

Date: Monday, November 14, 2011  
Time: N/A  
Place: N/A

---

**PRESENT:**

**2211 CAMBIE STREET - DE415022 - ZONE C-3A (COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Minutes  
Motion

**Board**

V. Potter Director of Development Services (Chair)  
B. Toderian Director of Planning  
S. Johnston Deputy City Manager  
J. Dobrovolny Director of Transportation

**Advisory Panel**

S. Romses Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
M. Biazzi Representative of the General Public  
M. Pez Representative of the Development Industry  
F. Rafii Representative of the Design Professions  
P. Sanderson Representative of the General Public

**Regrets**

S. Bozorgzadeh Representative of the General Public  
C. Chung Representative of the General Public  
K. Maust Representative of the Design Professions  
J. Miletic-Prelovac Representative of the General Public  
J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry

**ALSO PRESENT:**

**City Staff:**

J. Greer Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development  
R. The Engineering Services - Projects Branch  
P. Cheng Development Planner  
D. Autiero Project Facilitator

**BUTE STREET - DE414843 - ZONE RM-5A**

A. Matis Iconstrux Architecture Ltd.  
M. Reyes Port Capital Development Inc.

**CLERK TO THE BOARD:** L. Harvey

- BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**  
None.
-

**2. 2211 CAMBIE STREET - DE415022 - ZONE C-3A  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Inconstrux Architecture Ltd.

Request: To construct a six-storey mixed-use commercial/residential building containing commercial uses on the ground floor, fifteen (15) dwelling units on the second through sixth storeys and two levels of underground parking, including a Heritage Density Transfer of 10%.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Ann McLean, Development Planner, introduced the application for a 6-storey building with two levels of underground parking, two commercial units at grade with parking at the lane for the commercial units. The underground parking will be accessed by car elevator from the lane. In describing the application, she noted that the outright height of 30 feet may be increased in consideration of compatibility with nearby residential buildings as well as pedestrian amenities. The proposal is for 69 feet to the top of the parapet/rail and 82 feet to the top of the elevator overrun. Although there are three view cones over the site the building height does not come near the underside of any of the view cones.

Ms. McLean indicated that there are guideline recommendations regarding height as Cambie Street is recognized as a gateway and the guidelines recommend that the building step down in height to open up views to the downtown core. Views from downtown to City Hall are also asked to be protected. Staff are proposing an increase in the height to improve the retail floor-to-floor height at grade and to improve the canopy relationship. As well the increased height will increase the roof deck slab thickness to create a better green roof system that will allow drainage without impacting the residential storey below.

Ms. McLean described the amount of density allowed. Outright is 1.0 FSR and may be increased to 3.0 FSR in consideration of a heritage density transfer and this building is proposing 3.3 FSR.

Ms. McLean stated that the massing of the building on the site is well placed. It is compatible with the context and is an architecturally interesting response to the site. The perimeter of the building will be wrapped with alternating open balconies and sunshades (brise soleils). These serve as passive solar devices, as well as private residential amenity and architectural articulation. From a livability point of view, the units are generously sized and most have private balconies. There will also be a green roof deck available to all residents. The second floor units at the lane have generous decks that improve their livability. Several units propose enclosed balconies.

Ms. McLean noted that there is no front yard setback required however the proposal is offering a four foot setback with twelve feet clear of pedestrian sidewalk. This is necessary as this is the main access point to and from the Canada Line Station.

The proposed materials are white cement concrete and curtain wall with granite setts proposed at the lane for the parking area. While it is not required for a development permit, the applicant is pursuing a LEED™ Gold rating.

Ms. McLean reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated November 2, 2011. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

#### Questions/Discussion

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

None.

#### Applicant's Comments

Arno Matis, Architect, further described the application noting that there is a considerable amount of Canada Line infrastructure that is wrapping the site on two sides. A large part of the exercise was the urban design aspect on making sure the sidewalk widths were accommodated. The client has been accommodating in setting back the retail portion. The one area where they had some discussion with Engineering Services was the turning radius to the lane. Mr. Matis asked that this radius be modified somewhat so that the distance and the pinch point could be reduced at West 6th Avenue and the lane to facilitate pedestrian traffic coming through from the Canada Line Station. In describing the architecture, Mr. Matis noted that they wanted to break from the grid and introduce a more regular shape. The idea was to take the energy off Cambie Street and the building starts to fragment as it wrapping around. The brise soleils component was to introduce passive design and to have a strong architectural expression. The intent that the spandrels will define where the brise soleils components are and the open edges are where the balconies will be expressed.

Mr. Matis said he had reviewed the report and are prepared to accept the condition in the report. He mentioned that there were two items in the report that he thought needed some clarification. One was that the date of the validity of the development permit should be May 31, 2012 and not May 31, 2011. The second item was the commercial parking requirement. He noted that their calculation shows that the minimum was two parking spaces and the maximum three and the report states that the minimum should be three parking spaces. He asked for clarification on this item.

#### Questions/Discussion

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

- The enclosed balconies are oriented to the south to pick up solar orientation in the winter.
- In terms of expressing the enclosed balconies, the applicant is looking at breaking the glass line with that is clearly expressed on the exterior.
- There are overhangs on the south façade that form a strong passive rationale.
- There are a variety of tenants being proposed for the retail. They are looking at retailers or banks as tenants.
- The applicant created the on-grade condition along West 7th Avenue for pedestrians entering the building at grade.
- The applicant is looking to increase the height of the retail as part of the slab is below grade on the Cambie Street frontage.
- The applicant would like to see the slab ends come through and be expressed on the exterior of the building.

- The first proposal had a large mechanical room on the west side of the roof and took up a lot of space. The applicant has been able to put most of the mechanical below grade with the exception of a couple of components which will be on the roof behind the elevator overrun. The elevator overrun comes out on the roof as the last stop is for roof access. There will also be stair access to the roof.
- The applicant is looking at cold bridging and thermal breaks for the slab edges. They are still looking at how they will address the issue.
- The applicant is targeting LEED™ Gold.
- There are 22 parking spaces. Some of the larger units will get two parking spaces.
- There will be some partial air cooling for the upper units but no air conditioning for the lower units.
- The heating will be hydronic using coils in the floor as well as some forced air options. Geothermal has been ruled out because of the size of the site.
- The penthouse light well on the roof could be screened with landscaping to keep people from looking down into the 6th level unit.
- The atrium is excluded from the square footage.

#### Comments from other Speakers

None.

#### Panel Opinion

Mr. Romses said that the Panel thought it was a gateway project and even though the building is only 6-storey, it has a strong, iconic presence. The Panel was pleased with the quality of the materials but emphasized that care needed to be taken with the execution of them. The Panel thought it was one of the better projects that they had seen this year.

Mr. Rafii said the project was nicely put together project. He was concerned that Conditions 1.2 and 1.3 could have a negative effect on the project and thought they should be consideration items.

Mr. Sanderson said it was a well designed project but had a few confusing details such as the balcony expressions and the car elevator although he said he thought the details could be worked out. Mr. Sanderson added that he thought it was a handsome project.

Mr. Biazi thought it was a great project and recommended approval. He commended the applicant but was concerned with the height of the party wall and thought it should be reduced. He also had some concerns regarding privacy issues on the roof but added that he liked the size of the balconies.

Mr. Pez said he thought it was a dynamic building and would be a wonderful gateway to the Cambie Corridor. He agreed that increasing the height for the retail was a good move and would make the retail more viable. He said he thought there should be a different expression between the balconies and the brise soleils. He also thought that Planning shouldn't try to change the design too much as it was a good composition and was working well. He added that he thought meeting the green targets would be challenging without using geothermal.

#### Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian said since he came to the City he has been trying to foster a dialogue where there was a greater level of architectural adventurism. He added that he was willing to use the term iconic for this project and thought it was one of the best pieces of architecture he had seen in

the five years he had been the Director of Planning. He noted that often party walls don't have the level of details as shown on this project. As well he noted that signature buildings don't have to be tall buildings; there can also be can signature mid-rise buildings. The view termination coming over the bridge offers a perfect opportunity of an architectural signature moment. He commended the applicant for going after LEED™ Gold even though they don't have to. He encouraged the applicant to continue addressing the energy source issue. He congratulated the applicant for moving the mechanical off the roof and he supported the increase in height both for the roof material depth as well as the retail space. He added that he thought it was almost poetic that the common roof "looked down on" the penthouse open space. Mr. Toderian moved approval of the recommendations with an amendment to the conditions.

Mr. Judd thought it was a nice solution to this prominent location. Regarding the curb on the lane, he said he thought it was designed to accommodate semi-trailers in making a turn into the lane and would look at having it at a different radius. He noted that the maximum parking spaces for commercial would be seven spaces and thought the number for the project was transit friendly.

Mr. Johnston agreed that it was a great project but wanted it to be energy efficient and was concerned that it could achieve LEED™ Gold without including geothermal. He encouraged the applicant to take into consideration adding urban agriculture as well as programming some of the green space on the roof. He congratulated the applicant on a great project.

## Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE415022, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated November 2, 2010, with the following amendments:

Add Condition 1.6 to read as follows:

*Design development to reduce the massing of the roof top mechanical and elevator overrun where feasible.*

## 3. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

## 4. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM