

Date: Monday, February 20, 2012  
Time: N/A  
Place: N/A

---

**PRESENT:**

**177 ROBSON STREET - DE415323- ZONE DD**  
Minutes  
Motion

**520 WEST GEORGIA STREET - DE415285- ZONE CD-1**  
Minutes  
Motion

**775 RICHARDS STREET - DE415286 - ZONE CD-1**  
Minutes  
Motion

**Board**

K. Munro Assistant Director of Planning (Chair)  
K. McNaney Assistant Director - Central Area 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  
M. Biazi Representative of the General Public  
S. Bozorgzadeh Representative of the General Public  
J. Miletic-Prelovac Representative of the General Public  
P. Sanderson Representative of the General Public  
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

**Regrets**

C. Chung Representative of the General Public  
M. Pez Representative of the Development Industry

**ALSO PRESENT:**

**City Staff:**

G. Greer Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development  
R. Thé Engineering Services - Projects Branch  
A. Molaro Development Planner  
D. Autiero Project Facilitator

**177 ROBSON STREET - DE415323- ZONE DD**

A. Jamal Relative Form Architecture Studio  
Z. Bhatia Mayfair Properties Ltd.

**520 WEST GEORGIA STREET - DE415285 - ZONE CD-1**

P. Wood Henriquez Partners Architects  
D. Chan Westbank Properties

---

**775 RICHARDS STREET - DE415286 - ZONE CD-1**

P. Wood Henriquez Partners Architects  
D. Chan Westbank Properties

CLERK TO THE BOARD: L. Harvey

**1. 177 ROBSON STREET - DE415323- ZONE DD  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Relative Form Architecture

Request: To construct a new 2-storey hotel and residential building with commercial on the ground floor and hotel rooms on the second to fourth floors

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, noted that the application has already received approval but the applicant is wishing to transfer in a modest amount of heritage density to the site. Prior to issuing the permit, the applicant asked for a slight redistribution of the uses within the building. They wanted to reduce the amount of hotel floor area and increase the amount of residential floor area within the building. This requires them to purchase slightly more heritage density. As well there are some modest design changes that will be approved by the Director of Planning.

Ms. Molaro also noted that the Board had received a memo regarding the amendment to the Technical Analysis section of the Development Permit Board report on the Floor Area and FSR. The current site area is now smaller due to the south seven feet of land that was dedicated for road purposes under the previously approved Development Permit (DE411173).

The applicant requested that the Floor Area and FSR calculations be based on the pre-dedicated site size and site area of 27,026 square feet. When the current development permit application was made in November 2011, the road dedication had not been finalized.

Ms. Molaro reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated February 20, 2012. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

**Comments from other Speakers**

Denis de Keruzec said his unit faces the site. He explained that he had tried to find information on the site but the City told him that there were not any applications registered for the property. He said he hoped the roof designed would be developed so that his overlook would not be unattractive.

**Questions/Discussion**

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarifications were provided by Ms. Molaro and the applicant:

- The intention is to have a green roof; a combination of extensive green roof and intensive plantings.
- The building's height is restricted by a view corridor. A condition of the permit will be that no service equipment or cellular antenna can be located on top of the roof.
- The original application was approved in 2008 and perhaps with the address change city staff were not able to find information on the current application.
- A condition of the permit allows for irrigation on green roofs. The strata corporation will be responsible for the upkeep of the roof.
- The City rarely puts a covenant on title regarding the care of green roofs.

**Panel Opinion**

None.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. Johnston suggested the applicant put up signs to let the neighbours know what is happening on the site.

**Motion**

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE415323, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated February 8, 2012.

**2. 520 WEST GEORGIA STREET - DE415285- ZONE CD-1  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Henriquez Partnership

Request: To develop this site with a 22-storey mixed-use building (commercial and office uses) over four levels of underground parking having vehicular access from Richards Street.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Anita Molaro, Senior Development Planner introduced the application and noted the context for the area which includes a number of residential highrises and office buildings. The proposal consists of 928,000 square feet of mixed-use office and residential. The development will replace the two existing parkades along Richards Street with a 22-storey office tower on West Georgia Street and a 45-storey residential tower and retail podium on Robson Street wrapping around to Richards Street.

The existing White spot restaurant on the north end of Seymour Street will be replaced by an extension of the office block over the lane creating a covered plaza area with some retail functions oriented onto it. The north end of the lane accessing Georgia Street will be closed to vehicles along for the plaza expansion and the lane will be reconfigured to turn out onto Richards Street. The Kingston Hotel, on Richards Street will remain as it is separately owned.

The existing Telus facility (William Farrel Building) on the Seymour Street frontage will be upgraded and expanded. The upgrade will proceed at a later date under a separate

application.

The office building consists of slightly more than 46,400 square metres of floor area. The uses on the ground floor will be retail as well as the office lobby area. There are below grade CRUs which will be accessed via a stair and elevator.

Integrated within the building are a number of landscaped roof areas and internal sky gardens. An extensive green roof is planned on the tower roof and will incorporate amenity spaces.

As this application has undergone a comprehensive rezoning process Ms. Molaro highlighted the important attributes of the project as well as new issues identified through the detail design development.

The height of the building is restricted by a view cone which limits the building to 86.5 metres (289 feet), however the CD-1 By-law permits a greater height of 91.5 metres. The by-law permits this overall height subject to the design performance and impact that the incursion may have on the view cone. Ms. Molaro noted that staff are satisfied that the additional height requested, that accommodates the upper portion of the elevator along with the photovoltaic panels does not negatively impact the view corridor and the actual height of 89.70 meters is within the additional permitted height. She noted that the rezoning condition restricts any further incursions into the view cone or any other elements such as cellular towers, service equipment and window washing equipment.

Ms. Molaro indicated that through the rezoning process, the cantilevered spaces over Seymour and Richards Streets were supported and arrangements have been made, with Council's approval, for these spaces over these two streets. As well a new cantilevered skybox has been introduced over Georgia Street. The design of this skybox is intended to incorporate a media screen function. Staff are prepared to support this additional cantilevered element as it provides visual presence to Georgia Street and contributes to the overall architectural composition of the building. However, Ms. Molaro noted that the proposal for a media screen will require a separate Council approval and will require a separate process, including detailed assessment of any visual impact, context and the time and amount of use.

As part of the building composition and technologies, the application is proposing a number of architectural lighting elements integrated into the design. Ms. Molaro also noted that staff are concerned that the introduction of glass water surface treatments restricts access between the public realm/sidewalk and plaza area.

The adjacent Kingston Hotel is an existing 4-storey building containing a restaurant and hotel rooms. Staff have been in discussion with this property owner about the potential redevelopment of this site under the current zoning provisions of the ODP. An assessment of possible massing options indicates that this site could be developed with a potential building height that would result in a compromised proximity between a new development building and the proposed south facing skybox on Levels 10-12. Staff are recommending that this skybox be raised by two floors to improve the interface between these two building.

Ms. Molaro indicated that the site is subject to both the Rezoning Policy for Greener Buildings and the rezoning policy for Green Larger Sites. She added that the application is also proposing to go beyond the required LEED™ Gold to achieve LEED™ Platinum. Also, the project has been registered with CaGBC.

Ms. Molaro explained that staff have a couple of concerns. Those concerns include the location of the Vista Switch and the proposed steps at the Richards Street. The current Vista Switch is located within the public realm along Richards Street straddling the property lines. As one of the rezoning conditions provided by Engineering Services, the location of electrical services, including Visa Switches be located on private property. The applicant has indicated that this is not achievable as it would require a notch within the building frontage and it would significantly impact the retail continuity of the building frontage. It is staff's understanding that other locations on the site were also not workable.

Ms. Molaro reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated February 20, 2012. 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 clarifications were provided by Ms. Molaro:

- Condition 1.1 is asking the applicant for better definition between the two glazing systems on the horizontal office extrusion.
- The Kingston Hotel future tower will have a zero lot line condition and the separation will be approximately twenty feet.
- The Kingston Hotel is not a heritage building.
- There is provision under the rezoning for parking access being provided through the proposed residential and office buildings to serve the Kingston Hotel site.
- The glass in the plaza that is water covered is intended to daylight the retail below.
- The two cantilevered pieces of Seymour and Richards Streets were contemplated at the time of the rezoning and require certain legal arrangements that are managed through Engineering Services. As part of the development permit application another element was added to the design.
- At the time of the rezoning there were height limits set for the height of the building. One of the height limits was at the view cone height and also one that granted the Director of Planning an allowance of up to 3.3 metres into the view cone for architectural appurtenances.
- Parking structures are a permitted use in the downtown but are not tied to any specific development. The replacement of the parking structure is not a requirement of the proposal.
- Retail units will be facing the lane as a way to pedestrianize the environment. As well there will be some bollards at Robson Street to better manage vehicles turning in and out of the lane.
- The material choice was thought to be too dark at the Urban Design Panel's review. They thought a lighter material choice should be considered for the north side of the site. The Panel also mentioned that there were a lot of elements that come down to grade and thought they restricted pedestrian movement through the plaza.
- The Kingston Hotel at this time is not looking at redeveloping their site.
- The media screens will need to be included as an application to amend to the Sign By-law to permit them and needs to go to Council for decision.
- The 2.4 metre statutory right-of-way is for improving pedestrian circulation and the applicant has indicated that they want to bring the stairs out into the right-of-way.

**Applicant's Comments**

Peter Wood, Architect, noted that they accept Condition 1.1 in the Staff Committee Report and added that the design of the steel bar on the cantilevered element on West Georgia Street is going to be cut back for a deeper reveal. He clarified the lighting feature and stated that they are thinking of having LED lights or the lighting may also be considered for a public art piece. Mr. Wood indicated that they are proposing a water scrim on the plaza that will be seasonal. He added that when there is water over the area people will still be able to walk through the area. The plaza in order to have a civic presence needed to be extended to the curb and down the lane to animate the block. He said they could pull the basalt paving back to the property line and that they are looking for a lighter coloured material.

Regarding the relationship between the southerly skybox and level 10 through 12, Mr. Wood said they have shifted it west. He added that they accept the conditions in the Staff Committee Report except for Condition 1.5.

Regarding the steps and the 2.4 metre statutory right-of-way, Mr. Wood said that unfortunately the stairs are needed because of the grade change. If they are shifted then the entry also needs to be shifted and impacts the functionality of the lobby.

He explained that they wanted to put the Vista Switch Gear in the lane but a large area of retail would be lost if the switch was added into the building. They decided to locate it so that it will straddle the property line.

**Questions/Discussion**

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

- The applicant has stated that they will be incorporating antennas into the design of the building as they can not be added to the roof because of the view cone.

**Comments from other Speakers**

Richard Cook was representing the hotel owners. He said they support staff's recommendations in Condition 1.5 because of the future potential to develop the Kingston Hotel. Also the owners of the hotel supported the rezoning.

David Cookson said he had some concerns regarding the media screens.

Amir Sanai who is a resident in False Creek also had some concerns regarding the media screens.

**Questions/Discussion**

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

- The sky box projecting towards the Kingston Hotel is fully on Telus property.
- There is no specific condition in the report with reference to deleting the media screens.
- The media screens are not part of the application and can not be approved at this time.

**Panel Opinion**

Mr. Romses said that the Urban Design Panel generally supported the proposal. They reviewed the application twice and in the last review their only concerns were with some of the architecture. They had some concerns regarding the penetration of the bar into the office building and the public realm design. However, Mr. Romses noted that the applicant has responded to their concerns. He added that the Panel recognized that the application was one of the most important projects to come into the city recently. He said he thought there was a high level of thoughtfulness and creativity in the design. Regarding the conditions in the Staff Committee Report, Mr. Romses thought the applicant showed a strong interest in improving the design and that there was room for flexibility regarding Condition 1.5.

Mr. Rafii thought the project would be a great addition to the city. He said he thought all the conditions in the Staff Committee Report were doable including Condition 1.5. He added that he was in support of the application.

Mr. Stovell said he supported the recommendations in the Staff Committee Report with the exception of Condition 1.5. He thought that the applicant could only go so far to support a possible future development. He added that he supported moving the vista switch into the public realm.

Mr. Biaz said he was in support of the application and thought it was a creative project. He recommended acceptance of the conditions in the Staff Committee Report but thought the City needed to be careful regarding the addition of media screens to the project.

Ms. Maust noted that there were no heritage issues included in the application. She thought the applicant had been sensitive to the Kingston Hotel and recommended support of the application. She added that she thought the project was well resolved and thought Condition 1.3 may be unnecessary.

Ms. Miletic-Prelovac complimented the applicant on their presentation. She thought it was an important development and would like to see the further development of commercial laneways. She added that she was in support of the conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Sanderson was in support of the development. He said he thought it was a very significant building and liked the architectural design including the public plaza. He said he also liked the attempt to do something with the lane but had some concerns regarding the media screens. He added that Council will need to deal carefully with the issue. He added that he was in support of the application.

Ms. Bozorgzadeh said she had some concerns regarding the media screens.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. Judd moved approval of the application. He noted that the issue of the media screens was outside the authority of the Development Permit Board. He said that Condition 1.3 was supportable but thought the steps could be moved back to provide more space in the pedestrian sidewalk.

Mr. Johnston seconded the motion. He thought that Condition 1.2 could be reworded as the lighting would not be visible during the day.

Mr. McNaney thought it was an exciting project and fulfills Council's plan to shift the business centre to the east. He also thought it was exciting for land use and jobs on transit to anchor the downtown. Mr. McNaney said he agreed with the amendments to the conditions in the Staff Committee Report and thought there were issues regarding the media screens. He added that the decision on the media screens is not the prevue of the Development Permit Board. Mr. McNaney said he was happy to see the amendment to Condition 1.2. He noted that the project will provide an enormous amount of job space. Mr. McNaney said he was strongly in favour of Condition 1.5 as it will provide some breathing space for the site to the future development and was a reasonable condition for flexibility in the future. He added that he thought it would not jeopardize the architecture.

### Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE415285, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated February 8, 2012, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.2 to read as follows:

clarification that the lighting feature proposed integrated within the soffit area cantilevered over both Richards and Seymour Streets;

Add a new Condition 1.7 to read as follows: *any proposed media screens are specifically not approved as part of this proposal and require Council approval.*

Delete Condition A.2.12

Renumber Conditions A.2.13 through A.2.30 to **A.2.12 to A.2.29**.

### 3. 775 RICHARDS STREET - DE415286 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Telus Communications

Request: To develop this site with a 46-storey mixed-use building (retail and residential uses) over eight levels of underground parking having vehicular access from Richards Street.

### Development Planner's Opening Comments

Anita Molaro, Senior Development Planner introduced this application for a residential building with retail spaces on the ground floor and a residential lobby fronting onto Richards Street. There is access to the second floor retail from Robson Street via a stair and elevator. Ms. Molaro noted that the application had undergone a comprehensive rezoning process. She described the height of the building noting that the building will sit within the shadow of the



Scotia Tower and added that the rezoning condition restricts any further incursions into the view cone from such elements as cellular towers.

Mr. Molaro explained that the site is subject to both the Rezoning Policy for Greener Buildings and the policy for Green larger sites. The proposal is meeting the required LEED™ Gold and will be registered with CaGBC. Ms. Molaro mentioned that the Sustainable Site Design has been addressed with a landscaped roof area and a number of passive design building elements. As part of the criteria, Engineering Services has provided conditions regarding Green Mobility and Clean Vehicles. The applicant has incorporated design provisions for a central energy plant and extensive low grade heat recovery.

Ms. Molaro noted that there was an issue regarding the current Vista Switch which is located within the public realm along Richards Street straddling the property line. As one of the rezoning conditions provided by Engineering Services, the location of the Vista Switch should be located on private property. Ms. Molaro explained that the applicant has indicated that this is not achievable as it would result in creating a notch within the building frontage along with significant impact to the retail continuity of the building.

Ms. Molaro reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated February 8, 2012. 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 clarifications were provided by Ms. Molaro:

Staff have a condition in the Staff Committee Report to clarify the amount of parking spaces. The lane will have the same material treatment as the plaza so that it feels more like a pedestrian environment. As well there will be some retail space on the lane.

There are conditions in the Staff Committee Report to manage the loading and as well the Kingston Hotel management were consulted regarding the interface.

Entrances are being provided from Robson Street.

It is always difficult to convert a lane to a pedestrian mews when there are servicing requirements.

The units are 45 feet back from the Kingston Hotel site which is not unusual between a residential use and a commercial use.

#### **Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Woods further described the proposal noting that there is a lot going on in the tower. On the Richards Street side they tried to demass the tower by breaking it up into three separate boxes. He said they believe that with the 25 foot cantilever out of the box there is a lot interest in that area of the project particularly at the podium. He noted that the balconies are continuous which is unusual in the city. He said he agreed with staff regarding the visual prominence of the residential entry. They are planning to make some changes to improve the expression. Mr. Wood said they had taken the Urban Design Panel and staff's comments into consideration and have deleted the under soffit lighting. He noted that parking will replace the current parkade and access to the underground parking will be off Richards Street. Mr. Wood explained that they have worked with Engineering Services to block access to Robson Street with bollards that can be lowered to limit the use of the loading area to after hours.

**Questions/Discussion**

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

The pool is located on the south façade and is the only location to add a full lap pool as there are no lot of other opportunities for amenity space.

**Comments from other Speakers**

Richard Cook said he supported Condition 1.4 in the Staff Committee Report but was concerned that the lighting might affect the neighbours. He was also concerned with the potential brightness of the media screens and as well with the possible exhaust noise from the residential air intake fan. He noted that there was no discussion regarding drop off zones.

Rob Utendale said he is a resident and owner on Seymour Street and was excited about the development. He added that most of the neighbours' concerns have been addressed and was excited to see the plans for the laneway. He was however concerned with the media signs and specifically the one that is only 66 feet away from their residential units. He requested that all references be removed from the development permit drawings and models. Mr. Utendale said he was concerned with the phasing or splitting of the development application from the redevelopment of the William Farrell building. As well he wanted to see the park at Richards and Symthe Streets be developed. He thought that the pool should project out over the street.

**Panel Opinion**

Mr. Romses said the Urban Design Panel was supportive of the residential tower. In terms of density, they thought the applicant had done a good job in handling the amount on the site. He added that in the previous version the podium wasn't expressed at the rezoning. He felt that they had done a good job in editing and giving it some presence. Mr. Romses said he thought the Richards Street façade was the money shot and said that not every façade had to try so hard. He added that the Panel felt that the Seymour Street façade could have a subtle element of playfulness with the addition of some colour or some other visual interest.

Mr. Rafii said it was a nice looking building. He said he thought Condition 1.1 could be removed from the report as he thought it had been resolved. He said he agreed that the Seymour Street façade was too busy.

Mr. Stovell noted that the city seems to have gone from parking is good to parking is bad and the industry and the buyers are struggling to adapt to lower parking ratios. He added that the application was at more than City's minimum for the amount of parking spaces. As it is 83 units won't have parking spaces. He said he thought the Seymour Street façade still needed some design development.

Ms. Maust said she thought it was a well resolved project and agreed that there needs to be some perspective regarding parking.

Ms. Miletic-Prelovac said she liked how the massing goes up the tower and is broken up on the Richards Street façade. She agreed that the Seymour Street elevation could be improved a bit more. She also wanted to see some more discussion regarding the laneway as she felt it was a underused space. She recommended that more treatment be given to the other side of the laneways and to look at animating laneways for the future.

Mr. Sanderson said he liked the building, especially the way it had been segmented. He thought the laneway elevation could be adjusted a bit but thought that generally it was an interesting building. From every direction it looks like a different building and creates a lot of visual alternatives. He said he also liked the podium and the use of materials including the illuminated onyx materials as they will sparkle at street level. Mr. Sanderson said he liked the notion of trying to do something at the lane and through the mixture of pedestrian and vehicular movement would evolve over time.

Ms. Bozorgzadeh said she only had two concerns; the parking and the signage. She thought the parking could be put in with the project and could always be repurposed later. She thought the signage needed to be looked at, especially the sign facing the hotel. She added that she was generally in support of the project.

### Board Discussion

Mr. Judd moved approval of the application and a couple of amendments to the Staff Committee Report conditions. He said he thought it was a nice development and liked that each façade had a different expression. He noted that the parking minimum is the lesser of the square footage number or one space per unit and that the development is substantially over the minimum. Also he noted that the project is meeting the bylaw regarding bike parking.

Mr. McNaney supported the amendments. He said he thought it was a strong development and that the site was always intended to be mixed-use with residential. He added that it is a transition site and will be different from the rest of the buildings on the block. Mr. McNaney thought the Seymour Street expression needed some work and could use some visual interest. Mr. McNaney added a condition regarding the Kingston Hotel and the signage. He thought it should be moved back from the property line as it was the neighbourly thing to do. He added that he was supportive of the park at Smythe and Robson Streets and that there would be a lot of public realm improvements on Richards Street. Mr. McNaney said he was pleased that the bollards would be closed during the day.

Mr. Johnson commended the applicant for their Green strategy and for pursuing LEED™ Platinum. He said he was looking forward to seeing the building at completion as he thought it was an important design and that the city would benefit from the project. He added that he supported the motion.

### Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE415286, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated February 8, 2012, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.4 to read as follows: design development under soffit lighting will have a non-impactful effect particularly for near by residences;

Amend the Note to Applicant in Condition A.1.12 to read as follows: **Note to Applicant:** Assessment shall include venting systems and their impact on adjacent Kingston Hotel. Notation shall be indicated on plans confirming that:

“The acoustical measures will be incorporated into the final design, based on the consultant’s recommendations as concurred with, or amended by, the Medical Health Officer.”

Amend the Note to Applicant in Condition A.1.14 to read as follows: **Note to Applicant:** The large vertical signs should be relocated in order to minimize its impact on the Kingston Hotel.

Delete Condition A.2.5

Re-number Conditions A.2.6 to A.2.26 to **A.2.5 to A.2.25**

Add a new Condition B.2.1 to read as follows:  
Service equipment including window washing infrastructure, cell tower and antennae elements are not permitted to intrude into the view corridor or beyond the view shadow of the Scotia Building.

Re-number Conditions B.2.1 through B.2.10 to **B.2.1 to B.2.11**

#### 4. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:16 pm