

Date: Monday, September 15, 2003
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

T. Timm Deputy City Engineer (Chair)
A. McAfee Co-Director of Planning
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager
D. Rudberg General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

S. Lyon Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions
P. Kavanagh Representative of the Development Industry (not present for 2290 Cambie St.)
C. Henschel Representative of the General Public
J. Leduc Representative of the General Public

Regrets

D. Chung Representative of the General Public
T. Durning Representative of the General Public
E. Mah Representative of the Development Industry

ALSO PRESENT:

R. Segal Development Planner
S. Hein Development Planner
M.B. Rondeau Development Planner
M. Mortensen Project Facilitator
V. Potter Project Facilitator
M. Thomson City Surveyor
A. Di Nozzi Asst. City Surveyor

1616 Bayshore Drive

M. Ehman Downs Archambault & Partners
A. Johnson Downs Archambault & Partners
S. Vincent Durante Kreuk

531 Beatty Street

C. Brook Brook Development Planning Inc.
F. Rafii Rafii Architects

2290 Cambie Street

M. McDonald Kasian Kennedy Architects
J. Stich Kasian Kennedy Architects
B. Kozak Canadian Tire

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

1. MINUTES

July 7, 2003

Mr. MacGregor requested an amendment to paragraph one, p.10, to replace "voiced his concern" with "commented". Other minor typographical errors were also noted.

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of July 7, 2003 be approved as amended.

July 21, 2003

It was moved by Mr. Rudberg, seconded by Dr. McAfee, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of July 21, 2003 be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 1616 BAYSHORE DRIVE - DE407671 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Downs Archambault + Partners

Request: To construct a 25 storey structure comprising a market residential building (building I), a non-market residential building (building J), ground-oriented retail and 6 townhouses, as well as a 47 person childcare facility. An existing 5 level parking structure is retained.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ralph Segal, Development Planner, presented this complete application to develop the site at the corner of Cardero Street and Bayshore Drive in the Bayshore Gardens neighbourhood. An interesting variety of uses is proposed within the development which is strongly supported by staff. Mr. Segal briefly reviewed the site context and noted the proposal complies very closely with the Bayshore Gardens CD-1 By-law and Guidelines. The only minor issues identified by staff relate to the height of the rooftop amenity space of the low-rise non-market housing component, and the architectural treatment of the south podium elevation facing Georgia Street. The height of the non-market building exceeds the Guideline recommended height by 2.8 m and staff are concerned about the resulting increased morning shadowing on the rear courtyard. Condition 1.1 calls for some adjustment to the amenity space roof and mechanical penthouse to address this concern, and condition 1.2 calls for some improvement to the south elevation of the podium. Mr. Segal drew the Board's attention to standard condition A.1.7 which deals with Council's approval of the affordable housing component, and tabled revised wording for this condition. He also highlighted condition A.1.8 which calls for the water feature to be fenced if children from the daycare must routinely walk past it.

In summary, staff consider the proposal meets or exceeds the provisions of the guidelines and by-law and recommend approval, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report dated August 20, 2003.

Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg concerning the roof-top amenity space in the non-market building, Mr. Segal stressed it is not intended to be publicly accessible but is meant solely for the use of the residents who will be retired performing arts professionals. Standard condition A.1.1 seeks details of the proposed programming of this space.

Mr. Rudberg questioned whether the future residents of this development would be advised of the proposed streetcar route which passes the site along Cardero Street. Mr. Segal noted that staff did not believe there would be major negative impacts caused by the streetcar but agreed the developer can be requested to advise future residents of the proposed streetcar routing.

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor concerning Condition B.2.4, Mr. Segal confirmed it is not intended that the amenity spaces in each building would be accessible by residents of both buildings. Residents will have access only to the amenity spaces in their own building.

Dr. McAfee sought clarification regarding the impact of the overheight of the non-market building. Mr. Segal explained that the applicant is seeking 4 m ceiling clearance in the interior of the space to accommodate the proposed performing arts requirements. Staff believe some adjustment to the shape of the roof and the size of the mechanical penthouse could gain about 15 minutes extra sun penetration on the courtyard.

In response to a question from Mr. Henschel regarding the number of non-market rental units required to be provided in this neighbourhood, Mr. Segal agreed that the issue is of some concern but staff believe the total requirement is achievable within the two remaining high-rise towers to be developed.

Applicant's Comments

Mark Ehman, Architect, explained that the proposed non-market housing component is intended for retired members of the performing arts industry. The Performing Arts Lodge (PAL) intends the amenity space to be multi-use; for exercise activity and for performing arts. For the latter use, a ceiling height of greater than 8 ft. 6 in. is necessary.

Mr. Ehman briefly described the parking provisions, in response to an earlier question from Mr. Henschel. He noted the parking arrangements are rather complex because of the different uses in the development as well as the need to provide part of the parking requirements for the adjacent hotel.

Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Dr. McAfee concerning the treatment of the roof-top amenity space, Mr. Ehman confirmed they are prepared to work with staff to achieve an acceptable solution.

Some discussion took place regarding the time provided for the applicant to respond to the conditions (condition B.1.2). Mr. Segal confirmed that the November 10, 2003 date can be easily extended at the request of the applicant.

In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg regarding the recommendations of the Staff Committee, Mr. Ehman confirmed they have no objection to any of the conditions contained in

the report. Regarding the future streetcar, Mr. Ehman agreed that potential residents will be made aware of the proposal to route it passed this development.

The Chair drew the applicant's attention to Appendix C in which Fire & Rescue Services indicates there are major access issues to and throughout this building.

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Lyon advised the Urban Design Panel was strongly supportive of this project and the recommended conditions very accurately reflect the issues raised by the Panel. Regarding the roof-top amenity space, the Panel thought there was an opportunity, without compromising the design, to lighten it somewhat, possibly reducing overshadowing and view obstruction from suites in the high-rise tower. The Panel also recommended further design development to the south elevation given it is the project's primary aspect from Cardero Street, and thought some consideration should be given in the podium for the fact that this building is the termination of Hastings Street.

Mr. Hancock said it is a very well crafted scheme and is very consistent with the original amended CD-1 zoning. However, he recalled that there had been some discussion at the rezoning stage about the compatibility of the competing uses in the courtyard, and the daycare was proposed to be located on the roof of the low-rise component so that the courtyard could be devoted to more passive uses. Otherwise, he said the project is very well done and he recommended approval.

Mr. Kavanagh also recommended approval. He recommended deletion of the Note to Applicant in A.1.8 which calls for a fence around the water feature.

Mr. Henschel was pleased to support the application and said the massing is appropriate. He had no concern about the height of the roof-top amenity which he thought would have little impact on the courtyard. He was also unconcerned about the roof finish.

Ms. Leduc commended the proponents for a very interesting project and she recommended approval. With respect to condition 1.1, Ms. Leduc said she would not want to see the amenity space compromised in any way in favour of the little extra sun penetration that might be gained.

(Mr. MacGregor was called away from the meeting on urgent business and the meeting was adjourned for 10 minutes during his absence)

Board Discussion

Mr. Rudberg said it is a good looking project that has been fairly well controlled by the CD-1 zoning and the guidelines. With respect to condition A.1.8, he agreed that fencing of the water feature should be avoided but he thought the applicant should make every effort to provide a secured route for the daycare users. Mr. MacGregor and Dr. McAfee had no further comments.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 407671, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated August 20, 2003, with the following amendments:

Amend A.1.1 to add "to be submitted" after "provision of a program";

Re-number the duplicate A.1.4 and subsequent A.1 conditions;

Revise A.1.7 to read:

Provision of Council approval of the affordable housing component, or such other arrangements to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services and the Director of the Housing Centre to prohibit construction of the project commencing prior to Council approval of the affordable housing components, and execution of all related legal documentation on terms and conditions to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services and the Director of the Housing Centre;

Re-number the duplicate A.1.8 to A.1.9;

Amend the last sentence of B.2.4 to read: "...letter *to be submitted* by the Applicant".

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. **531 BEATTY STREET - DE407649 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Rafii Architects Inc.

Request: To construct a 9-storey mixed-use building containing 40 residential units with retail and parking uses at grade and one level of underground parking accessed from the lane and to receive up to 4,500 sq. ft. of heritage density bonus pursuant to Section 3.12 of the Downtown Official Development Plan By-law.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Scot Hein, Development Planner, presented this complete application in the DD zone, which is before the Board largely because of the request for a heritage density bonus. No significant issues have been identified. Referring to the Staff Committee Report dated August 20, 2003, Mr. Hein briefly reviewed the site context. He noted several heritage properties on the east side of Beatty Street, across from this site, as well as the Keefer Steps which is an important emerging pedestrian link in the connection from Chinatown to the Library Precinct.

Mr. Hein referred to the Technical Analysis on p.3 and 4 of the report and tabled a revised analysis amending the FSR breakdown which staff now believe complies with the maximum residential FSR requirements. Condition A.1.1 calling for compliance can be deleted. At 90.7 ft., the building is well below the maximum permitted 150 ft. and there are no view and shadowing implications. While the proposed parking is one stall deficient, staff support a relaxation in this respect.

Mr. Hein briefly reviewed some aspects of the Downtown Design Guidelines. Staff believe the proposal responds very well to the built form objectives by providing a substantive streetwall, noting it sets a good precedent for the smaller adjacent sites to the south as well as the parking garage site directly to the north. With respect to the architectural design objectives, staff strongly support the proposed use of brick in response to the contextual quality of this street. As well, the fenestration patterns, window openings and ratio of solid and void are well handled. Improvements are sought in the refinement of architectural detailing and are addressed in the recommended prior-to conditions.

With respect to the adjacent site immediately south, staff believe it remains a developable lot. This site currently provides access to underground parking for residents of 550 Beatty Street.

The project fully meets the criteria for receipt of the requested heritage density bonus.

In summary, staff believe this is a fairly straightforward proposal and recommend approval, subject to the conditions outlined in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

In response to requests for clarification from Mr. Kavanagh and Ms. Leduc with respect to condition 1.1. Mr. Hein explained that staff are looking for a more refined and simpler approach to architectural detailing. He added, staff appreciate the architect's stylized approach to the façade treatment but wish to ensure the building is complementary to the heritage buildings across the street.

Applicant's Comments

Foad Rafii, Architect, briefly reviewed the history of the project and the decision to pursue the heritage density bonus. With respect to the conditions, Chuck Brook said they do not believe the design needs additional refinement and requested deletion of 1.1, noting the proposal was unanimously supported by the Urban Design Panel. Mr. Rafii advised they are willing to add additional brick to the north façade in any event. With respect to the south elevation, he noted the building is on a zero lot line, which makes it extremely difficult to include brick detailing. As well, the resulting additional width would impact the interior unit plans on this already tight site.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Rudberg commented the proposal has the appearance of a suburban building that seems out of context. Mr. Brook said they intentionally designed a building that contrasted with, rather than replicated, the heritage buildings across the street. The brick was included at the request of staff.

Some discussion took place regarding the development potential of the adjacent parking garage site. Mr. Brook advised that the owner of the project has approached the strata corporation of the building across the street and negotiations are continuing to acquire this small, 50 ft. frontage lot with the objective of site consolidation and a larger development. Mr. Hein pointed out that staff do not take economic viability into account in their analysis but it is believed the adjacent site does have redevelopment potential.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

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

Panel Opinion

Mr. Lyon noted the Urban Design Panel commented very favourably on this project and it was unanimously supported. A number of minor issues that were raised are addressed in the recommended prior-to conditions. With respect to condition 1.1, Mr. Lyon suggested replacing the word "strengthen" with "better complement". The Panel recognized that the applicant was adopting a traditional approach to the building but thought it could complement the buildings across the street a bit more. There were some concerns expressed about the size of the columns and proportion of elements. With regard to the brick, the Panel's comments related to the frontal nature of the design and suggested the extension of the brick should be equal down both sides.

Mr. Hancock commented that one side of this block is strongly heritage while this side is contemporary and nondescript. He suggested the design is influenced by two competing forces which results in a hybrid building. He said he would prefer it to go one way or the other. He was not convinced it should reflect the heritage nature of the street, rather that the architect be given a free hand to do what he wants on this side of the street. Mr. Hancock recommended deletion of 1.1. He said he found the recessed character of the penthouses to be a bit of an anomaly and would prefer to see them fill the frame. Otherwise, he said he supported the general direction of the project and recommended approval.

Mr. Kavanagh recommended approval, with the deletion of conditions 1.1 and A.1.1. He liked the design of the building which he thought provided a very polite conversation with its neighbours.

Mr. Henschel also liked the project. With respect to condition 1.1, he commented the building could either be simplified or, preferably, provide a better antithesis to the heritage buildings by strengthening the columns and cornice and having less contrast between the light and dark portions of the building. He did not support adding brick to the south façade noting it is easier to deal with graffiti on a concrete finish.

Ms. Leduc agreed with Mr. Hancock that the architect should be given more of a free hand in the design. She said it is the heritage buildings that need to be emphasized on this street and noted she is not in favour of modern buildings mimicking heritage buildings, only that the proportions be appropriate. She recommended deletion of 1.1.

Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor said it is a very attractive proposal. He noted the application seeks the maximum residential density. He did not support the deletion of 1.1. However, his suggested revision to the Note to Applicant, to require consideration of more brick on the south elevation, was not supported by Mr. Rudberg or Dr. McAfee. After further discussion he re-stated his motion.

In supporting retention of the Note to Applicant, as written, Mr. Rudberg noted the south façade will be very visible from Keefer Steps for many years to come. He agreed a significant adjustment to the building is not necessary and he supported replacing the "strengthen" with "complement". Dr. McAfee concurred.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 407649, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated August 20, 2003, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1 to replace "strengthen" with "complement";

Amend the first sentence in the **Note to Applicant** in 1.1 to replace "required" with "recommended";

Delete A.1.1.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Kavanagh left the meeting at 5.00 p.m.

5. **2290 CAMBIE STREET - DE407204 - ZONE C-3A
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Kasian Kennedy Architects

Request: To construct a three-level commercial building, with rooftop and one level of below grade parking for 272 vehicles, accessed off both 6th Avenue and 7th Avenue.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mary Beth Rondeau, Development Planner, presented this complete application for a new Canadian Tire store on Cambie Street between 6th and 7th Avenues, in the C-3A zone. Maximum permitted density is 3.0 FSR and the application seeks 2.7, of which 0.9 FSR is for rooftop parking. A height of 30 ft. is allowable outright, and the Guidelines suggest that 90 ft. is acceptable. The proposal seeks a maximum of just below 50 ft. at the corner of 6th Avenue and Cambie Street. Ms. Rondeau briefly reviewed the guidelines for the area and noted the proposal has achieved a generous pedestrian promenade along Cambie Street. With respect to the massing, staff support the requested variation from the guidelines in that the overall building height of 45-50 ft. on Cambie Street provides strong street enclosure.

Ms. Rondeau briefly reviewed the proposed new Canadian Tire store, the entry to which is at the street level and onto a mezzanine. There is also a service entry on Yukon Street. The development also includes a smaller retail unit (5,000 sq.ft.) at the 7th Avenue street grade. The proposed rooftop parking area will be significantly landscaped and the lighting will not overspill onto adjacent properties. The addition of specialty paving is recommended, at the suggestion of the Urban Design Panel. The Canadian Tire Garden Centre is located next to the rooftop parking area. Loading and additional parking is accommodated underground.

Following a brief review of the recommended prior-to conditions, Ms. Rondeau noted this is a large scale development which staff believe will make a positive contribution to the area. The recommendation is for approval, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report dated August 20, 2003.

Questions/Discussion

Ms. Leduc raised a question about the safety aspects of the rooftop parking area, given the number of trees proposed. Ms. Rondeau confirmed that CPTED criteria have been carefully

considered in the scheme. She also noted the parking lot will not be accessible after store hours.

In response to a question from Dr. McAfee regarding what assurance there is that the landscaping will be maintained over time, Ms. Rondeau explained the applicant is being requested to provide irrigation details. As well, staff depend on the reputation of the owner to ensure it is well maintained.

Mr. Henschel noted the strong emphasis on environmental considerations in the proposal and questioned whether it would qualify for LEED silver or gold certification. Ms. Rondeau said there has been considerable discussion about a storm water retention system as well as substantial greening of the roof. The City would strongly support LEED certification for the development but it is not something that can be required.

In response to a question from Dr. McAfee regarding condition 1.9, Ms. Rondeau explained that requiring a commitment to not expand or consolidate the two larger retail units was a repeat of the condition that the Board applied to the recent application at 455 West 8th Avenue (Grosvenor) to the south of this site.

Applicant's Comments

Michael McDonald, Architect, noted the setback being provided along the Cambie Street edge is 38 ft. at its narrowest point. As well as providing a double row of street trees, they have been working with the development to the south to ensure uniform treatment of the sidewalk along this section of Cambie Street to enhance the future pedestrian route to Southeast False Creek. With respect to the Canadian Tire Store, Mr. McDonald noted they have worked hard to achieve direct street access that also works from a security point of view. Provision of the motorist will create considerable activity along Cambie Street and the store itself will be completely transparent.

Mr. McDonald briefly reviewed the public consultation process and explained the ways in which they have responded to the neighbours' concerns.

Regarding sustainability, storm water will be collected off the roof of the garden centre and it will be re-used for irrigation. The proposed "grasscrete" will also have a direct impact on storm water by acting as a filter. About 95 percent of demolition material will be recycled, which exceeds LEED requirements on this aspect of sustainability. The bicycle plaza at the corner of 7th Avenue and Cambie Street will be an integral part of the 7th Avenue bicycle route and it is also a very appropriate fit with Canadian Tire. Light overspill from the roof will not be an issue. Low flow sensors and fixtures will be used for water efficiency. With respect to energy efficiency, there will be a centralized chiller on the rooftop, located well away from the residents on 6th Avenue. Low emission materials will be used and daylight will be maximized.

Mr. McDonald noted that traffic management has also been a significant consideration, particularly along 7th Avenue and the lane reconfiguration to accommodate the bicycle route. A new traffic signal at Yukon and 7th Avenue is proposed.

Mr. McDonald requested the Board to consider the following amendments to the conditions:

Deletion of 1.4 in favour of 1.1;
Inclusion of \$100,000 maximum in 1.2 c);
Delete "expand or" in 1.9.

Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg concerning condition 1.2 c), Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, explained that this condition parallels the language used in the "Grosvenor" development application (as amended by the Board). The only difference is that the Grosvenor development traffic calming measures are 60 percent applicant funded and the subject application requires 40 percent. Mr. Thomson added that staff do not anticipate a cost approaching \$100,000 for this applicant, noting that only five blocks of traffic calming is envisaged.

Dr. McAfee sought clarification regarding condition 1.9 and Ms. Rondeau explained the condition is a repeat of that required of the Grosvenor application. Brian Kozak, Canadian Tire, said the possibility of subdivision is currently uncertain. He noted that one option would be for Canadian Tire to sell the entire site and lease back the larger retail space on a long term basis. Strata titling is less likely. However, he said they would prefer not to be prohibited from consolidating because they are unsure of the future implications. Ms. Rondeau noted the exact mechanism for this condition has not yet been established.

Dr. McAfee commented that, while the proposal strongly emphasizes sustainable design and the site is located very close to a major transit node, it is a very car-oriented development. Mr. McDonald noted the number of parking spaces is significantly less than would typically be provided in a shopping centre location. Mr. Kozak added that Canadian Tire is very likely to maintain its store in this location for the long term to serve the downtown market.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Lyon advised the Urban Design Panel unanimously supported this project, having not supported an earlier rendition of the scheme. The Panel found the applicant had responded very well to its suggestions and comments. The Panel particularly liked the visibility and openness of the Cambie Street edge and appreciated the environmental initiatives of the project. The Panel also thought the signage had been improved. With respect to the bicycle hub at the 7th/Cambie corner, the Panel had some suggestions for improving its texture and usefulness for the public. The Panel also recommended that the applicant continue to consider pedestrian level signs as opposed to more dominant signage. With respect to the conditions, Mr. Lyon thought 1.4 could be deleted as requested by the applicant.

Mr. Hancock was impressed with the way this single large retail space has been able to successfully address the relationship to the street. The massing and the expression on Cambie Street is a very positive contribution. Mr. Hancock saw no problem with deleting condition 1.4. He also commended the applicant for locating all the loading underground.

Mr. Henschel also found it a very interesting and commendable project. He thought condition 1.4 could be deleted. He also recommended deleting 1.9, noting that this project is much smaller than the Grosvenor development.

Ms. Leduc agreed with the previous comments. With respect to 1.2 c), she suggested indicating that the cost to the applicant would not exceed \$100,000, and to delete 1.9.

Board Discussion

Dr. McAfee said she noted with interest some of the sustainable features being proposed in this development.

Mr. Rudberg commented that this site has been problematic because of the number of access points causing disruption. This development will improve the situation considerably with a number of good measures, including the double row of trees, enhancement of the bicycle route, and reduction in number of curb cuts. Internalizing all the loading activity is also a very big improvement. Mr. Rudberg congratulated the applicant for the efforts made to address some of the sustainability issues that the City is trying to encourage, and expressed the hope that it provides leadership for other commercial developments in the city to emulate.

Mr. MacGregor noted that this scheme is considerably smaller than the adjacent Grosvenor development. He was also very pleased with the loading and parking arrangements and with the overall design.

Motion

It was moved by Dr. McAfee and seconded by Rudberg, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 407204, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated August 20, 2003, with the following amendments:

Add to the **Note to Applicant** in 1.1:

All references to proposed signage should be removed, as per condition A.1.4.

Delete 1.4;

Amend 1.8 to read:

Provision of a construction management plan with emphasis on staging and deliveries to reduce disruption to business and traffic on West 6th Avenue, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services;

Amend 1.9 to delete "expand or";

Amend A.2.10 to add "that the" after "consultant"

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6.00 p.m.

C. Hubbard
Clerk to the Board

T. Timm
Chair