

Date: Monday, November 1, 2010
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Council Chamber, City Hall

PRESENT:

Board

C. Warren Director of Development Services (Chair)
R. Jenkins Assistant Director - Current Planning Division
J. Dobrovolny Director of Transportation
D. McLellan General Manager of Community Services Group

Advisory Panel

B. Haden Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
S. Chandler Representative of the Development Industry
F. Rafii Representative of the Development Industry
S. Bozorgzadeh Representative of the General Public
C. Chung Representative of the General Public
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

Regrets

M. Woodruff Representative of the Design Professions
H. Hui Representative of the General Public
A. Yan Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

City Staff:

B. Boons Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
P. Storer Engineering Services - Projects Branch
R. Segal Senior Architect/Development Planner
D. Robinson Project Facilitator

1101-1238 SEYMOUR STREET - DE414060 - ZONE DD

S. Chiang Owner - Not present at meeting

745 THURLOW STREET - DE413483 - ZONE CD-1

M. Thompson Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
J. Cordonier Bentall

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of June 28, 2010 and July 12, 2010 was deferred to November 29, 2010 when the regular Board members will be in attendance.

**3. 1101-1238 SEYMOUR STREET - DE414060 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Shih Kuang Chiang

Request: Interior alterations to add 148.0 sq. ft. by converting the enclosed balcony to floor space and expanding the mezzanine in Suite #1101, in the existing Multiple Dwelling/Residential Unit with Artist Studio - Class A building on this site, using a Heritage Density Transfer of 148.0 sq. ft. from donor site at 640 West Pender Street.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

None.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The exiting stairs are located against the wall and will be removed and repositioned to create a bridging element.

Applicant's Comments

None.

Questions/Discussion

None.

Panel Opinion

None.

Board Discussion

None.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. McLellan and seconded by Mr. Dobrovlny and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE414060 in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated November 1, 2010.

**4. 745 THURLOW STREET - DE413483 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership

Request: To construct a 25-storey (24 floors of Office plus Amenity on the 25th floor) Office tower including Retail and Restaurant with 6 levels of underground parking accessed from the lane.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ralph Segal, Senior Architect/Development Planner, introduced the application for a 25-storey office building as part of the Metro Core Jobs Program. Mr. Segal noted that the City was happy to see a full blown office building being developed on the site. The development application followed rezoning approval by Council on July 22, 2008 and was approved in principle for the form of development. A text amendment was approved by Council on October 19, 2010 to add an additional 19,000 square feet of density.

Mr. Segal described the context for the surrounding area noting the height allowance in the zoning as well as the view cone that crosses the site. The view cone restricts the height to 300 feet, however one corner of the building will have a height of 302 feet and will require a relaxation.

The applicant is pursuing LEED™ Gold and the developer is committed to registering the building. Mr. Segal noted that there were a few design issues that still needed to be resolved and noted the Urban Design Panel's comments which were contained in the Staff Committee Report. The Urban Design Panel reviewed the application twice; once at rezoning and then at the development permit stage.

Mr. Segal reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated October 20, 2010. 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 clarification was provided by Mr. Segal:

- There is an amenity space on the roof and a second level of mechanical above that will also contain the elevator core.
- The height is limited by the view cone.
- There was a concern at rezoning with the issue of scale on the south façade of the building as it seemed to loom over Robson Street. Staff now feel that the treatment of that façade has been improved and are not seeking any more resolution.
- The amenity space on the roof will be used by the office workers in the building as a work out space and outdoor lunch area.

Applicant's Comments

Mark Thompson, Architect, said they were happy to work with the conditions in the Staff Committee Report. He noted that they had changed the proportions of the south façade and improved the surface. All the CRU's will have a ground floor as well as a second floor exposure. Regarding the loading, Mr. Thompson noted that Bentall has a large number of buildings in the downtown area and they are aware of what is required to manage the loading

bay. He said he felt that what was recommended will be appropriate for the type of building and there will be someone on site to manage the area. The amenity space will be primarily for the building's tenants. As well it activates the roof with a large outdoor space. Regarding the removal of the existing building, Mr. Thompson noted that it is mostly concrete and will be used for aggregate in the new building. They will be able to control the dust when the building is demolished.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The bike parking in the building is being reviewed with Bentall and some design development still needs to be done in that area.
- Access to the roof top amenity space will be through the service elevator or the stairs.
- Smoking is not permitted in any Bentall building.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Haden noted that the Urban Design Panel had reviewed the application twice and supported it both times. He noted that the conditions in the Staff Committee Report were accurate. He said the Panel supported more job space in the downtown core. Mr. Haden thought there were challenges when designing a skin-dominant building and the Panel had asked the applicant to design a full scale model to make sure there would be no problems once the project was built. Mr. Haden said he would like to have seen a context model with the presentation as there are several large towers adjacent to the site and without one it was harder to evaluate the application. Mr. Haden added that the Panel would support the approval of the application.

Mr. Chandler congratulated Staff and the applicant on a good presentation noting that the site had a lot of history. He thought it was wonderful that the applicant was pursuing LEED™ Gold and thought it was a well designed building. He noted that the ground floor retail had a high degree of transparency and would like to see that go to the third level. Mr. Chandler added that all the issues had been handled by the conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Rafii said he supported the project and the conditions put forth by staff.

Ms. Bozorgzadeh said she would like to have seen a green roof and that the building could be taller and slimmer. She added that she was in support of the project.

Board Discussion

Mr. McLellan noted that the design was very much limited by the view corridor but thought it was an appropriate architectural response. He said he was intrigued by the lighting design on the building. Mr. McLellan said he would be glad to see the existing building demolished and thought the new building would be a substantial improvement to the streetscape in that area.

Mr. Dobrovolny said he was very pleased to see the project moving forward.

Mr. Jenkins supported the recommendations in the Staff Committee Report. He thought the scale and massing was appropriate considering it was driven by the view corridor. He noted

that the floor plate was typical for an office building and would add a different pattern and form to the area. He added that it was a unique response to the site and supported the applicant pursuing LEED™ Gold. Mr. Jenkins added that he thought the building would make a bold statement in terms of the lighting element.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. McLellan and seconded by Mr. Dobrovolny and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE413483 in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated October 20, 2010.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

6. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:45 PM.

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

C. Warren
Chair