

Date: Monday, July 13, 1998)
Time: N/A
Place: N/A

PRESENT:

Minutes
Business Arising from the Minutes
1768 West Broadway - DE402821
Other Business

Board

L.B. Beasley, Director of Central Area Planning
J. Rogers, Deputy City Manager
D. Rudberg, City Engineer

Advisory Panel

J. Drohan, Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
A. Waisman, Representative of the Design Professions
A. Gjernes, Representative of Development Industry
J. Oberlander, Representative of General Public

Regrets

P. Kavanagh, Representative of Development Industry
S. Kellington-Catliff, Representative of General Public
D. Chung, Representative of General Public
B. Parton, Representative of General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

City Staff:

R. Segal, Development Planner
N. Peters, City Surveyor

Item 3 - 1768 West Broadway - DE402821

C. Brook, Brook Development Planning Inc.
T. Bell, Gomberoff Policzer Bell Architects
E. Schroeder, Gomberoff Policzer Bell Architects

CLERK TO THE BOARD: Carol Hubbard

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Ms. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Rudberg, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of June 29, 1998 be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. **1768 West Broadway - DE402821 - Zone C-3A
(COMPLETE APPLICATION AFTER PRELIMINARY)**

Applicant: Brook Development Planning Inc..

Request: To construct a mixed-use commercial/residential building complex comprised of:

- one-storey, grade level retail/commercial on Broadway (16,185 sq.ft)
- 3-storey, 10 unit townhouses on Broadway
- 3-storey, 10 unit townhouses at lane
- 6-storey, 42 unit residential mid-rise at westerly side
- 11-storey, 65 unit residential high-rise at easterly side (Pine Street)

1. To increase the FSR from 1.0 to 3.0; and
2. To increase the building height from 30 ft. to 43.7 ft. (Broadway townhouses), to 38 ft. (lane townhouses), to 58.4 ft. (6 storeys), and 103.7 ft. (11 storeys).

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Ralph Segal, presented this application which was approved in principle by the Board on March 23, 1998. With the aid of scale models, Mr. Segal briefly described the proposed development and the context of the site. A major issue at the preliminary stage related to view blockage, particularly from the Monte Carlo building to the south (1736 West 10th Avenue). Mr. Segal reviewed the main conditions imposed by the Board at the preliminary stage and how they have been addressed in this complete submission. The high rise tower has been reduced from 12 to 11 storeys and now proposes to use underslung elevators. The townhouses along Broadway have been increased from two to three storeys. With respect to the 6-storey building, the Board had requested the applicant to ensure the preservation of water views from the sixth floor of the Monte Carlo, for which a slight reduction in height was anticipated. The complete application, however, seeks a slight increase in height, although it does appear to just maintain the water view. Given the margin of error in calculations, staff recommend that the building parapet be lowered to approximately 57 ft., noting also that there will be some intrusion from the elevator penthouse. Staff believe the 57 ft. height can be easily achieved using standard concrete construction and it will provide greater assurance that the water view will be maintained. With respect to the open space treatment, Mr. Segal tabled a revision to condition A.1.9, dealing with legally securing public access to the proposed public amenity space. Concerns were raised at the preliminary stage about the architectural treatment. Staff note the submission now meets expectations in terms of earning the relaxations being sought. Proposed materials include brick, steel and glass; and the landscaping plan is excellent. Two letters were received in response to the notification. Staff believe the concerns raised about traffic congestion in the lane and landscaping on Broadway have been satisfactorily addressed in the complete submission. Staff recommend approval of the application, subject to some minor conditions listed in the Staff Committee Report dated June 24, 1998.

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

Applicant's Comments

Referring to view diagrams, Mr. C. Brook reviewed the condition imposed by the Board at the preliminary stage, to preserve water views for Monte Carlo residents. He noted that while some Monte Carlo residents currently enjoy water views, the building is some distance from the water and separated from English Bay by sites which are zoned potentially for medium density and higher rise developments. At the preliminary stage a very exhaustive comparative view analysis was conducted to illustrate potential view impact from the Monte Carlo and two typical low rise buildings to the south, showing both the proposal and a hypothetical "outright" C-3A development. Subject to certain conditions, it was concluded that the proposal was superior in terms of its urban design response. Mr. Brook noted the changes made to the scheme since the previous submission. With respect to the 6-storey building, a computer view analysis concluded that, except for the elevator penthouse, the views of the water from the 6th floor of the Monte Carlo would not be impacted. With respect to staff's recommendation to reduce the height to 57 ft. to provide greater assurance that the water view will be preserved, Mr. Brook urged the Board to allow 58 ft. since they believe the spirit of the Board's condition has been satisfied. He stressed that the additional 1 ft. is very important because it affects their ability to determine the building's construction system. The proposal is for a combination steel and concrete system and to maintain a viable amount of clearance for the first floor commercial space, resulting in an overall height of 58.43 ft. Reducing the height to 57 ft. limits them to a concrete system which, as well as cost implications, could also limit the area of commercial space since a greater transfer beam is required with the use of concrete construction on the upper floors. He requested the Board to delete condition 1.2.

Mr. Brook said they will be pleased to work with staff to satisfy conditions 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4, which they find acceptable

Discussion

In response to a question from the Board, Mr. Segal reiterated staff's position that lowering the 6-storey building to 57 ft. is not an onerous condition. Mr. Eric Schroeder, Architect, distributed copies of comparative sections of the two construction systems, noting that deeper beams are necessary with concrete construction, resulting a loss of height in the commercial space.

Some discussion took place regarding the development potential of sites to the north. Mr. Segal noted there is clearly some development potential that could impact the water view from the 6th floor of the Monte Carlo building, which depends on the view through the gas station site to the north. Staff conclude, however, that the gas station could remain for many years. Land beyond the gas station, although zoned C-3A, is unlikely to be developed to great height, particularly on the west side of Burrard, because of its adjacency to the low rise RM-4 zone.

Comments from Other Speakers

Mr. Paul Hancock, 1695 West 10th Avenue, explained that 11 bedrooms in his building face the corner which proposes a restaurant with outdoor seating. He urged that this not be allowed to occur, given the potential disturbance it could create. Mr. Hancock also expressed concern about traffic congestion in the lane, and urged that amelioration measures be put in place. He also requested the developer to observe a good neighbour policy during construction. Mr. Hancock said he thinks it is a very nice project and he welcomed the residential uses.

Discussion

In response to a question from the City Engineer regarding the proposed outdoor restaurant, Mr. Segal explained that the City takes into account the proximity to residents and can apply a time limit on the permit for the outdoor seating. This is typically for one year, after which the

City monitors complaints. Permits are not renewed if there are consistent complaints. Mr. Segal suggested the Board may wish to impose a condition that any outdoor seating be time limited. Mr. Brook noted the space identified for restaurant use is fairly modest at about 2,000 sq.ft. He said they would be amenable to a temporary permit for the outdoor seating at the corner, noting this would be preferable to eliminating it which would be counter to the goal of animating the street.

Panel Opinion

Ms. Drohan noted the Urban Design Panel saw this project three times. In its review of the complete submission the Panel was very encouraged by the applicant's efforts to address the urban design issues raised previously, and supported the project unanimously. Reconfiguring the tower to allow for the view requirements identified could have resulted in a very awkward mass, but the Panel found the resulting building had greater clarity and responded well to the request for stronger residential character. The Panel found the architectural treatment to be considerably improved. Ms. Drohan added, she would like to see some more notes of colour on the exterior to complement those indicated within the private realm. The Panel also found the outdoor spaces considerably improved, especially the mid-block public courtyard that opens to Broadway. With respect to the 6-storey component, given the applicant's efforts to address views on this project and the development potential for the northeast corner of Burrard and Broadway, Ms. Drohan recommended leniency on any further height restriction. The Panel believes this project will be a very positive addition to the Broadway corridor.

Mr. Gjernes recommended approval of the application. He also felt a further reduction in height of the 6-storey building was not appropriate and recommended deletion of condition 1.2. Mr. Gjernes said he would be concerned about restricting at this stage the use of the outdoor patio, noting its importance to the street ambience. He did, however, believe an annual permit would be appropriate.

Ms. Oberlander said the project will be a welcome addition to the existing part of this block. She felt the applicant had demonstrated adequately that the conditions imposed have been accommodated. She recommended the height of the 6-storey building be permitted as proposed at 58.4 ft. With respect to the restaurant outdoor seating area, Ms. Oberlander suggested there may be a compromise solution (i.e., limiting operating hours or the number of seats) which would address the neighbours' concerns. She recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Waisman noted the significant progress that has been made on this project. He recommended approval. With respect to the height of the 6-storey building, Mr. Waisman said he was concerned that staff and the applicant seemed to be unable to reconcile the calculations and felt inclined to support staff's recommendation. He also supported retention of the outdoor restaurant, with a time limited permit.

Board Discussion

Mr. Rudberg said the improvements that have been made to this project since the preliminary submission demonstrate the effectiveness of the development application process by achieving something better for everyone. Based on the advice of the majority of the Advisory Panel with respect to the height of the 6-storey building, Mr. Rudberg said he was prepared to delete condition 1.2. With respect to the restaurant outdoor seating area, he recommended an amendment to A.1.8, specifying a time limited approval. He supported staff alternative condition A.1.9. Regarding the traffic issues raised by Mr. Hancock, Mr. Rudberg noted such matters should be subject to a neighbourhood traffic planning process, which he understands is already under consideration.

Ms. Rogers supported Mr. Rudberg's recommendations. She said it is a great project and all the improvements made along the way have made it very pedestrian friendly and accessible. Regarding the height of the 6-storey building, Ms. Rogers said she was persuaded to accept the height as proposed, largely because of future development potential to the north. Given there is no guarantee as to the what the actual height will be, she said she hoped that staff were being very conservative in its advice, adding the Board would be very concerned if it does ultimately impact the views. She also supported a time limited permit for the restaurant outdoor seating area, noting it does provide an opportunity to respond to the community in the event of complaints.

Mr. Beasley commended the applicant for concurring with the addition of the time limited approval for the easterly section. It is a very neighbourly gesture which bodes well for the project's future relationship with the neighbourhood.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Rudberg and seconded by Ms. Rogers, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 402821, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated June 14, 1998, with the following amendments:

Delete 1.2;

Add to the Note to Applicant after A.1.8: The easterly outdoor seating area is hereby given a time limited approval for one year and renewal of this use will be subject to review, with particular emphasis on neighbourhood comments.

Amend A.1.9: legal agreement or other satisfactory arrangement to secure the use and access of the public amenity space by the general public will also be required, to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services and Director of Planning;

Note to Applicant: Delineate on architectural and landscape plans the area of the Broadway courtyard that is intended as a public amenity space. Actual size and configuration of this public amenity space to be finalized in consultation with Planning staff.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:15 pm.