

Date: Monday, March 23, 1998
Time: N/A
Place: N/A

PRESENT:

Minutes
Business Arising from the Minutes
1221 Homer Street - DE402673
955 Richards Street - DE402919
1768 West Broadway - DE402821
Other Business

Board

J. Forbes-Roberts Director of Community Planning (Chair)
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
D. Chung Representative of General Public
S. Kellington-Catliff Representative of General Public (excused Item #3)
B. Parton Representative of General Public

Regrets

A. Gjernes Representative of Development Industry
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry
J. Oberlander Representative of General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

City Staff:

R. Segal Development Planner
M. Kemble Development Planner
N. Peters City Surveyor

Item 3 - 1221 Homer Street - DE402673

K. Hemphill Rositch Hemphill & Assoc.

Item 4 - 955 Richards Street - DE402919

C. Brook Brook Development Planning Inc.
F. Raffi Raffi Architects
A. Chilcott Bosa Ventures Inc

Item 5 - 1768 West Broadway - DE402821

C. Brook Brook Development Planning Inc.
N. Farris Intergulf Development Group
T. Bell Gomberoff Policzer Bell Architects
E. Schroeder Gomberoff Policzer Bell Architects

CLERK TO THE BOARD: Carol Hubbard

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of February 23, 1998 be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 1221 Homer Street - DE402673 - DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Rositch Hemphill & Assoc

Request: To construct a 14-storey mixed-use commercial/residential building containing 6,123 sq.ft. retail at grade along Davie Street, and 3,546 sq.ft. commercial office uses at grade along Homer Street, and 137 residential dwelling units.

To receive 10,500 sq.ft. (10 percent) of heritage density bonus floor area transferred from the former Canadian Linen building pursuant to Section 3.12 of the DODP By-law.

To relax the loading requirement from 3 to 2 spaces.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Mike Kemble, presented this application. The site, located at the southwest corner of Homer and Davie Streets, has 175 ft. frontage on Homer Street and 120 ft. flanking frontage on Davie Street. Following a brief description of the immediate site context, Mr. Kemble reviewed the three main issues arising from the staff review of the proposal, namely the overall building massing, amenity space provisions, and the extent and treatment of the grade level retail. This site is seen as a transition between the lower scale Yaletown and the emerging tower and podium development in Downtown South. The Downtown South Guidelines (New Yaletown District) that apply to this site envisage the tower and podium approach. Therefore, a number of relaxations have to be considered to permit the kind of project being proposed. Mr. Kemble briefly described the project, highlighting the areas in which relaxation of the guidelines is sought. With respect to the retail component, the zoning requires continuous retail along the Davie Street frontage. As well, the ODP prohibits retail along Homer Street, the intent being to limit retail to Granville and Davie Streets in Downtown South. The guidelines are silent with respect to corner transitions between retail and non-retail streets. Staff recommend a maximum depth of 30 ft. for the retail along Homer, with entry from Davie Street only.

Four letters of objection were received in response to the notification, all from the adjacent property. However, the general concept received good support from an ad hoc citizens committee in the area.

In summary, staff consider the proposed mid-rise, masonry building responds well to its context as a transition between the older Yaletown Historic Area and the emerging New Yaletown

neighbourhood. Its eclectic massing approach in contrast to the more typical tower and podium developments nearby will help to provide greater variety and a more neighbourly response to its context. The recommendation is that the Board approve the application, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report dated February 25, 1998.

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

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Keith Hemphill, Architect, said they have no problem in addressing the conditions and have already made a number of changes. He briefly described the project, stressing the intention is to develop a good transition building between Downtown South and Yaletown. One area of concern relates to the retail on Homer Street. He acknowledged the ODP requirement for retail to be confined to Davie Street; however, in this case the retail turns the corner. As well, a larger setback is proposed at the corner with the extension of the double street trees. He explained their preference is to have a second retail component on Homer Street, to provide a better relationship to the street.

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Ms. Drohan reported that the Urban Design Panel considered the applicant had responded quite well to its previous concerns. The Panel found the restriction of retail entries to Davie Street somewhat prohibitive given this corner situation, and felt it would be more positive if the retail could be extended around the corner, as proposed. The Panel was concerned about the livability of some of the inside corner units. With respect to the top of the tower, the Panel indicated a preference for a somewhat lighter expression. Commenting on the latest revisions, Ms. Drohan said the revised proposal for the amenity areas at the second floor is positive and provides a better connection with the outside. With respect to the architectural expression, she added she believed the strong cornices at the five and seven storey levels are a good contribution to this part of Homer Street, noting it responds quite well to a number of neighbouring buildings. The building also has the potential to contribute to the overlook view from surrounding taller buildings. Noting the building embodies much of the Yaletown character, it goes a long way towards being a transition building. It also provides some diversity in the downtown core.

Mr. Waisman recommended approval of the application subject to the recommended conditions, with the exception of 1.2 regarding the corner retail. He suggested it would be better to give the applicant some flexibility in order to avoid the possibility of the retail space remaining unoccupied.

Ms. Parton also recommended approval. She thought the design lent itself well to the Yaletown historical area. She supported the applicant's request to maintain the corner retail as proposed, with access on Homer Street. Ms. Parton added, she had some concern about the very small size of the studio units.

Mr. Chung recommended approval. He supported the proposed transitional height between the Downtown South towers and Yaletown, and the heritage appearance of the design. He questioned whether there was sufficient turning space at the vehicular access points.

Board Discussion

Ms. Rogers said she considers the building to be an excellent transition between the two zones. She was pleased to note the increase in balcony space. She said she was also encouraged to learn that the project is supported by an ad hoc citizens advisory committee. With respect to the issue of the corner retail, Ms. Rogers said she had no difficulty with the applicant's proposal to extend the Homer Street retail frontage to 60 ft.

Mr. Rudberg said he liked the proposal because it offers some variety from the more typical tower and podium developments in Downtown South. Responding to Mr. Chung's concern about parking access, Mr. Rudberg noted that condition A.2.3 requires that adequate turning radius be provided. With respect to the retail, Mr. Rudberg agreed that extending it to 60 ft. would be acceptable, provided it is one retail unit. However, the applicant's proposal for a second retail unit on Homer Street, and two entries on the Homer frontage, does exceed the intent of the Official Development Plan. Mr. Rudberg added, he did not believe a secondary entry off Homer Street, as long as it is part of the same unit, would violate the ODP. Ms. Rogers concurred.

Ms. Forbes-Roberts concurred with her Board colleagues. Noting this building is in a location where there will be several surrounding towers overlooking it, she commended the applicant to pay special attention to the design of the outdoor spaces. She noted the retail component will be very important to the animation of the street.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 402673, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 25, 1998, with the following amendment:

Amend 1.2: design development to the grade level retail area at the Homer/Davie corner, to limit its Homer Street frontage to a maximum 60 ft., in response to section 2 Retail Use Continuity of the DODP;

4. 955 Richards Street - DE402919 - DD (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: W. T. Leung Architects Inc.

Request: The construction of a mixed-use residential/commercial development consisting of:

a 26 storey, 173 unit residential tower;

a 16 storey, 97 unit mixed-use retail/residential tower;

a 2 1/2 to 4 storey, 20 unit townhouse podium;

retail tenant spaces on the ground floor; and,

2 1/2 levels of underground parking for 302 vehicles.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Mike Kemble, presented this application. He described the site context and the proposed development, noting the principal issues that have been identified, namely: the number of towers for the size and frontage of the site; expression and massing of the podium level townhouse units; architectural treatments of the towers; the amount of open space and its usability; and vehicular access arrangements from the lane. The site frontage is 25 ft. less than would normally be required for a two tower scheme under the Downtown South Guidelines. Mr. Kemble reviewed the principal conditions of approval recommended in the Staff Committee Report dated March 11, 1998, noting that staff support the two tower concept for this site. An additional condition was also recommended, requiring the applicant to consider retaining some existing plane trees on Nelson and Richards Streets. The Staff Committee recommends approval in principle, with the complete application dealt with by the Director of Planning. Staff consider all the issues have been covered by the conditions and can be dealt with at the complete stage.

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

Applicant's Comments

Mr. C. Brook said they believe they can address all the conditions, including the new 1.7. He said they were pleased that both staff and the Urban Design Panel considered the two tower proposal to be superior to a single tower solution for this site. Concerns raised about the architectural expression have been addressed. With respect to open space, Mr. Brook said there are opportunities to increase the amount of open space provided on the site. He requested an amendment to condition 1.3 to require an increase in open space "to the greatest extent possible", "closer to" Section 7.2 of the Guidelines. **Mr. F. Raffi**, Architect, explained the revisions made in response to concerns raised by the Urban Design Panel.

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Ms. Drohan noted the Urban Design Panel supported the two tower scheme as a better fit for this particular context. The Panel had serious concerns about the multiplicity of architectural styles, and the weakness of the podium base. It was felt there needed to be a much stronger framing of the street and a more vertical expression of the townhouses. A reduction in the massing of the tower above the upper cornice line was also suggested. The Panel also had serious concerns about the open space at the northwest which many Panel members thought was an inappropriate location. Commenting on the latest revisions to the scheme, Ms. Drohan said she saw considerable improvement. Pulling the upper townhouses closer to the street to make a more deliberate streetwall is a definite improvement; however, the north end of the podium remains somewhat weak. With respect to the open space, Ms. Drohan commented that if the intent is as illustrated it would be a welcome model for the northwest corner of the site, as more of a contemplative garden; otherwise the Panel's concerns would remain. The lane access is still an area of concern. Ms. Drohan strongly suggested that the applicant take some cues from the successful approach taken by the Savoy development across the street, particularly with respect to the degree of landscape, noting that lane accesses such as these are becoming the front doors of developments.

Ms. Parton recommended approval in principle. She was concerned about access to parking off the lane, and agreed with Ms. Drohan's concern about the lane treatment in general, noting it will be a principal entry point. With respect to the expression of the towers, Ms. Parton said she felt it would be better to have the two towers facing the same direction. She was

concerned about the proximity of the townhouses to the street, noting other similar townhouse developments have become totally closed off from the street by permanently closed window blinds.

Ms. Kellington-Catliff supported the two tower scheme in principle, noting it reduces shadow on the public open space and provides opportunities for private views. She questioned whether there should be a condition which addresses awning depth. Regarding the northern courtyard, she questioned whether at this preliminary stage there should be a condition to ensure wheelchair access from Richards as well as the lane. Also, to request some type of lane fencing material for the safety and security of any children playing in that area. She questioned whether landscape condition A.1.15 should be extended to include lighting in the northerly courtyard area. She also suggested an addition to the CPTED conditions, requiring some type of transparent fencing material at the base of the Richards Street stair accessing the central garden courtyard. She supported the applicant's requested relaxation of condition 1.3, and agreed with Ms. Drohan that the landscape illustration presented is a welcome model for the northwest corner. She also suggested condition 1.2 might be modified to include the word "residential". Finally, she complimented the architect on the variety in the architectural expression.

Mr. Chung echoed Ms. Parton's concern about the fortress nature of townhouse developments built close to the street. He supported the differing heights of the towers and liked the overall design of the project.

Mr. Waisman congratulated the architect on the improvements made to the design. He supported the recommended conditions of approval. He did not believe 1.3 required any amendment. He strongly agreed with the concerns identified with respect to lane treatment, and urged the applicant to pay special attention to this part of the development.

Board Discussion

Mr. Rudberg said he supported the proposal. He commented that the decision to develop a two tower scheme in an area which is less than that suggested by the guidelines has caused some problems in terms of access and the provision of adequate open space, and achieving these objectives has begun to constrain the site. Given a two tower solution is the developer's preference, it is his responsibility to make it work. However, noting this is a preliminary application, Mr. Rudberg said he felt confident the applicant would be able to arrive at the necessary design solutions. He moved approval in principle, with amendments to the conditions. He did not support the applicant's suggested amendment to 1.3, but added a reference to disabled access to the condition. He felt some of the issues raised by the Advisory Panel can be dealt with at the complete stage. However, he said he would like to emphasize the issue of lighting, and suggested an amendment to condition A.1.15. He agreed that the complete application can be dealt with by the Director of Planning, but stressed that if the issues concerning the porte cochere and the outdoor open space are not satisfactorily addressed, the application may be returned to the Board for final consideration. It was noted the complete application will in any event be reviewed by the Urban Design Panel.

Ms. Rogers added her support for the application. She also commented that the two tower scheme presents some interesting challenges, and she was encouraged by the applicant's indication that further enhancements will be sought, particularly with respect to the outdoor open space. Ms. Rogers said she also liked the concept being considered by the applicant for this space. She agreed with the concerns expressed about the lane treatment.

Ms. Forbes-Roberts noted the applicant has been given some very good advice and she looked forward to seeing the complete application.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE IN PRINCIPLE Development Application No. 402919, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated March 11, 1998, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.2: design development to the residential architectural vocabulary and treatment of the towers, to achieve a more consistent residential architectural style for the project that better relates to the lower level podium details;

Amend 1.3: design development to the open space treatments to maximize their usability, including disabled access and attractiveness ... Section 7.2(a) of the Guidelines;

Add 1.7: consideration be given to the retention of the eight (8) London Plane trees existing on the Nelson and Richards Street frontages of the site, integrated with the Downtown South Streetscape treatments and required public realm setbacks;

Amend A.1.15: provision of a lighting concept plan should be added to the Landscape Plan that illustrates the location and type of light, especially in the porte cochere and the northern landscaped area to ensure improved safety and security;

5. 1768 West Broadway - DE402821 - C-3A (PRELIMINARY APPLICATION)

Applicant: Gomberoff Policzner Bell Architects

Request: A mixed-use commercial/residential building complex comprised of:

- one-storey, grade level retail/commercial on Broadway (14,954 sq.ft.)
- 2-storey, 7 unit townhouses on Broadway
- 3-storey, 10 unit townhouses at lane
- 6-storey, 41 unit residential mid-rise at westerly side
- 12-storey, 70 unit residential high-rise at easterly side (Pine Street);

To increase the FSR from 1.0 to 3.0.

To increase the building height from 30 ft. to 34 ft. (Broadway

townhouses), to 36 ft. (lane townhouses), to 56 ft. (6 storeys), and 113 ft. (12 storeys)..

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Ralph Segal, presented this application. The site is located on the south side of Broadway between Burrard and Pine Streets and has a 350 ft. frontage. He briefly reviewed the immediate site context and the proposed development. The guidelines for this Burrard sub area recommend a 70 ft. height limit. In addition to considering whether the application has earned the maximum 3.0 FSR, the main issue to consider is whether the increase in height is justified, firstly beyond the 30 ft. outright, and then beyond the 70 ft. guideline height to the requested 113 ft. With respect to the requested discretionary FSR maximum, Mr. Segal noted the proposal has responded well to the guidelines in terms of enhancing pedestrian amenity along Broadway. The application also meets the 1991 Central Broadway Area Plan Goals and Land Use Policy which calls for predominantly residential use in this sub area. Mr. Segal noted that the Central Broadway Design Guidelines which recommend a 70 ft. height limit were adopted in 1976, at which time Broadway was likely envisioned as a commercial corridor.

The major issue to be considered is height and its impact on views, particularly from the Monte Carlo, a 12-storey residential building at 1736 West 10th Avenue. Mr. Segal reviewed a photo montage comparing the impact of a 70 ft. scheme with the proposal. In summary, the lower level units of the Monte Carlo generally benefit from the proposal as opposed to a 70 ft. scheme, and from the 7th floor up there is quantitatively either little or no impact. A qualitative analysis of the view impacts was also carried out, as a result of which a number of revisions are being recommended, namely to lower the tower from 12 to 11 floors and incorporate an underslung elevator, and incorporate a hydraulic elevator in the 6-storey building in order to reduce the height of the elevator penthouse. Mr. Segal tabled an additional condition, 1.11, requiring the parapet of the 6th storey building to be lowered by 1.5 ft. The objective of the conditions is to diminish qualitative and quantitative view loss from the Monte Carlo to a more acceptable level and to a level which staff believe will justify the height increase in the context of the other benefits achieved by the proposed massing configuration. Considerable negative response was received in response to notification, citing view blockage, excessive density, traffic congestion, lowering property values, and construction noise. The Staff Committee recommendation is for approval in principle with a fairly substantial number of conditions, as outlined in the report dated February 25, 1998.

(Board and Panel members took a few minutes to review the model and posted material)

Applicant's Comments

Mr. C. Brook noted Council indicated in 1991 that it sees predominantly residential uses as the future for this section of the Broadway corridor. If the 1976 guideline which allows 70 ft. height for a frontage up to 75 percent is applied to this very long site, the result is not necessarily what might have been intended, and there are some compelling reasons to consider some variations. Recent history shows that the full 3.0 FSR has generally been obtained in C-3A, particularly for the larger sites. Mr. Brook said they believe it is therefore reasonable to use the 70 ft. guideline model as a comparative counterpoint to the proposal. They also believe it is an appropriate response for the evolving nature of the Broadway corridor, noting a 70 ft. scheme would create considerable shadowing on the north sidewalk. Mr. Brook reviewed the heights of buildings in the adjacent RM-3 zone and Burrard Slopes C-3A, also pointing out that the proposal is a better relationship in terms of scale with the 3-storey buildings along 10th Avenue at the rear of the site. The proposed building height is slightly lower than the Prospect Centre, it balances the block and opens up a window for Broadway. It is an appropriate

transition between the outright height of 120 ft. behind (RM-3) and the 100 ft. in front (Burrard Slopes) and is not out of scale with its neighbours.

With respect to the main conditions in the Staff Committee Report, Mr. Brook said that while they do not see the need to lower the tower they recognize the concerns of some of the Monte Carlo residents, and accept condition 1.1. He requested an amendment to 1.2 to provide greater flexibility with respect to the type of elevator and they will endeavour to provide the minimal elevator penthouse. Regarding materials, Mr. Brook said they are proposing 53 percent glass, 9 percent brick, 3 percent alucabond and 35 percent EIFS (Exterior Insulation and Finishing System). He requested a rewording of condition 1.8 to permit use of the high quality EIFS material. **Mr. Eric Schroeder**, Architect, described the material which is prefinished panels with an acrylic coating and is of much higher quality than applied stucco. With respect to condition 1.10, to relocate a loading space, Mr. Brook said they wish to retain the consolidated loading spaces at the easterly end of the site because it is more efficient. Regarding the new condition 1.11, Mr. Brook said it may be possible to reduce the parapet of the 6-storey building. He requested that this condition be a consideration item and they will attempt to demonstrate how it has been addressed at the complete stage, noting they will do everything possible to lower the building within the technical limitations.

Comments from Other Speakers

Mr. Ron Longstaffe, 1736 West 10th Avenue (Monte Carlo), said his comments reflect the broader views of the entire Strata Council of the Monte Carlo. He explained that the Monte Carlo is a relatively new building and before purchasing suites in the building they read the guidelines and were aware that the 3-storey buildings across the street could be redeveloped to 120 ft., although they do not believe this will occur in the foreseeable future. He said they knew that the guidelines allow some flexibility, but did not know to what extent; nor is there any indication in the guidelines that assembling a larger site easily achieves 3.0 FSR rather than the 1.0 indicated in the guidelines. There also seems to be a will on the part of the City to allow the full 3.0 FSR on such sites. Mr. Longstaffe said their main concern is that when applicants achieve that density, its impact in fact is appropriating values from other property owners. He noted that while the proposed tower is described as "slim" its footprint is bigger than the Monte Carlo. He said they realise the guidelines are 21 years old and evolution has occurred during that time. They also appreciate the City's open process but it is not very open to the general public to know how much the guidelines have been altered mentally within the perspective of City staff. Mr. Longstaffe suggested that the guidelines should be rewritten, or some explanation provided for members of the public to be more reasonably informed as to what may occur. He said they do not consider the 3.0 FSR should be given to this project.

Mr. Charles McConville (Monte Carlo resident) showed photographs showing the proposed development compared with what exists now rather than compared with a 70 ft. high project. He said the issue is whether the applicant has earned 3.0 FSR and was concerned that it will result in severe parking problems in the area.

Mr. Michael Reay (Monte Carlo resident) was also concerned about parking given the current parking problems in the area. He was concerned that he will lose the ocean view from his 6th floor apartment and urged the Board to maintain condition 1.2; alternatively to reduce the building to five floors. View impact will be significant and substantially reduce their property value.

Panel Opinion

Ms. Drohan noted the Urban Design Panel saw this project twice. On both occasions the Panel strongly supported relaxation of the 70 ft. guideline height, mainly because it felt a richer and

more diverse street would be possible. It also contributes to a clearer expression of residential use, noting the commercial buildings on the north side of Broadway are much more indicative of the relentlessness of the 70 ft. guideline. Ms. Drohan briefly summarized the Panel's second review of the project. She congratulated staff and the applicant on the exhaustive care taken to study the view impacts. Given the grade difference between the Monte Carlo and the proposed tower and the condition to reduce the mechanical penthouses Ms. Drohan said she found condition 1.1 somewhat severe, and suggested some minor word changes to the condition. She noted condition 1.5 addresses the Panel's concern about the gap at the east end of the site. She also suggested that the continuity in the street front might be further improved by adding some kind of open frame above the retail to achieve the connection. Similarly with the courtyard opening. With respect to condition 1.8, Ms. Drohan stressed that high quality materials should especially apply around the public spaces. She said the project has gone a long way towards being much simpler and clearer in its expression; however, the stepping in the plan of the 6-storey building detracts from this somewhat. Finally, she said that the potential of this project to enrich and animate this part of the evolving Broadway corridor far exceeds the guideline recommendations which, she added, are sorely in need of a fresh review.

Mr. Waisman congratulated staff on the very thorough view analysis. Clearly, more people win with the proposed scheme than would have otherwise been possible. It is a very good design which could make a difference to an otherwise dull street. He briefly reviewed the conditions, suggesting a minor amendment to 1.2 and the deletion of 1.10. He urged retention of 1.8 regarding high quality materials. In summary, he said while it has been a difficult application the City wins and most of the residents will also win if the view analysis is accurate.

Ms. Parton said that while she was sympathetic to those who will be losing their views she stressed that a tall tower is better than a large, squat building that impacts more people. She said she was concerned about parking and suggested that more be provided. With respect to materials, she said she was concerned that the newer, airtight building products cause condensation and mould. Other concerns related to safety in the plaza, lighting in the lane and safety of the elevators.

Responding to a concern expressed by the Monte Carlo residents, **Ms. Kellington-Catliff** said she strongly agreed that prospective purchasers/laymen must be given complete information when contacting the City's zoning/development by-law departments. She stated that, in her opinion, a 70 ft. guideline scheme would be monolithic and less sensitive to the majority of its neighbours and, as such, she agreed it is preferable to put massing into one tower in one location for the offsetting benefit of the 6-storey view-preserving mid-rise at the other end of the site. She supported the application, subject to the conditions in the report. She questioned whether the CPTED conditions should include lighting in the mid-block courtyard and the southeast children's play area. In addition, there should be an unclimbable 6 ft. fence to serve and surround the children's play area. She suggested the following amendments to the parking garage: wheelchair access from the commercial parkade to the restaurant/retail space, access from the P2 north parking slab to the elevator room, and elevator access from the visitor parking area. She also questioned the purpose of several banks of P2 stairs. She suggested consideration be given to treating the townhouse rooftops to visually improve views for surrounding neighbours, and she supported the applicant's requested relaxation of conditions 1.2, 1.10 and 1.11.

Mr. Chung complimented the applicant on the quality of the design. He said hoped the lane would be as lively as illustrated. He supported reducing the height of the tower to no less than 11-stories, as required by condition 1.1.

Board Discussion

With respect to loading (condition 1.10), **Mr. Rudberg** said typically loading is located at one end of a development. However, experience has shown that loading spaces are not used if access is inconvenient, resulting in double-parking and traffic disruption. He stressed that lanes are for servicing, including loading/unloading activities.

Addressing the residents of the Monte Carlo, **Mr. Rudberg** said the most recent C-3A proposals along the Broadway corridor have earned the maximum 3.0 FSR by providing high quality developments with good pedestrian environment and public open spaces. This application also meets the criteria the Board typically looks for to grant the increase in density, and to deny 3.0 FSR in this case would not be equitable in terms of what has been given in the past. He agreed that accurate information needs to be provided to the public with respect to what the experience has been and the intent of the guidelines. Given the two types of development that are possible at 3.0 FSR, **Mr. Rudberg** said he believes the proposal is a better response than a monolithic type of development. However, he agreed with condition 1.1 to reduce the height of the tower to 11 storeys because it does provide some relief to the buildings to the south. He said he generally supported the application, with amendment to condition 1.2. He did not support amending 1.8, noting that high quality materials are required for the 3.0 FSR to be earned. He also did not support amending 1.10 with respect to loading. He recommended an amendment to the proposed condition 1.11, noting the applicant has indicated an improvement can be achieved, and a new consideration item regarding rooftop treatment. With respect to parking, **Mr. Rudberg** noted that parking standards are regularly reviewed and he is satisfied the parking requirement for this development is adequate. He noted the other issues raised by the Advisory Panel will be addressed at the complete stage. Given the extent of the conditions, **Mr. Rudberg** added it is appropriate for the complete submission to be reviewed by the Board.

In seconding approval in principle, **Ms. Rogers** commented that the community's demand for fairness has compelled the applicant and staff to undertake an unusually detailed analysis which has been extremely helpful in considering the application. She agreed with **Mr. Rudberg** that citizens should receive adequate information from the City. The City is seeking to animate the Broadway corridor and the proposed development would clearly contribute to that objective. **Ms. Rogers** indicated to the Monte Carlo residents that their demand for a thorough review has resulted in an improved proposal which she looks forward to seeing at the complete stage.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE IN PRINCIPLE Development Application No. 401821, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 25, 1998, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.2: design development to incorporate underslung or hydraulic elevators in the tower and in the 6-storey building, to diminish view obstruction for the Monte Carlo residents;

Amend 1.11: design development to the 6-storey building to preserve the water views for Monte Carlo residents;

Add 1.12: consideration to be given to rooftop landscaping or treatment in order to improve overlook;

Ms. Forbes- Roberts congratulated staff and the applicant for the arduous analysis undertaken. She added, the delegations have made a valid point that the public ought to be better informed and to be able to get a better understanding of what development is possible when they purchase property. Clearly, the City has some work to do with respect to updating the Broadway guidelines. She noted the exercise has also been difficult for the Monte Carlo residents, noting those on the lower floors benefit from the proposal, and she commended them for arriving at a consensus. It is very important to the rigour of the application exercise that the City continues to communicate with neighbours when projects such as this come forward.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6.45 pm.