

Date: Monday, November 28, 2011
Time: N/A
Place: N/A

PRESENT:

1188 RICHARDS STREET - DE415193 - ZONE DD
Minutes
Motion

400 SW MARINE DRIVE - DE415055 - ZONE I-2
Minutes
Motion

Board

V. Potter Director of Development Services (Chair)
B. Toderian Director of 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
S. Bozorgzadeh Representative of the General Public
J. Miletic-Prelovac Representative of the General Public
P. Sanderson Representative of the General Public

Regrets

M. Biazi Representative of the General Public
K. Maust Representative of the Design Professions
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

1188 RICHARDS STREET - DE415193 - ZONE DD
Not Present

400 SW MARINE DRIVE - DE415055 - ZONE I-2

P. Busby Perkins + Will Architects
R. Bragg Perkins + Will Architects
A. Grant PCI
B. Hemstock PWI Landscape Architects

CLERK TO THE BOARD: L. Harvey

1. Minutes

It was moved by Mr. Johnston seconded by Mr. Toderian and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting of November 14, 2011 with the correction of some minor typographical errors.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 1188 RICHARDS STREET - DE415193 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: HDL Construction Ltd.

Request: Interior alterations to Unit No. 505 by converting the existing 56.0 sq. ft. enclosed balcony to floor space in the existing mixed-use commercial/residential building on this site, thereby requesting an increase in the Floor Space Ratio using a Heritage Density Transfer.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

None.

Questions/Discussion

There were no questions or discussion from the Board or Panel

Applicant's Comments

None.

Questions/Discussion

None.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

None.

Board Discussion

None.

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. DE415193, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated November 28, 2011.

4. **400 SW MARINE DRIVE - DE415055 - ZONE I-2
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Perkins + Will Architects

Request: The development of a mixed use, transit-oriented complex comprising of two residential towers of 26 and 35 storeys with a STIR component, an office tower of 15 storeys, an 11 screen movie theatre, a three storey retail podium and five levels of underground parking, subject to Council's enactment of the CD-1 By-law and approval of the Form of Development. The project also includes the construction of two neighbourhood plazas and a ground oriented pedestrian mews.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, explained that the development permit application is subject to a pending CD-1 Bylaw, along with the form of development approved by Council and is subject to a series of conditions, following a Public Hearing in July of 2011. Ms. Molaro provided the Board and Advisory Panel with some context for the site. She noted that the site is located in the Marpole neighbourhood on the southeast corner of Cambie Street and SW Marine Drive. It is a large site that also contains transit easement for the Canada Line and the bus loop which occupies about one third of the site area. The grade across the site drops about twenty feet from Marine Drive to the bus loop. The Marine Drive Canada Line station straddles the property as well as Cambie Street. Yukon Street is the only side of the site that has vehicle access. The bus loop is served off this frontage as well as all the parking and loading for the development.

To the southeast of the site is the City of Vancouver Waste Transfer station. To the west are low-rise multi-unit residential developments and a Buddhist temple. To the north, on the east side of the intersection is a large site that is currently in a rezoning application. Other existing buildings including marine Gardens a market rental townhouse development

The application has two towers over a 100 foot podium with residential uses of both market and rental housing with four levels of underground parking. Building are organized around a pedestrian "high street" or mews providing access between SW Marine Drive, the Bus loop and the Canada Line Station entry. Along this pedestrian connection will be retail uses including a grocery store, banks and other services. The second floor will include retail uses connected across a pedestrian bridge. The third floor level contains theatre connected across a pedestrian bridge to the office floors. The applicant is proposing LEED™ Gold for the project.

Ms. Molaro gave some background on the development noting the Canada Line Marine Drive Station and Bus Loop. She noted that the reduced Cambie Street right-of-way south of Marine Drive which has resulted in a minimal sidewalk width along the west side of the station. The applicant has included a second entry on the east side of the station at the Marine Drive elevation which can be accessed via a public right-of-way to and from Marine Drive to serve pedestrians accessing the station from the north side of Marine Drive with a further vertical circulation connection to the bus loop.

Ms. Molaro described the circulation attributes of the site noting the passengers are dropped off on the east side of the bus loop with passengers getting on the buses at the west side of the bus loop. Vehicular movement into the site is limited to the Yukon Street frontage. Cyclists currently access the station via on-street dedicated lanes on Cambie Street to the plaza associated with the bus loop.

With respect to the pending CD-1 By-law, Ms. Molaro noted that the proposal complies with the permitted uses and density. The by-law permits a base height of 335 feet with a permitted increase in height to 351 feet to accommodate the roof top mechanical enclosure, subject to impacts such as views, overlook and in this particular case shadowing on public open spaces. Staff have assessed the shadow impacts and are satisfied that the requested discretionary increase is supportable.

Ms. Molaro explained that staff strongly support innovative, bold architecture given the prominence of this transit oriented “gateway entry” site at the city’s edge. While the applicant’s response is well resolved, particularly the office building, staff believe the residential buildings could be further developed to achieve a more distinguished architectural statement.

Other issues identified in the Staff Committee Report include the public open space connections and the public realm interface. There are several areas of concern including the public connection between the mews to and from the Canada Line Station and the vertical connections between the mews and the bus loop. Pedestrian movement through the mews to and from the Canada Line Station concourse level is an important link that also serves transit riders accessing the station from the intersection. This large, covered open space is also intended to function as a public open space that will be activated.

Staff have identified several concerns with the current configuration. One is the legibility of the pedestrian transition between the mews through to the station. There is a concern regarding the pinch point between the larger grand stair and secondary stair up to the second floor retail area. In addition there is a lack of substantial animating uses fronting into this covered public open space. From a CPTED perspective staff would like to see more opportunities for retail activity to animate the covered frontage.

In addition, staff are concerned, as a public gathering space, that there is a minimal amount of open to the sky sitting opportunities with the given configuration combined with the legibility and connectivity of the space. Staff believe there is an opportunity for an increase in daylight attributes to better strengthen the link between the pedestrian mews and this space.

The north end of the Marine Level 01 is an important pedestrian and cyclist environment as one approaches this site. Given the nature of the existing curb line and how the station straddles both the property line and sits within both the property and the street right of way, an interim new curb alignment has been provided to improve the width of the public realm along this frontage.

Staff are recommending further design development to ensure that the retail and bicycle mobility frontage is well integrated, with the station and guideway above,

along with maximizing the amount of retail oriented onto this frontage including minimizing the number of exit doors in this location.

Ms. Molaro noted that Condition 1.7 is a rezoning condition that has not been satisfied and the applicant needs to address the interface between the station at both the concourse and platform levels with the proposed new podium.

The Marine Drive frontage is a substantially long that also has a slope along it. Staff are recommending design development to introduce a finer grain of architectural treatment, noting also that this is a north facing frontage, and are asking the applicant where ever possible to improve opportunities for daylight access. In addition, given the slope, staff want to ensure that the public realm interface is well integrated with the retail entries.

Ms. Molaro stated that the vertical circulation components between the upper pedestrian mews and the bus loop need to be addressed. The proposal has the escalator slotted between retail units, with the elevator offset. In addition the geometry of the main stair and the bus loops, combined with a ventilation shaft needs resolution.

Ms. Molaro summarized the sustainability attributes of the proposal. This site, through its rezoning, is subject to both the rezoning policy for Greener buildings and the rezoning policy for Greener larger sites. Contained within the report are a number of conditions related to these requirements and objectives. Staff have endeavored to identify, within the Sustainability section of the Staff Committee Report the related conditions applicable at the time of Development Permit. Staff also note that some of the outcomes of these sustainable rezoning policies have been secured through conditions of enactment, but that others, in some cases cannot be confirmed at the development permit stage but rather will be assessed and secured through the building permit stage, occupancy stage and post occupancy stages of the development.

Ms. Molaro 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. Molaro:

- The concourse level is at the same elevation as Marine Drive. There is an elevator into the concourse from the bus loop.
- The community wanted a southerly exposed space to gather which became part of the rezoning.
- There are some concerns for long term impacts if the CRU space encroaches on City property. Engineering staff feel there are other ways to animate the space without having to pull retail into the City right-of-way.
- The second floor cantilevers over the ground floor in the office building and there might be some way to modulate the upper floor to achieve more sun access.

- Staff asked for legal arrangements to secure on title that there might be an impact for the residents should the transfer station expand. The City's legal department has said that they can't impose that on the title.
- Staff want Cambie Street to be an important frontage and have asked for design work regarding the exit doors.
- There is to be a green roof treatment but the applicant hasn't proposed urban agriculture on the office building roof.
- There are a number of different ways for wheelchairs and cyclists to get access onto the site including the open space from Marine Drive and an elevator from the bus loop.
- It was a Council condition to increase the tower separation and staff are seeking to optimize that up to 70 feet however the applicant is proposing 61 feet. It is not possible in this location to have a wider separation due to the foot print of the site and how the two towers will sit on the site.
- The theatres are double height.
- There is a challenge with the retail that fronts onto the bus loop as Translink does not want to compete with pedestrians for the retail.
- There is a possibility for an escalator into the mews but it might have an effect on the retail frontage.
- Having a CRU at the bus loop elevation could help to animate that frontage with consideration with appropriate lighting.
- There have been discussions between Engineering Services and the applicant regarding having two crossing at Marine Drive and Cambie Street.

Applicant's Comments

Peter Busby, Architect, described the project using a power point slide show presentation. He noted that it has been a long process between the public, the planning department and interested parties. He added that they have been working on the project for over four years with many meetings and six public open houses. The power point presentation will be included on the website.

Ryan Bragg, Architect, described their concerns with some of the conditions in the Staff Committee Report. He said they were in agreement with Condition 1.1 as they feel the southern face of the development is unlike any other in the City of Vancouver. They are also in agreement with Condition 1.2 as they will be enclosing the cell tower on the upper roof. Mr. Bragg said they were in agreement with Condition 1.3. With Condition 1.4, Mr. Bragg said that they recognize there is a limited amount of space and are trying to do a lot on the south end of the site. He added that they are still working with the Planning Department and have no concerns with the condition as written. He said they were in agreement with Condition 1.5 provided there was no loss of commercial. Mr. Bragg said that Condition 1.6 was perhaps the most complex condition. It was an issue that was brought up with the community, staff and the Urban Design Panel. He said they agree that if they have the ability to increase the retail at Marine Drive and Cambie Street it will animate the street. He said they would continue to work with Engineering Services and Planning. Mr. Busby noted that there are some difficulties with the lease. Mr. Grant added that there is \$750,000 available to expand the sidewalk and bike lane along Cambie Street with additional retail space. Mr. Bragg explained that in its current scenario that retail would terminate under the guideway and they are trying to improve that relationship. Mr. Bragg said they had no concerns with Condition 1.7 and are working with Translink and Planning to use the space for a piece of public art. He also said they had no concerns with

Condition 1.8 as long as there isn't any loss of retail. The applicant team also accepts Condition 1.9. Mr. Bragg said they thought Condition 1.10 didn't pose a problem as written but noted that there were a number of ways to address the issue including adding an escalator into the mews. The applicant team accepted Condition 1.11 however Mr. Busby noted that the fitness centre is on the bus loop level and will have the longest operating hours of any of the retail. He added that the underside of the overhang will be lit. Mr. Grant added that the use above that area will be a grocery store. Mr. Bragg said they object to Condition 1.12 noting that they have worked to enhance the public realm on the south side of the site. They have moved the access from the mobility centre to the station by another 60 feet and if they were to provide a second form of entry it would make for a very long corridor with safety and security issues. He added that there would also be a loss of retail in that space. Mr. Bragg said they were willing to work with staff to see if a second means of access could be added within the mobility centre. Mr. Grant noted that one of the features of the Mobility Centre is that it is as manned all the time as there will storage as well as changing rooms available to cyclists. The applicant team would like to explore another option.

Mr. Bragg noted that Condition B.2.6 in Appendix B lists square footage for the amenity space. There are two amenity spaces planned for the development and have their own separate air space parcel. Mr. Bragg said they would like to change the wording to recognize that there are two amenity spaces being provided with separate management costs and ownership.

Mr. Bragg said they applicant team did not have any issues with Appendix C.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The applicant has developed a landscape plan which doesn't include public agriculture on the office building and is not practical to have residents or others using the space.
- This is not a phased development and will be built concurrently.
- The applicant said they were happy to continue working with staff to activate the frontage along Cambie Street.
- The applicant has done as much as they can to increase the store frontage on both sides of the core. They would like to have been able to provide a larger south plaza.
- The applicant continues design development and detailing of the residential and office towers.

Comments from other Speakers

Janet Fraser is a member of the Marpole Area Resident's Association (MARA) and brought a power point presentation. She stated that they did a survey to ask what the community wants to see in the neighbourhood. There is some concern regarding the height and density as they want a vibrant walkable neighbourhood. She said they appreciated that the applicant team and City staff have worked hard to address their concerns. However she said that the public realm issues have not been resolved especially on the east side of Cambie Street. They would also like to see some improvements on the blank concrete wall. As well the pedestrian circulation at the

south end of the site is still unresolved and as well on the north east along Cambie Street. Ms. Fraser added that the development will make a profound change in the neighbourhood and they want a good outcome.

Jo-Ann Pringle is also a member of the Marpole Area Resident's Association. She asked that the City implement traffic calming especially along SW Marine Drive and Yukon and Cambie Streets during the construction phase. She described the number of accidents at the intersection. She noted that since the Canada Line opened there are more people crossing at Ash Street which doesn't have a light. As well there are more people crossing at Yukon Street which does have a light.

Don Bartel who is also a member of the Marpole Area Resident's Association talked about pedestrian safety at the SW Marine Drive and Cambie Street intersection. He noted that this intersection has the highest number of injuries in Marpole. There were two main points that came from the survey including having a direct route to the station that is also safe and that the signal timing needs to be made longer. Mr. Bartel mentioned that the supporting columns for the Canada Line impede vision for north bound drivers which can be a hazard for pedestrians in the cross walk. He proposed that north bound right turns be prohibited to reduce conflicts with pedestrians and cyclists. He added that they would like to see an improvement in the public realm with more space and removal of the current traffic bulge for more sidewalk and cycling lane space.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The Marpole Area Resident's Association have been actively engaged in suggesting improvements all through the rezoning phase.
- The Marpole Area Resident's Association have made suggestions for traffic calming but feel they are not qualified to say what would be the best method to use.
- Engineering Services intends to do a review of the intersection.
- The Marpole Area Resident's Association would like to have the traffic calming measures in place before construction begins.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Romses said the Urban Design Panel supported the project noting that there had been some design issues at the beginning. However, the Panel thought that the applicant had done a fine job in addressing the Panel's concerns. Mr. Romses said that they were happy to see the applicant's willingness to find solutions and they often brought back better solutions to the Panel. He added that the Panel has full confidence in the applicant's ability to produce a high quality project. Mr. Romses said that as the project carries forward he hoped the creativity would not be lost as there is a lot of importance for the residential tower to anchor this urban village. Mr. Romses added that he has full confidence in the applicant team will improve the project and that the detailing and expression will make a fantastic building.

Mr. Rafii complimented the applicant and staff for bringing the project through a complex process. He recommended to minor changes to the condition: change

Condition 1.6 to achieve acceptable resolution for staff and the applicant and to make Condition 1.12 a consideration item.

Mr. Stovell thought it was a complicated project and commended everyone for the work involved. He said he supported the conditions in the Staff Committee Report expect for Condition 1.6. He said he thought it was really important to get retail on the corner. Also he thought Condition 1.1 was very important and was glad to hear from the applicant that there is more than one good idea and would work with staff.

Mr. Sanderson said he thought it was an exciting project and took full advantage of the transportation facilities in the area. This is the first venture into the new plans for the Cambie Corridor and that the office space is a critical component of the project. He thought that MARA had pointed out the vehicular and cyclists issues and trusted they would be resolved.

Ms. Miletic-Prelovac said she hoped the applicant would be able to design the south public plaza with the same attention to detail as the north plaza. She said she was glad to hear the applicant is willing to work to achieve the best possible outcome for the project. Ms. Miletic-Prelovac added that she was in full support of the project.

Ms. Bozorgzadeh said she supported the project and thought the applicant had done a beautiful job with their presentation. She added that she hoped there was ongoing work to make sure the public has a safe crossing on Marine Drive.

Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian moved the motion and made several amendments to the conditions in the Staff Committee Report. He noted that it has gone from a large and complex exercise with some fundamental issues from land use to issues of transit oriented development, to a design with a handful of details to address - quite an achievement. He acknowledged MARA for all their work and stated that he thought the project had gotten better because of all of their work. He also thanked the applicant team and PCI as well as staff for a good job of listening through the process and unproving the design based on the listening. Mr. Toderian said he is confident that when the conditions are satisfied it will be a statement piece of architecture, something that is worthy of its placement in the urban pattern as both a "hello and goodbye" to the city. He stated that he has advised the applicant team that substantial moves don't need to be made to the building floor plate and basic building program and that there can be improvements with the skin, materials and the expression that will achieve an exceptional architectural statement.

Mr. Toderian said that he was satisfied with the southern portion open space stands because he believed the requests being made by staff give it a better chance of success. He said he was hopeful that there wouldn't be a loss of retail space but thought it was more important that the public space have all the advantages possible. Mr. Toderian said he agreed that a solution should be found to make the retail and bicycle mobility centre frontage work. Regarding the frontage along Marine Drive, Mr. Toderian said he was in agreement with the applicant in that there shouldn't be a reduction in CRU space and that he would like to see a way to creatively increase daylight access.

Mr. Toderian said good points were made all around on the issue of connecting the bicycle mobility centre to the open space but he thought there were other answers that could address the situation to make it work.

Mr. Toderian said he was concerned of the issue of potential resident complaints to an inevitable expansion of industrial and possibly waste management uses in the area. Although the Law Department had advised that a charge can't be put on title regarding this matter, he was not convinced that there wasn't a creative solution. He added that he would like the minutes of this Development Permit Board meeting again make it clear that the intention has always been that these industrial and other uses be expanded at some point in the future.

With regard to the comments from MARA, which were very detailed and comprehensive, Mr. Toderian noted that the majority of those points are probably issues for the City to tackle, as opposed to the applicant. If they were raised in the context of the original rezoning then that was an opportunity to attach them to the developer and they would have been factored in as part of the CAC calculation at the rezoning stage. But since that didn't happen, he said he didn't see it as appropriate to connect such requirements to this particular development but thought Engineering Services would take these concerns under consideration. He added that staff needs to take a creative look at the intersection of Marine Drive and Cambie Street. This is probably one of those intersections where the City's priorities aren't reflected and it does feel more like an auto dominated intersection than a pedestrian friendly intersection. Given the amount of people going into the area, he thought some broader thinking could be done in the context of traffic calming and other ways to pedestrianize that intersection, regarding public safety and pedestrian safety at the intersection.

Mr. Judd commended the applicant for a clearly transit orientated development. He noted that something that wasn't mention was parking. The applicant has made a real effort to reflect the transit oriented nature of the development where there is a maximum on the parking. The energy system is very innovated and has the potential for other developments in the area. The provision of the mobility centre is great. Mr. Judd acknowledged MARA for their comments. He added that the development is a significant change to the community. It is important that staff take a hard look at the implications. He said he was aware of the short cutting down by drivers during the Canada Line construction and will look at ways to mitigate issues during construction. There is provision through the rezoning process for some funding for traffic calming and other intersection changes that were anticipated. Mr. Judd added that he would have Transportation staff look at the area and involve MARA in the discussion.

Mr. Johnston said he thought it was a great project that is achieving so many of the City's urban objectives. Many of the green features including minimizing parking and being a transit oriented development, energy efficiency, LEED™ certification at Gold level is very impressive. He commended the applicant for the work they have done on the project. Mr. Johnston suggested an additional condition (Condition 1.14) to the Staff Committee Report and Mr. Toderian and Mr. Judd accepted the additional condition.

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. DE4151055, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated November 2, 2010, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.5 to read as follows: design development to southern portion of Level 01 - Marine to **adjust** the amount of uncovered open space to strengthen and emphasize this area's role as a public gathering space between the pedestrian mews and the station's concourse-level transit entry;

Note to Applicant: Design development should consider extending the curved pedestrian movement of the mews, more directly, as a component of the uncovered open space. **Loss of CRU space should be unnecessary.**

Amend Condition 1.6 to read as follows: design development to the Cambie Street retail and bicycle mobility centre frontage to achieve an active public realm interface combined with a well-integrated building with the station and guideway that **achieves an effective** amount of retail frontage oriented to this important frontage, **with prominent access to the Bicycle Mobility Centre, and public use of the space** (see also Engineering Condition A.2.1);

Amend Condition 1.8 by deleting **“to improve daylight access along this frontage”** at the end of the paragraph to read:
Design development to the public realm interface of the Marine Drive retail frontage to achieve a higher quality, finer grain of architectural treatment including careful articulation and modulation of the cantilevered second floor;

Amend the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.8 to read as follows: **Note to applicant:** Given the northerly orientation of this frontage and to further maximize daylight access, continuous weather protection along this façade should incorporate clear glazing. **Improvements for daylight access would be desirable. Loss of CRU space should be unnecessary.**

Amend the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.10 to read as follows: **Note to Applicant: Flexibility in the addressing of this issue is encouraged.** Integration of the various orientations and geometries of these components should emphasize the visual connection and pedestrian experience between these two levels. To improve legibility the escalator location should be consolidated with the elevator and/or stairs. CPTED principles should also be applied to maximize the visual connections between the two levels and circulation components. Blank

walls of the stair edge should be avoided. In addition, the location of the parkade vent should be relocated to an alternate, perhaps vertical location.

In the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.11 change 4.5 to 4.15 meters.

Amend Condition 1.12 to read as follows: design development to expand and connect the bicycle mobility centre to provide a direct entry oriented into open space provided at the southern portion of Level 01 - Marine, *or an alternative approach suitable from a connectivity, CPTED, retail continuity and design perceptive.* (Note: this amendment was moved by Mr. Johnston and seconded by Mr. Toderian).

Add a new Condition 1.13 to read as follows: *That continued consideration be given prior to the issuance of the Development Permit regarding advisories or alternative approaches to initial and future residents about the anticipated retention and expansion of industrial and waste management uses in proximity to the residential housing.*

Add a new Condition 1.14 to read as follows: *That continued consideration be given to community or office user gardens on the roof areas of the commercial office building. (This condition was moved by Mr. Johnston and seconded by Mr. Toderian)*

Amend Condition A.2.1 to read as follows: indicate that all portions of the CRUs and entranceways in the area under the Canada Line Station and Guideway *should be* contained within the private property, *unless otherwise supported by the City Engineer and the Director of Planning relative to Condition 1.6;*

Amend Condition B.2.6 by removing "of 5,382 ft.2,"

5. OTHER BUSINESS

The Advisory Panel members were informed that they need to reapply if they wish to continue on as Panel members for the Board.

6. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:05 PM.