

Date: Monday, September 27, 2004
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

T. Timm Deputy City Engineer (Chair)
L. Beasley Co-Director of Planning
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager
I. Adam Assistant City Engineer

Advisory Panel

M. Ostry Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
E. Mah Representative of the Development Industry
K. McNaney Representative of the General Public
G. Chung Representative of the General Public

Regrets

J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions (Conflict of Interest)
J. McLean Representative of the Development Industry
D. Chung Representative of the General Public
C. Henschel Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

J. Barrett Development Planner
V. Potter Project Facilitator
M. Thomson City Surveyor

900 Pacific Boulevard - Building A

W. Francl Walter Francl Architect
D. Negrin Concord Pacific Group

900 Pacific Boulevard - Buildings B and D

B. Haden Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden Architects
D. Negrin Concord Pacific Group

900 Pacific Boulevard - Building C

J. Hancock Hancock Bruckner Eng & Wright
D. Negrin Concord Pacific Group

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

1. MINUTES

The following amendments were noted:

- p.18: the amendment to the Note to Applicant in 1.5, to change "use" to *users*;
- p.18: the amendment to 1.6 should retain *along with necessary*;

It was moved by Mr. Beasley, seconded by Mr. MacGregor, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of ~~September 21, 2004~~ *September 13, 2004* be approved as amended.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 900 PACIFIC BOULEVARD - BUILDING 6A - DE408503 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Walter Francl Architect Inc.

Request: To construct a 15-storey residential tower containing 86 dwelling units, including 10 two-storey townhouses with three levels of parking containing 124 parking spaces.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Jonathan Barrett, Development Planner, presented this application in the new Coopers' Neighbourhood. Council approved the form of development for the six buildings in the neighbourhood in May 2004. The forms were fairly precisely determined at that time, taking into account view cones that limit height across the site, and the existing park which resulted in a very specific site configuration. The form of development proposed in this development application is as was presented at the Public Hearing. Three design conditions of rezoning related to the whole neighbourhood: (1) the design of the new public realm; (2) the redesign of the park, and (3) an extension of the design under the Cambie Bridge. These items are beyond the scope of the Development Permit Board in consideration of the subject application and are noted for information only.

The proposal is for a 15-storey tower containing 86 units, including townhouses around the base. The illustration of the design at the rezoning stage was for 14 storeys. Following a review of the height, including a reduction in floor-to-floor dimensions, the application now proposes 15 storeys although it remains within the height approved at the rezoning. Referring to the Staff Committee Report dated September 1, 2004, Mr. Barrett described the two minor design conditions recommended, calling for design development to the mechanical penthouse form and colour, and removal of the 'Concord Pacific Place' sign. Mr. Barrett tabled a third condition relating to the creation of proper outside front door arrangements to all park facing townhouses. A correction to p.4 of the report was also noted, whereby the total floor area to date for the whole neighbourhood should be 57 247 m².

The design fully achieves the design intent established for the neighbourhood at the rezoning stage. It meets the challenges of a tight site. It makes a very important statement beside the bridge and also responds very well to its immediate context. The recommendation is for approval, subject to the conditions contained in the report.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley noted that Council set a condition for further design development to ensure the row house treatment is carried around the base of all the buildings in this neighbourhood in order to help achieve domesticity and safety and security, etc. Mr. Barrett confirmed that this is addressed in the new condition 1.3.

Mr. MacGregor raised a question about acoustics, in particular with respect to noise from the Plaza of Nations and BC Place Stadium. He stressed that it should be identified in all the applications for this neighbourhood that this is an active zone and should be taken in account in the design.

With respect to Standard Note B.1.6, Mr. MacGregor suggested an amendment to make it in accordance with approval of this application, noting that Council policy with respect to sustainability is currently in flux. Mr. Barrett advised that sustainability measures for this neighbourhood have been carefully negotiated with the developer and there is full agreement about what it expected to be achieved. Mr. Beasley said he believes the intent is that the Director of Planning ensures the documentation is in order, not to judge it.

In response to a question from Mr. Timm about LEED certification, Vicki Potter, Project Facilitator, advised it was determined that going through the formal LEED process was not desirable. Rather, a LEED-type checklist has been developed, on the understanding that LEED certification would not be sought but would be monitored by the City in this case. The rezoning required sustainability measures, with no reference to LEED. Mr. Beasley suggested there is need for tolerance on this issue and to work with each application because a sustainability policy document is still in preparation. This policy is expected to address both discretionary zoning applications and rezoning applications.

Mr. MacGregor sought assurance that the entire neighbourhood meets the by-law requirements for total square footage and number of units. Mr. Barrett explained there is a maximum density for the whole area. In addition to the subject application and Buildings 6B & D and Building C which are also being considered today, there are two other sites under the same CD-1: a non-market residential building and a townhouse development, applications for which have not yet been submitted. Mr. Barrett confirmed the total square footage and number of units meets the target for the neighbourhood.

Applicant's Comments

David Negrin, Concord Pacific Group, said they intend to work with the City on the treatment of the townhouses, on this and the two concurrent applications. He noted they have also spent a great deal of time dealing with sustainability. He said they believe it was a very successful rezoning, with good cooperation between the Park Board and the City, and it will be a first class project.

Walter Francl, Architect, added that he has worked very successfully with the City on this project. He noted they have already begun revising the top penthouse unit in response to a recommendation from the Urban Design Panel. Colours will also be modified to differentiate the building from neighbouring towers. He confirmed they will meet all the guidelines and

CPTED requirements for the site and will comply with the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. MacGregor questioned the requirement for heated floors for the parking ramp (condition A.2.4). Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, advised this has been a requirement on other applications and it comes from the Parking and Loading Design Guidelines for slopes greater than 10 percent.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, Mr. Negrin confirmed they have no concerns about condition 1.3.

Mr. Negrin also requested a condition allow them to continue working with the City on revisions to the penthouse. The revisions will add some density, but they will remain within the rezoning requirements. Mr. Barrett advised the applicant wishes to refine the rooftop mechanical by concealing it partly with some residential use, adding about 900 sq.ft. If this occurs, the building will be 16 rather than 15 storeys. It will still not exceed the maximum height permitted in the zoning although will require a full technical review to ensure it meets the requirements for FSR and parking. Mr. Beasley said he believes this change should be incorporated into the conditions if the Board considers it is an integral part of solving a condition already applied. Given the buildings in this neighbourhood are far removed from other residential sites it might be the most efficient method of dealing with the issue, rather than requiring a Minor Amendment. Mr. Thomson said he believed the area of concern for the Staff Committee would be whether the revision would have elicited negative response to notification if it had been part of the original application, noting the rezoning dealt with a 14-storey building. Mr. Adam said he found it to be a very unusual approach but agreed that if it remains within the height requirement and receives the proper review from staff it might be pursued in this way.

Mr. Ostry sought clarification from the architect as to how he might address condition 1.3. Mr. Francl said they would enlarge the front doors as much as possible, providing adequate rain cover, and ensure they are not perceived as patio doors but have the appearance and formality of front doors. Mr. Beasley said he would be seeking more than this, noting the units now have front doors entering into kitchens and dining rooms. The intent of Council was that these be proper townhouses having a front door function and expression on the outside of the building. This will require some reorganization of the unit layouts. The applicant team confirmed they would make it work.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Ostry advised this project was very well received by the Urban Design Panel and it was unanimously supported. The only concern was the sign at the top of the building which the Panel found totally inappropriate. Mr. Ostry noted the response of the Panel to the way the building comes to the ground might be contrary to the proposed new condition 1.3. The Panel found the scheme as proposed to be very successfully handled and found it a refreshing departure from other Concord Pacific developments. There are some fundamental differences in the way the units relate to their outdoor space because they are buildings in a park. The Panel endorsed the current design and would not wish to see it conform entirely to the type that Concord has developed in the past. Mr. Ostry noted this would require a unique response from the architect in response to condition 1.3. With respect to acoustics, Mr. Ostry advised

the Panel has indicated that some projects may deserve development permit conditions that require purchasers to acknowledge in writing that they are aware of the types of neighbouring activities, in this case the Plaza of Nations and BC Place Stadium. He recommended that such a condition be included in this application.

Mr. Mah supported the application, including amendment to 1.1 to allow the addition of the extra residential square footage. He did not support requiring noise disclosure.

Mr. McNaney supported condition 1.3 because there is a need to add the human touch to this neighbourhood given it may be isolated for some time. He also supported the amendment to 1.1 to allow the residential use to come up around the mechanical roof. Mr. McNaney concurred with Mr. Ostry's comments with respect to noise. He recommended approval of the application.

Ms. Chung also supported adding a condition dealing with noise. She said she appreciated the inclusion of conditions dealing with crime and safety in the area. She recommended approval of the application and said it will be a good addition to the neighbourhood.

Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor said the City has in the past tried to deal with noise complaints by adding a covenant on title but it was not successful. He noted the difficulty of keeping subsequent purchasers informed.

Mr. Beasley said he agreed with the Urban Design Panel that this is a very well realised building. However, he did not agree with the Panel's commentary about the townhouses, noting that Council has clearly indicated it wishes to achieve a townhouse arrangement all around the bases of the buildings in this neighbourhood. This was partly in response to a concern about the condition where units interface directly with the park rather than a street. As well, there was a concern because this neighbourhood will be quite isolated to start with and needs to have as much activity and safety on the street as possible. Mr. Beasley said he therefore strongly supported the addition of condition 1.3. Mr. Beasley agreed with Mr. MacGregor that it is not effective to add a condition about noise but suggested it would be prudent for the developer to provide clear information to purchasers so that there is no confusion. Outdoor events at the Plaza of Nations are extremely loud and incoming residents will need to tolerate it from time to time, noting this is one of the few venues in the city for outdoor events. He urged that Concord Pacific take steps to ensure that purchasers are informed. Commenting on the amendment to 1.1, Mr. Beasley added that if there were neighbours close to this project he would be much more conservative in his approach. No meaningful public purpose would be served by requiring a Minor Amendment when it is an extension of a solution recommended by the Urban Design Panel for refining the top of the building.

Mr. Timm reiterated that staff should ensure that any additional floor space does not impact on the ability to achieve the non-market housing floor space and the other units required in the zoning.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. MacGregor and seconded by Mr. Beasley, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 408503, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated September 1, 2004, with the following amendments:

~~Amend the approval preamble to add, after "15-storey": **or 16-storey**;~~
Amend all references in the conditions to change "15-storey" to **15 or 16-storey**;

Amend 1.1 to read:

design development to the mechanical penthouse form and colour, and consideration to adding residential space to the mechanical penthouse level;

Note to Applicant: Technical review will be required to ensure additional residential space is consistent with other requirements.

Add 1.3:

design development to create a proper outside front door arrangement to all park-facing townhouses to improve the residential quality and function of the units;

Note to Applicant: This will require changes to the internal dwelling unit layouts.

Amend B.1.6 to delete "to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning" and replace with: *for review by the Director of Planning in accordance with the requirements of this application.*

**4. 900 PACIFIC BOULEVARD - BUILDING B & D - DE408563 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden Architects

Request: To construct two 24-storey residential towers containing 223 dwelling units (building B has 111 dwelling units including 6 townhouses, building D has 112 dwelling units with 7 townhouses) with two levels of parking containing 405 parking spaces.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Jonathan Barrett, Development Planner, presented this application in the new Cooper's Neighbourhood. The form of development for the six buildings in the neighbourhood was approved by Council in May 2004. The forms were fairly precisely determined at that time, taking into account two view cones which limit height across the site, and the existing park which resulted in a very specific site configuration. The form of development proposed in this development application is as was presented at the Public Hearing. Three design conditions of rezoning related to the whole neighbourhood: (1) the design of the new public realm; (2) the redesign of the park, and (3) an extension of the design under the Cambie Bridge. These items are beyond the scope of the Development Permit Board in consideration of the subject application and are noted for information only.

The application proposes two buildings on a continuous site with a 12 ft. right-of-way connection to the park. One minor change to the height has occurred since the rezoning and the buildings are now 24 storeys. The CD-1 zoning requirement on height is still met.

Mr. Barrett briefly reviewed the four conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report dated September 1, 2004. He also tabled an additional condition 1.4 dealing with the treatment of the front door expression of the townhouses. A correction to p.4 of the report was also noted, whereby the total floor area to date for the whole neighbourhood should be 57 247 m².

The application fully meets the intent established at the rezoning and meets the challenges of a tight site and the view cone. The overall architectural character responds well, other than the few concerns addressed in the conditions. The Staff Committee recommendation is for approval.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley questioned whether this application proposes to add square footage onto the roof element. Mr. Barrett advised a proposed revision adds about 1,500 sq.ft. He noted there is no impact on views and shadowing.

Applicant's Comments

David Negrin, Concord Pacific Group, said they agree with the recommended conditions. With respect to the family units, he noted there are fewer units in the neighbourhood than originally specified in the zoning but they meet the requirement for family housing units. With respect to the additional square footage at the top of the building, Mr. Negrin explained they are trying to enhance the appearance of the penthouses with as little impact as possible on the neighbourhood. He added they believe it is a considerable improvement over the original design. Mr. Negrin confirmed they would meet the floor area requirements of the zoning for the whole neighbourhood.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley noted a design condition of Council at the rezoning was to provide townhouses around the base of all the market residential buildings. On the street-facing townhouses on the subject two buildings there is little or no townhouse expression. Mr. Beasley said that while he agreed with the architectural merit of the proposal, it does not follow Council's instructions, and he suggested an amendment to condition 1.2 to consider extending the townhouse frontage around the project, where practical. Mr. Negrin agreed this is acceptable. He stressed this is a different neighbourhood. He said he agreed with the Urban Design Panel in this regard and said they want to enhance it and make it work as part of the design. He said he was confident the goals of the City could be achieved for this neighbourhood.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Ostry advised the project was unanimously supported by the Urban Design Panel. The Panel found the townhouses particularly interesting and unusual. Mr. Ostry said the challenge is for the architect to respect Council's policies with regard to the architectural elements that define townhouses. Nevertheless, he strongly suggested the spirit of the design be adhered to in refining the scheme. Mr. Ostry supported the conditions and recommended approval. He also thought acoustic issues should be addressed by a condition on the permit so that purchasers are informed of the noise conditions in the area. He said there would undoubtedly be noise complaints in the future and the City should have some protection by way of a covenant on title, noting the importance of the Plaza of Nations as one of the very few venues in the city where outdoor events can take place.

Mr. Mah recommended approval, including the additional square footage at the top.

Mr. McNaney also supported the application and concurred with the condition for design development to the townhouses for a more human feel.

Ms. Chung thought it would be a great addition to the neighbourhood. She agreed with the Urban Design Panel that there should be some explicit documentation to notify purchasers of the noise situation in the area. She recommended approval of the application.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley said it is a very well conceived project. He said he believed the design development conditions would achieve both great architecture and the kind of domesticity needed at the street level.

Mr. Adam agreed these buildings will be a valuable addition to the city and the recommended conditions and revisions will bring them further into line with the City's expectations. He added, he had some concern about making changes to the design at this late stage although acknowledged this is a somewhat unique situation, no neighbours are immediately affected and the changes are accommodated within the zoning.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Beasley and seconded by Mr. Adam, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 408563, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated September 1, 2004, with the following amendments:

Amend the approval preamble to add, after "24-storey": ~~or 25-storey;~~
Amend all references in the conditions to change "24-storey" to 24- ~~or 25-storey;~~

Amend condition 1.2 to read:

design development to Building B and D to generally strengthen the form and individual character of the townhouses and to consider extending the townhouse frontage as far as practical, and to provide a patio to townhouse D 01 with associated steps up from the public realm, to improve livability and the residential character of the Smithe Street extension;

Add 1.4:

design development to create a proper outside front door arrangement to all ~~park-facing~~ townhouses to improve the residential quality and function of the units;

Note to Applicant: This will require changes to the internal dwelling unit layouts.

Add 1.5:

design development to the form of the mechanical penthouses of Buildings B and D which may include usable residential square footage;

Note to Applicant: Technical review will be required to ensure additional residential space is consistent with other requirements.

Amend B.1.6 to delete "to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning" and replace with: *for review by the Director of Planning in accordance with the requirements of this application.*

5. 900 PACIFIC BOULEVARD - BUILDING C - DE408515 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Hancock Bruckner Eng & Wright

Request: To construct a 30-storey residential tower, with 6-storey and 10-storey lower built forms, containing 219 dwelling units, including 6 townhouses, and with two levels of parking containing 300 parking spaces.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Jonathan Barrett, Development Planner, presented this application for Building C in the new Cooper's Neighbourhood. Council approved the form of development for the six buildings in the neighbourhood in May 2004. The forms were fairly precisely determined at that time, taking into account two view cones which limit height across the site, and the existing park which resulted in a very specific site configuration. The form of development proposed in this development application is as was presented at the Public Hearing. Three design conditions of rezoning related to the whole neighbourhood: (1) the design of the new public realm; (2) the redesign of the park, and (3) an extension of the design under the Cambie Bridge. These items are beyond the scope of the Development Permit Board in consideration of the subject application and are noted for information only.

The application proposes a major tower with a significant piece of built form facing Pacific Boulevard, with a 6-storey form and a 10-storey form next to the seawall. Changes since the rezoning include the addition of one storey to the two higher forms. It still meets the height limit specified in the CD-1 zoning. Mr. Barrett briefly reviewed the eight recommended design conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report dated September 1, 2004. He also tabled an additional condition 1.7 dealing with the treatment of the front door expression of the townhouses. A correction to p.4 of the report was also noted, whereby the total floor area to date for the whole neighbourhood should be 57 247 m².

With the refinements called for in the conditions, staff believe the application will fully meet the design intent of the rezoning. The recommendation is for approval.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley noted the Urban Design Panel had serious concern about the adequacy of the pedestrian underpass and suggested it should be much higher than shown. He questioned why this issue was not addressed in the conditions. Mr. Barrett said this issue was considered very seriously but the conclusion was that extending it above the lobby level would encroach into the residential floors with a resulting loss of density. He added, however, that new information indicates the 10-storey tower is set back from the sea wall further than it needs to be so there may be other opportunities to relocate some density elsewhere in the project.

Mr. Beasley noted a condition of the rezoning called for the amenity areas to be designed to maintain the residential quality, animation and visual interest of the neighbourhood streets and pedestrian routes. However, the amenity area in this application takes up a complete façade on Pacific Boulevard. Mr. Barrett said condition 1.3 calls for design development to achieve a better rhythm and a more transparent character to this façade. The proposed location for the

amenity space was anticipated at the rezoning stage. This particular amenity will serve all the buildings in this neighbourhood.

Applicant's Comments

David Negrin, Concord Pacific Group, said they accept the recommended conditions. He noted the Urban Design Panel's strongest comment related to the rooftop design, and in this respect they propose to add residential floor area to partially conceal the mechanical equipment. With respect to the front low tower (10 - 11-storey form), Mr. Negrin advised they discovered the setback is inaccurate by 15 ft. because they were inadvertently working to an old seawall plan. They therefore propose to bring the front tower out 15 ft., noting it will still meet all the requirements of the zoning. He apologized for the error which he said was identified only after the Urban Design Panel review of the project. He noted they have now created a prow on the front building which they believe is a good response to comments from the Panel.

Jim Hancock, Architect, briefly described the design of the 10-storey building, adding a prow and considerably more glass which will make it a more interesting form. With respect to the height of the underpass, Mr. Hancock noted it is a two-storey space which is quite generous. He noted the townhouses are true townhouses with front door entries and they are through units with a front and back yard. The top two floors of the 6-storey component, which are lofts, are also through units and there is access to patios from the top units. With respect to the amenity, Mr. Hancock said they could meet the condition. They believe its location is a given at this stage and they would like to work on improvements at a detail level.

Mr. Negrin added he now believes they can consider increasing the height of the underpass.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Barrett raised a concern about the proposed redesign of the lower tower and the resulting scale relationship to pedestrians on the seawall. He confirmed the building fully meets the setback requirements. In discussion, Mr. Beasley said the urban design premise we often work toward is to establish a lower level massing at a human scale, with the higher level massing set back from it, whereas the proposed massing will come right down to grade. He said he shared Mr. Barrett's concern and suggested that in design development there should be a way to articulate the lower area to create a scale identifier at a human scale, noting this is one of the most important pedestrian spaces in the city.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Ostry advised the Urban Design Panel supported this application. With respect to the underpass, the Panel thought it should be higher to improve the public connection and increase its legibility as an extension of the street. He recommended strengthening condition 1.2 in this respect to require some additional height, noting it potentially would be an important thoroughfare once the land to the east is developed. Regarding the expression of the amenity building, the Panel also thought it could be improved. With respect to the 10-storey building, Mr. Ostry said he did not believe the additions and changes would result in a negative impact on the walkway or the building itself. He noted, however, that some Panel members suggested that the addition of elements at the lower level to relate to the pedestrian scale would be appropriate. Mr. Ostry stressed that this project will be the most affected by noise from the Plaza of Nations and BC Place Stadium. He reiterated his previous comments on the concurrent applications, that there will undoubtedly be noise complaints in the future and the City should have some protection by way of a covenant on title, noting the importance of the Plaza of

Nations as one of the very few venues in the city where outdoor events can take place. He recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Mah supported the suggested changes to the 10-storey building. He thought the proposed height of the underpass was acceptable but noted that an additional storey or more would considerably open it up. Mr. Mah had some concerns about the amenity space facing the street but noted there seems to be little alternative. He recommended approval of the application.

Mr. McNaney said the underpass could be enlarged and made more interesting; it currently does not seem like a public place. He had some concern about the amenity building and the amount of dead space on the street. He said it needs a lot more work to enliven it and make it feel interesting and safe on the street. He found the 10-storey building visually interesting but concurred with the Development Planner's concern that it could be overbearing on the seawall. Otherwise, he said it is a great project on a difficult site. He recommended approval.

Ms. Chung agreed with the Panel's comments and recommended approval.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley said this project is providing a good transition between this neighbourhood and the noisy area further to the east. While the amenity building location was agreed to at the rezoning stage, Mr. Beasley said he thought it was unfortunate because it creates another block of dead frontage on what is proving to be a very difficult street to tame. Mr. Beasley said he believes the row houses in this project are the best in the neighbourhood, with the exception of the base of the 10-storey element which needs a stronger front door expression. He commented that the 10-storey form is somewhat of an anomaly in the project and he thought it could be a little more sculptural. However, there does need to be a very careful scale identifier along the water frontage because the building should not be oppressive to the walkway.

Mr. MacGregor said he supported the project, including the location of the amenity space on Pacific Boulevard. He suggested an amendment to 1.4 to include recognition that additional square footage may be required. Mr. MacGregor said he supported the proposed redesign of the 10-storey tower and would not wish it to be changed substantially. He did not believe it would be imposing on the walkway. He had some concern that Mr. Beasley's motion to amend the Note to Applicant in condition 1.4 would result in a major change in the design as proposed. Mr. Beasley concurred the emerging design is very interesting. However, his concern relates to the base of the building. He was confident that a way to soften its impact could be achieved. In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor, Mr. Hancock said he understood the philosophical approach to creating scale. He thought this project provided an opportunity to do something different.

Mr. Adam agreed with the recommendation to add a scale identifier on the 10-storey building, without taking away from the design of the building. He added, the building also acts as a gateway from the park into a very active area, and for this reason it deserves different treatment. Mr. Adam said he was uncomfortable with the pedestrian underpass as proposed. He noted that in most other examples they tend to be dark and unattractive spaces. He also suggested it would be perceived as a private connection.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Beasley and seconded by Mr. Adam, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 408515 in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated September 1, 2004, with the following amendments:

Amend all references in the conditions to change 30-storey and 10-storey to *30-storey or 31-storey* and *10-storey or 11-storey*;

Amend 1.2 to add, after "underpass", *and to increase its height by at least one storey*;

Amend 1.4 to add, *recognizing this may require additional square footage*;

Amend the Note to Applicant in 1.4 to add, after "False Creek", *and insinuation of a scale identifier along the waterfront*;

Add 1.7:

design development to create a proper outside front door arrangement to all townhouses, particularly for the 10-storey or 11-storey tower, to improve the residential quality and function of the units;

Note to Applicant: This will require changes to the internal dwelling units;

Add 1.8:

design development of the form of the mechanical penthouses of the two buildings, which may include usable residential square footage;

Note to Applicant: A technical review will be required to ensure additional residential floor space is consistent with other requirements.

Add 1.9:

provide a pedestrian passage right-of-way under the 30-storey or 31-storey tower through to the Plaza of Nations site edge, to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services, in consultation with the Director of Planning and General Manager of Engineering Services;

Amend B.1.6 to delete "to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning" and replace with: *for review by the Director of Planning in accordance with the requirements of this application.*

Mr. Beasley acknowledged that the design of the park is outside the purview of the Development Permit Board but noted he did not support the design as shown and thought there needs to be more consideration to bring a tighter sense of place vis-à-vis the townhouse frontages on three sides.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5.30 p.m.

C. Hubbard
Clerk to the Board

T. Timm
Chair

Q:\Clerical\DPB\Minutes\2004\sep27.doc