relatively non-existent. He noted that in building office towers, we are in a great moment of opportunity for a different vision for Vancouver architecture.

Mr. Toderian congratulated the applicant team and thought the collaboration between the two architectural firms worked well. He also thanked Mr. Cote for being opened minded and for working through the difficult moments. He asked Mr. Cote to take the message back to Toronto

that this is the kind of building not only that Vancouver expects, but applauds Oxford Properties for developing. Mr. Toderian stated that Council had set a very high standard for this building because it goes slightly into the view corridors but also because of its incredibly important context, becoming what might be the most distinctive and exciting high-rise office building in the city. He noted that they started with a design challenge that said “pay respect to the Marine Building”.

One of the reasons for the Urban Design Panel’s original non-support for the project was that the original design idea, which was to make the building invisible so it wouldn’t hurt the view of the Marine Building, was not the right answer. The Panel felt it should be a special building in its own right which respects the Marine Building, even though the expression is contemporary. Mr. Toderian said he thought they had designed a building that would work from the user’s point of view as well. He also noted that the idea that this was “found” space that adds additional floor space means that there will be some challenges, particularly shadowing on other buildings. He said he recognized the inconvenience the community will have to face with the construction of the building, but he thought it would be worth it as they would have a beautiful building to look at once it was completed.

Mr. Toderian said he thought this was an example of beautiful, exemplary architecture. He added that those are terms he doesn’t use very often. The skin is exemplary and he is excited about the mullion approach both from a passive design and an aesthetic perspective. The approach to the skirt is a beautiful way of landing the building and sensitively integrating the heritage building into the new design. It will be a skirt and a transparency of building that envelops and reveals the heritage building. From a green perspective he said he was excited about the energy performance opportunities. He added that Telus just recently announced that their new building would be LEED™ Platinum and challenged Oxford Properties to not be out done by them.

From a public realm perspective, he saw the building not as a new building interrupting the public realm, but as healing and improving the public realm connections. The place where the building will land is currently a parking ramp which is an interruption in the public realm. This building will bring the connection through with a pathway and a great place to stay and enjoy. Mr. Judd said he was happy to second the motion with amendments. He said he thought this was an absolutely beautiful, elegant building. He added that it checks so many of the boxes regarding what is being achieved with the improvement of the public realm, around energy performance and heritage. He congratulated everyone who was involved in the process.

Mr. Johnston said it was a great project and he moved to approve the application.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE414163, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated March 23, 2011, with the following amendments:

Delete Condition 1.2;

Amend Condition 1.5 by adding “in various ways, including” after plaza to read: provision of the activation of the lobby and adjacent plaza in various ways,

including by maintaining the three doors sets as indicated on plan A-206, and these doors to remain operable during business hours;

Note to Applicant: Provide permanent seating, public art and/or other elements of activation and delight, as well as movable tables and chairs of approximately the same number as shown on Landscape Plan L-1. The design should provide at least one lobby-level food and beverage outlet.

Delete Condition 1.12

Renumber Conditions 1.3 through 1.15 to become 1.2 through 1.13;

Amend Condition 1.11 (was Condition 1.13) to read as follows: consider and anticipate future restaurant exhaust venting requirements, per city standards, and incorporate necessary chases, venting routes and exhaust locations at suitable points on the 4 story 'University Club' structures roof and/or perimeter; (See Standard Condition A.1.7)

4. OTHER BUSINESS

1. The Board agreed that when there isn't a Board meeting within a two week period, the minutes will be approved by email.
2. The Board bylaw is to be amended regarding alternates as follows:

At any Board meeting:

(a) the Board chair will be the Director Development Services or anyone acting in that position and as well the chair could be anyone of the Board members plus their alternate;

(b) the General Manager of Community Services, or any city official acting in that position, or any other General Manager, may act in place of the Deputy City Manager;

(c) an Assistant City Engineer, a Director in Engineering Services, or any city official acting in those positions, may act in place of the General Manager of Engineering Services; and

(d) an Assistant Director of Planning or any other city official acting in that position, may act in place of the Director of Planning.

6. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:45 PM