

Date: Monday, January 26, 1998  
Time: N/A  
Place: N/A

---

**PRESENT:**

Minutes  
Business Arising from the Minutes  
2198 Granville Street - DE402272 - Zone C-3A  
Other Business

**Board**

L.B. Beasley Director of Central Area Planning (Chair)  
D. Rudberg City Engineer  
B. Taylor Director - Office of Cultural Affairs

**Advisory Panel**

N. Baldwin Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
A. Gjernes Representative of Development Industry  
S. Kellington-Catliff Representative of General Public  
B. Parton Representative of General Public

**Regrets**

A. Waisman Representative of the Design Professions  
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry  
J. Oberlander Representative of General Public

**ALSO PRESENT:**

**City Staff:**

R. Segal Development Planner  
M. Thomson Survey Branch

**Item 3 - 2198 Granville Street - DE402272**

E. Martin Bosa Development Corp.  
N. Bosa Bosa Development Corp.  
J. Perkins Jr. Perkins & Company

**CLERK TO THE BOARD:** Carol Hubbard

**1. MINUTES**

It was moved by **Mr. Rudberg**, seconded by **Mr. Taylor**, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of January 12, 1998 be approved.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

---

3. **2198 Granville Street - DE402272 - Zone C-3A  
(COMPLETE AFTER PRELIMINARY)**

Applicant: Perkins & Co..

Request: To develop this site with a mixed-use residential/retail complex comprising two buildings ranging from 2 to 12 storeys with retail use on Granville Street and a total of 211 dwelling units.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

The Development Planner, **Ralph Segal**, presented this complete application for the north block of the Pacific Press site, noting the Board granted approval in principle for the whole site (north and south blocks) on June 30, 1997. A separate complete development application for the south block is expected to be submitted soon. By reconfiguring the present bus loop, this development proposal will also achieve a major public open space. Mr. Segal briefly described the proposal which achieves an FSR of 2.55 over a site which includes a small City-owned lot (lot 4) and a portion of lane, and the transfer of about 35,000 sq.ft. at the northeast for road and open space. For zoning purposes, the FSR of the newly created rectangular site will be fixed by means of a single site covenant, with the 2.55 FSR linked to the 35,000 sq.ft.± dedicated to the City. Mr. Segal briefly reviewed the process by which the new road, the open space and other aspects of the proposal will be achieved. This was approved in principle by Council in July 1997 and the negotiations between the City and Bosa Development Corporation are currently nearing completion.

Mr. Segal then reviewed the issues relating to the development proposal, as outlined in the Staff Committee Report dated January 14, 1998. In terms of heights and general massing, the complete submission is consistent with what was discussed by the Board at the preliminary stage and, in general, staff consider the proposal has met or surpassed the intent of the conditions established at that time. The Staff Committee recommendation is for approval of the application, subject to the conditions contained in the report. Staff believe it is an exemplary project that will make an important contribution to this neighbourhood. Mr. Segal noted a minor correction to condition A.2.11.

In response to a question concerning the common outdoor space sought in condition 1.2, Mr. Segal advised that staff believe the roofs of the two towers would be good locations for this space, accessed via an extension to the stairs. **Ms. Kellington-Catliff** sought clarification as to how some of the issues raised by the Urban Design Panel have been addressed, namely treatment at the Granville/5th Avenue corner, strength of the east vs. west side massing, and the width of 5th and 6th Avenue where it meets the pedestrian link. Mr. Segal explained that at the preliminary stage the Board applied a consideration item which has generated the massing now proposed at Granville and 5th Avenue. The preliminary proposal was for a 9-storey "gateway" building closer to the corner. However, in response to concerns raised by a Granville Street owner about easterly view impact, the applicant was asked to consider softening the massing at the corner. Staff did not believe the Panel's discussion around the relative strength of the east and west massing required a new condition. With respect to the junction of the new road and the pedestrian link, a change in surface treatment is being recommended.

*(Board and Panel members then took a few minutes to review the models and posted drawings)*

**Applicant's Comments**

**Mr. Eric Martin**, Bosa Development Corporation, focused his comments on the conditions that were causing them some concern. He sought clarification regarding 1.1 (d) and (e) which deal with relocation of the on-ramp and realignment of the pedestrian tunnel, noting these issues are to be dealt with as part of the park development. Responding to a comment by **Mr. Mike Thomson**, Survey Branch, that the development could not proceed unless satisfactory arrangements are made for these items, Mr. Martin explained that their concern is that these areas are in the purview of the City and beyond Bosa's control, although they have agreed to enter into a contract with the City to accommodate the work. Their concern relates to timing as it may affect the development. With respect to 1.1 (f), Mr. Martin requested adding "and/or abandonment", noting the intention is to abandon the utilities within the right-of-way. Mr. Martin asked the Board to consider deleting condition 1.8 which calls for setting back the glass rooftop guardrail by 4 ft. He also requested the deletion of 1.2 which seeks provision of common outdoor space, noting they are providing a significant amount of public and semi-public open space, large at-grade private decks for the townhouses, and larger than standard balconies for all the units. They do not believe common open space would be used very much and it would involve the provision of stair access to the roof. He said they are satisfied they can accommodate all the other conditions.

Some discussion took place on conditions 1.1 (d) and (e). Mr. Rudberg noted the relocation of the ramp and realignment of the tunnel are fundamental to the whole scheme, and the requirement is not that the work necessarily be done, only that arrangements be made that are satisfactory to the various City officials. Mr. Martin reiterated that their reservation relates to timing in the event of protracted legal agreements being necessary. A simple letter of agreement would satisfy their concerns. Mr. Thomson said he appreciated the applicant's concern and noted that Bosa is working actively with staff on the issues. He agreed there is a risk involved, but he did not consider it to be large. **Mr. Nat Bosa** stressed they do not want the project to be delayed for completion of a complicated legal document.

With respect to the provision of common outdoor space, Mr. Segal said staff do not believe it would be a hardship for the applicant to provide this space. It is called for in the guidelines and it would offer another dimension to the variety of open space being provided throughout the development. He agreed the guidelines are being surpassed with respect to the provision of private open space, and the public open space in the form of the pedestrian link and the proposed new park are valuable amenities. However, staff felt that some common open space that satisfies the guidelines could also be achieved simply in this project. Mr. Martin advised they are prepared to provide the space if the Board feels strongly that it should be included.

**Comments from Other Speakers**

**Mr. Jack Barr**, Vancouver Masonic Temple Association, said they believe the proposed development will have a severe negative impact on their building at 1495 West 8th Avenue where they have been located for nearly twenty five years. The 4th floor of the building contains a banquet room which is very important to the Masons and the many other organizations who use the facility, and its success relates to the panoramic view it currently enjoys. The loss of this view as a result of this proposal will inevitably result in loss of revenue.

**Mr. Jim Lehto**, representing the Masonic Temple, commended the applicants on the excellent design. He noted the transfer of the 35,000 sq.ft. (the "horn"-shaped portion) results in an effective density on the site of about 3.7 FSR, and the accumulation of a lot of mass on the site creates considerable pressure on sites to the south to achieve views through. Mr. Lehto referred to the intent statement in the C-3A District Schedule which indicates that developments should be designed compatibly with commercial uses. The guidelines also talk to

integrating future and existing non residential uses into the neighbourhood, and minimizing disruption of significant views. He suggested that the height be consolidated in the east tower and the west tower lowered, which would offer some view protection for existing commercial and non residential uses. If the matter of lot 4 is not resolved, Mr. Lehto suggested the additional density it yields be removed from the upper portion of the west tower. He urged the Board to consider the language in the by-law and guidelines and provide for sharing the views with properties to the south.

Responding to Mr. Lehto's suggestions, Mr. Segal acknowledged it would improve views from the Masonic Temple. However, he explained that the impact of scale and shadowing on the new park has been an important priority consideration. The current proposal causes minimal shadowing on the park whereas the massing suggested by Mr. Lehto would cause far deeper shadowing of the park. There was also an attempt to minimize the scale of the development facing onto the park. Mr. Segal also noted that such a revised configuration would likely cause concern to Fairview Slopes residents.

**Mr. Don Andrews**, 1355 West Broadway, suggested removing the roof elements from the mid rise component and one floor off each tower, to improve views for properties on Broadway and down the Granville corridor. It will also improve views for residents of the south block of this development. Mr. Andrews noted the view to the east has been preserved for the 3-storey Langmann Gallery by changing the massing on Granville Street, and the same should be done regarding the roof elements because they affect a lot more people. With respect to staff's request that the applicant provide common open space on the tower roofs, Mr. Andrews pointed out that it will be very dirty in this location, creating a long term maintenance problem for the buildings. He suggested the space not be encouraged because it will be unusable. The proposed tennis court in the new park will also suffer from dirt from the bridge and Granville Street traffic. Mr. Andrews also pointed out that the proposed new road configuration will cause serious problems for fire trucks which currently use Hemlock Street, which he felt may have been overlooked in the desire to achieve the public open space. Lastly, Mr. Andrews stressed that the City should ensure that the pedestrian connector is kept open in perpetuity as a Fairview Slopes north-south access.

**Ms. Diana Fontaine**, 1313 West 8th Avenue, said Fairview Slopes residents will be severely impacted by this development and she did not believe they had been considered. She also expressed concern about the proximity of this development to the Granville Bridge, given recent Council policy on this subject. The Chair explained that the recently approved Bridgehead Guidelines apply only to very specific properties directly adjacent to certain bridges. The policy does not apply to this bridgehead, nor to this property. This proposed development is more than 30 m from the bridge. Commenting on the desire of the Masonic Lodge for the density to be amassed on the easterly tower, Ms. Fontaine stressed that Fairview Slopes residents would wish to be consulted if this was considered. Finally, Ms. Fontaine sought assurance regarding the status of the walkway. Mr. Segal explained the mid block connector will be secured by a legal right-of-way, as called for in condition A.2.7.

#### **Panel Opinion**

**Mr. Baldwin** reported that the Urban Design Panel unanimously supported this application with a strong 9-0 vote. Most of the Panel's concerns are reflected in the prior-to conditions, although there were some differences of opinion with staff. Regarding the fairly major changes in massing suggested by the speakers, Mr. Baldwin said he felt there was a good discussion at the preliminary stage in terms of finding a balance of massing around all the viewpoints. Reconsideration of how the massing is distributed over the site at this stage is not appropriate, given the Board's decision to create the proposed massing was after a fully-rounded discussion.

Similarly, the roof forms were shown and approved in principle at the preliminary stage and should not be reconsidered. They add a great deal of vitality to the form of the buildings and to the roofscape, as well as providing private livable space at roof level. Regarding the conditions, Mr. Baldwin said he sympathized with the developer's concerns about 1.1 (d) and (e). Therefore, anything the Board could do to provide some clarity to the requirement of the developer at this stage would be beneficial. He agreed with the applicant's request to delete the requirement for common open space, noting the Panel supported the scheme as presented and did not see the necessity for any increase in semi-private open space. Mr. Baldwin commented that setting back the guardrail 4 ft. off Granville seems a very minor issue that will make no significant difference to the development although seems easy to achieve. Regarding the Panel's comment about the east vs. the west massing, Mr. Baldwin agreed a prior-to condition is unnecessary. On the issue of the 5th/Granville corner, however, at the preliminary stage the Panel felt there should be a strong marker there but it was ultimately reduced for consideration of a 270 degree view from one building. He therefore felt the Panel would wish to add a new condition to provide a stronger form on the corner of 5th and Granville as a better transition from the bridgehead to the urban street form of Granville.

**Ms. Parton** complimented the architect and the developer on the design. She expressed sympathy for the Masonic Lodge but felt the applicant had achieved a commendable scheme that maintains good views for the majority of people. She was concerned that the developer might be delayed by condition 1.1 (d) and (e). She recommended deleting 1.2, and hoped that recycling and garbage collection would not be overlooked. Ms. Parton said she especially liked the public access through the site. She had a major concern about the buses turning from 5th Avenue onto Granville Street, noting this area is already very congested.

**Mr. Gjernes** recommended approval. He sympathized with the concerns of the neighbours with respect to the views, in particular the Masonic Lodge. However, the increased park area is a worthwhile public benefit in exchange for the extra density on the site. It is inevitable that some people will be affected by a development of this size. Regarding the conditions, Mr. Gjernes said he would like to see 1.1 (d) reworded to refer more to the bus loop and 5th Avenue configuration rather than the bridge ramp, to avoid any misconception. He expressed some surprise that the associated costs were entirely the responsibility of the developer. He recommended the deletion of 1.2 and 1.8.

**Ms. Kellington-Catliff** supported the application subject to the conditions, and commended the architects, developers and planners very highly for the strength of the design. Appropriate response to the preliminary conditions has been made and considerable response towards achieving the substantive public benefits occurring from the proposal is also made. Overall, it is an exemplary project that will be an important contribution to this neighbourhood. She supported amending 1.1 (d), (e) and (f) and deleting of 1.2 and 1.8. She expressed sympathy for the residents who suggested redistributing height in an effort to improve surrounding views, but agreed the impacts of such redistribution creates a greater problem than it resolves. She also concurred that the roof "eyebrows" make a significant contribution to the project, and supported Mr. Baldwin's comment to add a new condition regarding the corner of 5th/Granville.

#### **Board Discussion**

Responding to a question from **Mr. Taylor** concerning conditions 1.1 (d) and (e), **Mr. Thomson** said he did not believe rewording the conditions would provide any greater clarity. The tunnel presently terminates on Lot 4, and one of the earlier conditions requires the incorporation of Lot 4 into the property. Council approval is required to transfer Lot 4 to the developer, and Council will likely make a condition of that transfer arrangements for the relocation of the

tunnel. Council has directed the Deputy City Engineer to negotiate with the applicant the arrangements for the on-ramp and bus loop and the pedestrian tunnel, and until Council is satisfied with the conclusion of those negotiations it will not be possible to provide greater clarity in the conditions of this development application.

**Mr. Rudberg** said he supported the application. It demonstrates a good public/private partnership by achieving a good private development and a beneficial public amenity. Clearly, this involves negotiations and both the public and the developer have to be satisfied that satisfactory arrangements have been made. With respect to the massing, Mr. Rudberg said he would also be very reluctant to make changes at the complete stage, given the discussions at the preliminary stage when the various trade-offs were discussed. The massing agreed on at that time reflected the views of not only Fairview Slopes but the properties further to the south. He moved approval of the application, with amendments to the conditions. He did not recommend any change to conditions 1.1 (d) and (e) but advised the Deputy City Engineer will be made aware of the need to complete negotiations as quickly and simply as possible. With respect to the amount of outdoor space, Mr. Rudberg said that given the dedication of land to the park that has been provided, the developer has gone a long way in terms of meeting outdoor space needs for not only the public at large but residents of this development. He moved the deletion of 1.2.

**Mr. Taylor** agreed this complete application is very close to what the Board anticipated at the preliminary stage. While it is regrettable any time views are lost, the balance presented meets the Board's expectations. He supported the City Engineer's amendments, with the exception of 1.2 which he wished to see retained because he felt the common outdoor space will be important to the residents of the buildings. Mr. Beasley concurred, noting it is a very modest addition that is being sought and the roofs offer excellent view opportunities for the residents.

#### **Motion**

It was moved by **Mr. Rudberg** and seconded by **Mr. Taylor**, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 402272 , in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated January 14, 1998, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1 (c): creation of "5th Avenue" which includes all dedications, establishments, road/lane closures, etc.

Amend 1.1 (f): relocation and/or abandonment of all utilities, etc.

Delete 1.8;

Amend the Note to Applicant in A.2.11 to change to reference to condition A.2.6;

It was moved by **Mr. Taylor** and seconded by **Mr. Beasley**, and was the decision of the Board, to include condition 1.2.

#### **Other Business**

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5.00 pm.