DEVELOPMENT PERMIT STAFF COMMITTEE REPORT
JULY 4, 2012
FOR THE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT BOARD
JULY 30, 2012

1155 HORNBY STREET (COMPLETE APPLICATION)
DE412314 - ZONE DD
AM/BM/MW/MD’A/DJ/LH

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

● Proposal: To develop this site with a 20 storey multiple dwelling and 3 storey townhouses containing a total of 164 dwelling units over 4 levels of underground parking; to rehabilitate the façade of the existing heritage ‘B’ listed building (The Murray Hotel); and retention of the existing 108 units in the existing Single Room Accommodation (SRA) at 1119 Hornby Street.

See Appendix A Standard Conditions
Appendix B Standard Notes and Conditions of Development Permit
Appendix C Processing Centre - Building comments
Appendix D Plans and Elevations
Appendix E Landscape Plans
Appendix F Murray Hotel Plans and Elevations
Appendix G Applicant’s Development Options Overview
Appendix H View Analysis

● Issues:
  1. Building proximity with adjacent existing buildings

● Urban Design Panel: Support
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT STAFF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE412314 submitted, the plans and information forming a part thereof, subject to Council designation of the existing Heritage Building, thereby permitting the development of an 20 storey multiple dwelling with townhouses having a total of 164 dwelling units over 4 levels of underground parking; to rehabilitate the façade of the existing heritage ‘B’ building (The Murray Hotel); and retention of the existing 108 units in the existing Single Room Accommodation (SRA) at 1119 Hornby Street subject to the following conditions:

1.0 Prior to the issuance of the development permit, revised drawings and information shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, clearly indicating:

1.1 City Council approves the municipal heritage designation of the Murray Hotel, 1119 Hornby Street, at public hearing, and the Heritage Designation By-law is enacted;

Note to Applicant: The owner(s) will be required to enter into a legal agreement with the City incorporating the following:

(a) that all work to the heritage building will be completed according to an approved heritage conservation plan;
(b) occupancy of all buildings be restricted until the rehabilitation of the heritage building is completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning;
(c) that the heritage rehabilitation work will be completed in a timely manner; and
(d) assurance that the services of a qualified restoration architect will be retained to provide professional services relative to all aspects, including site supervision, of the exterior restoration work.

Further confirmation is required, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Director of Legal Services, that the agreement is completed and registered on title in the Land Titles Office.

1.2 provision of a signed tenant relocation/mitigation plan, to the satisfaction of the Director of Social Development, to include amongst other conditions the following requirements:

(a) construction phasing schedule; and
(b) timetable of tenant relocation and management in relation to construction;

1.3 design development to townhouse public realm interface demonstrating high quality material treatments; and

Note to Applicant: Provision of a large scale (1/4”=1’ or 1:50) illustrating the townhouse to public realm interface including elevations and sections of the façade of the townhouse to the street curb and should include details of planting depth, stairs guard rails and the location of the underground slab.

1.4 design development to podium open space to provide opportunities for social activity, such as additional seating, a children’s play area or tables and chairs for outdoor eating.

2.0 That the conditions set out in Appendix A be met prior to the issuance of the Development Permit.

3.0 That the Notes to Applicant and Conditions of the Development Permit set out in Appendix B be approved by the Board.
### PROJECT INFORMATION

**Site Size/Area:** 61.0 m x 36.6 m (nominal) / 2 229 sq. m (survey)  
**Site Type:** inside with lane

### DOWNTOWN DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 3 - Density</th>
<th>PERMITTED</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area M</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Existing Murray Hotel 1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Bonus Density</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>Residential 5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>Subtotal 6.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area M</th>
<th>11 145 sq. m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Bonus Density</td>
<td>2 729 sq. m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13 874 sq. m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Balcony Area

- Open + Enclosed (8% x Residential)  
  - 8% x 11 213 sq. m = 897 sq. m  
- Enclosed (50% x Balcony Area)  
  - 50% x 819 sq. m = 448.5 sq. m

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon. Total</th>
<th>1 020 sq. m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Allowed</td>
<td>897 sq. m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess</td>
<td>123 sq. m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Amenity (lesser of 20% or 929 m²)

- 929 sq. m.  
- 151 sq. m

### Section 4 - Height

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area B</th>
<th>91.44 m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>View Cone elevation @ penthouse</td>
<td>88.47 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Cone elevation @ main parapet</td>
<td>87.35 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Cone elevation @ lower parapet</td>
<td>87.55 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Top of Elev./Mech. parapet wall | 89.63 m |
| Top of main parapet wall | 88.31 m |
| Top of lower parapet wall (SW corner) | 87.61 m |

### PARKING BY-LAW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>REQUIRED</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Murray Hotel</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Existing Murray Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>lesser of 1 sp./140 m² and 1 sp./unit</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 213 m² x 1 sp./140 m² = 80 spaces</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Car (25% maximum)</td>
<td>1 sp. + 5 sp. = 6 spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176 spaces x 25% = 44 spaces</td>
<td>Disability Spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 sp./1² 7 units + 0.034 sp./unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164 units - 7 units = 157 units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>157 units x 0.034 sp./unit = 5 sp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 sp. + 5 sp. = 6 spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horizontal 50% (minimum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lockers 20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vertical 30% (maximum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Outlets 1 outlet/2 Class A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class A</th>
<th>Class B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murray Hotel</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Murray Hotel | 0 |
| Residential | 205 |
| Total | 205 |

**Note on Density:** Pursuant to Section 9, the Development Permit Board may, for any development which includes the restoration of an existing building listed on the Vancouver Heritage register, permit an increase in the floor space ratio, subject to prior approval by City Council and designation of the building as a Municipal Heritage Site. Real Estate Services has assessed the eligible bonus density at a land value of 2 729 sq. m.

**Note on Height:** Staff support the minor height incursions into the view cone as they would result in no perceived reduction of mountain view from the origin of the view point.
### Section 5.2.1 Loading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>REQUIRED</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Murray Hotel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Existing Murray Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Unit Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>REQUIRED</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Murray Hotel</td>
<td>108 single room occupancy (SRO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td>1 - 2 bedroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 2 bedroom + den</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3 bedroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 - studio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70 - one-bedroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34 - one bedroom + den</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 - two-bedroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 - three-bedroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158 units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6 + 158 = 164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Note on Parking: The 1 space/10 unit parking ratio for the existing Murray Hotel is intended for the building’s staff and for outside services accessing residents. It also recognizes that the building is to last for some decades and that its occupant profile may change; the 1:10 ratio allows the building to have some capacity to adjust to changing needs/circumstances. Social Development (Housing) has determined this parking requirement for Murray Hotel early in the pre-application review process. Standard Engineering Condition A.2.3 requires a registered covenant, including access, to secure the parking spaces for the Murray Hotel.
Guideline Technical Analysis - Downtown South Guidelines (excluding Granville Street):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDED</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tower Width &amp; Floor Plate Size¹</td>
<td>width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Section 4.1.3]</td>
<td>depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tower width or depth - 27.43 m (90 ft.)</td>
<td>22.38 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimum tower widths to fronting streets</td>
<td>31.08 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(typically north and south streets) - range of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.86 m (75 ft.) - 25.91 m (85 ft.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tower floor plate - 604 sq. m. (6,500 sq. ft.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor-to-Floor Heights [Section 4.1.4]</td>
<td>levels 2 - 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typical floor-to-floor heights</td>
<td>2.67 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generally between 2.59 m (8.5 ft.) and 2.74 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9.0 ft.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard &amp; Setbacks²</td>
<td>podium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Section 4.2.1]</td>
<td>tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.83 m (6 ft.) for all heights</td>
<td>2.7 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard &amp; Setbacks Interior Side³</td>
<td>podium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Section 4.2.2(d)]</td>
<td>tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.19 m (40 ft.) &gt;21.33 m (70 ft.) height</td>
<td>north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.35 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.24 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard &amp; Setbacks⁴</td>
<td>podium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Section 4.2.3(a)]</td>
<td>tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.05 m (10 ft.) ≤10.67 m (35 ft.) height</td>
<td>22.93 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.14 m (30 ft.) &gt;10.67 m (35 ft.) height</td>
<td>4.42 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal Angle of Daylight⁵</td>
<td>den on 2nd floor of townhouse - 27°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Section 4.4]</td>
<td>habitable rooms adjacent to and facing Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>habitable rooms to have at least one window</td>
<td>Hotel - &lt; 50°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with unobstructed view of 50° or sum of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70° over a distance of 24.38 m (80 ft.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Floor of Building [Section 5.5.1(d)]</td>
<td>0.95 m - 1.01 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>main floor of residential units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should be located approximately 0.91 m (3.0 ft.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awnings, Canopies, Recesses and Arcades [</td>
<td>weather protection to be provided over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5.6]</td>
<td>entrances to residential uses and encouraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weather protection to be provided over entrances</td>
<td>where appropriate on non-retail streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to residential uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and encouraged where appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on non-retail streets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Private Open Space⁶</td>
<td>Staff are satisfied with the main residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Section 7.2]</td>
<td>setback from street with building above that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential units to provide an aggregate area</td>
<td>adequate weather protection has been provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of 4.65 sq. m (50 sq. ft.) per unit (164 units x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.65 m (50 sq. ft.) = 762.6 sq. m (8,209 sq. ft.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448 sq. m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Open Space [Section 7.3]</td>
<td>residential units to have access to a private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outdoor space with a minimum width of 1.83 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 m - 2.7 m; some units with Juliette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>balconies only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Note on Tower Width and Floor Plate: The tower floorplate and towers are modestly more than the guideline recommendations. With respect to tower width, the north/south tower width has been minimized to maximize its tower separation with London Place while also generally meeting the lightwell guideline criteria. The leading tower width facing London Place has been minimized. Staff support the variations from the guidelines. See commentary under Tower Siting and Built Form, pages 9-10.

²Note on Front Yard & Setbacks: The townhouse frontage exceeds the minimum front yard setback. The tower and lower tower massing provides for a transition in the street wall to better respond to the existing urban fabric of the Murray Hotel. Staff support the reduction in the front yard setback requested.
Note on Side Yard & Setbacks: The proposal exceeds the recommended upper massing setbacks of 12.19 m (40 ft.) for those portions of buildings above 21.33 m (70 ft.) in height.

Note on Rear Yard & Setbacks: Staff support the reduction in the rear yard setback given the challenges presented with the tower placement in addressing tower separation and tower placement with the nearby adjacent buildings. See commentary on page 10.

Note on Horizontal Angle of Daylight: Staff have considered and accept the reduction in the HAD guidelines as it applies to only a limited number of primary living spaces, 4 living rooms facing into the landscaped courtyard between the proposed tower and the Murray Hotel and 2 secondary living spaces, bedroom and den facing into the courtyard underneath the tower.
• **Legal Description**
  Lot I, Block 90, DL 541, Plan LMP915, and Lots 33, 34, 35 and The North ½ of Lot 32, all of Block 90, DL 541, Plan 210

• **History of Application:**
  08 07 21 Complete DE submitted
  08 09 08 Vancouver Heritage Commission
  08 09 10 Urban Design Panel
  10 03 08 Revised DE submission
  12 04 18 Revised DE submission
  12 07 04 Development Permit Staff Committee

• **Site:** The site is located midblock on the westerly side of Hornby Street between Davie and Helmcken Streets. The site contains an existing heritage ‘B’ building, The Murray Hotel, a 4-storey building containing 108 SRA units.

• **Context:** Significant adjacent development includes:
  
  (a) 1177 Hornby Street, ‘London Place’, 12-storey mixed used residential and commercial
  (b) 1134 Burrard Street, 16-storey social service and social housing building, approved
  (c) 1100 Burrard, ‘Burrard Motel Inn’, 4-storey hotel
  (d) 1144 & 1166 Burrard Street, ‘Burrard Medical Building’, 4.5 and 10-storey office building
  (e) 1190 Hornby Street, commercial office building
  (f) 1081 Burrard Street, St. Pauls’ Hospital
  (g) 1000 Burrard Street, ’Wall Center’, residential towers
- **Background:** A similar development application for this site was originally submitted in 2008 and reviewed by staff and the urban design panel. A revised submission was submitted in 2010. At the applicants request the application was put on hold. This new application is substantially similar to the previous application.

- **Applicable By-laws and Guidelines:**
  
  (i) Downtown Official Development Plan (DODP)
  (ii) Heritage Policies and Guidelines
  (iii) Downtown South Design Guidelines (Burrard-Granville)
  (iv) Guidelines for New Development Adjacent to Hotels and Rooming Houses

  In summary, the By-law allows 5.0 FSR, up to 91.4 m (300 ft.) in height. The by-law also permits (Section 3.9) for any development that includes the restoration of an existing building which is listed on the Vancouver Heritage Registrar, an increase in the floor space ratio, subject to prior approval by City Council and the designation of the building as a municipal Heritage site. The site has Council-approved view corridor B1 - Charleston Seawall to the Lions passing over the site restricting the maximum height to approx. 55.9 m (183.4 ft.).

  This site is within the ‘Burrard-Granville’ sub-area of Downtown South. The Downtown South Guidelines recommend ground oriented residential units, 24.4 m (80 ft.) tower separation, tower floor plates of 604 sq. m. (6,500 sq. ft.) and 1.8 m (6 ft.) street setbacks. The Guidelines for New Development Adjacent to Hotels and Rooming Houses prime consideration maintain livability, access to light and air, through adequate setbacks for these existing affordable accommodations.

- **Response to Applicable By-laws and Guidelines:**
  
  (i) Downtown Official Development Plan (DODP)
  (ii) Heritage Policies and Guidelines

  **Use:** The proposed uses, consisting of a residential tower and ground oriented townhouses is consistent with the uses sought within the By-law

  **Density:** Section 3.9 of the DODP bylaw states that the Development Permit Board, for any development which includes the restoration of an existing building which is listed on the Vancouver heritage registrar, permit an increase in the floor space ratio, subject to prior approval by City Council and the designation of the building as a municipal Heritage site. In determining the increase the Development Permit Board shall consider:

  (a) the cost of the heritage-related restoration;
  (b) the value of the increased floor area:
  (c) the impact upon the livability and environment quality of the neighbourhood; and
  (d) all applicable policies and guidelines adopted by Council.

  The proposed density of 6.09 FSR is comprised of the maximum permitted in this sub-area of 5.0, plus 1.09 FSR (bonus density) for the retention of the façade of the Murray Hotel. Heritage Policies and Guidelines state that resources identified on the Vancouver Heritage Register have significance and that the City’s long term goal is to protect through voluntary designation as many resources on the Vancouver Heritage Register as possible, and that legal designation will be a prerequisite to the granting of certain bonuses and incentives.

  Real estate staff’s proforma analysis confirms that the costs associated with the restoration and retention of the Murray Hotel exterior facades exceeds the requested bonus floor area of 1.09 FSR (2,439 sq. m.). Staff recommend the Development Permit Board consider the increase in permitted
density as bonus density compensation for the extent of the heritage rehabilitation of the Murray Hotel. Pursuant to this, Council approval will be sought to designate the retained portions of the “Murray Hotel” as protected heritage features. See also Heritage commentary on pages 15-16 and Condition 1.1.

**Height:** The site is affected by View Cone B1 - Charleson seawall to the Lions, restricting the height permitted on the site to an overall elevation of 88.91 m. The proposed building results in an elevation of 89.63 m to roof of elevator machine room. Staff are satisfied that the minor height incursions into the view cone would result in no perceived reduction of mountain view from the origin of the view point and support the height requested.

(iii) Downtown South Design Guidelines (Burrard-Granville)
(iv) Guidelines for New Development Adjacent to Hotels and Rooming Houses (With Windows or Lightwells Near Interior Property Lines)

**Tower Siting and Built Form:** This site is challenged by a number of existing building adjacencies that include the on-site Murray Hotel, the adjacent London Place and the recently approved social housing development across the lane. A number of massing options were explored, including various street wall massing forms with and without a tower form. See Appendix G, pages 1-6. The proposed massing consisting of a tower, in conjunction with a three-storey townhouse podium along Hornby Street, was considered to have the most merit as it generally conforms to the applicable guidelines and includes the retention of the Murray Hotel as described in the following commentary. This approach was also considered to be less impactful than the other massing scenarios, such as a seven-story streetwall permitted under the zoning.

The Downtown South Guidelines state that new development should be massed as compactly as possible and situated so that significant distant views can be shared between a proposed project and existing and future development on surrounding sites. This is to be achieved with slim compact towers that maximize views between buildings rather than wide towers that block views, and with appropriate height, siting and spacing of towers in relation to other existing and proposed developments. On those sites affected by Council-approved view cones and Heritage assets, variation from the guidelines may be considered, subject to maintaining livability.

The proposed tower floor plate of 620.4 sq. m. (6678 sq. ft.) is slightly more in area than the guideline recommended maximum floor plate of 604. sq. m (6500 sq. ft.). The tower shaping results in overall dimension of 22.6 m by 31.075 m (74.2 ft x 102 ft.), exceeding the guideline recommendation for slim tower dimensions of 22.86 m to 25.9 m (75 ft to 85 ft.) up to a maximum dimension of 27.4 m (90 ft.). While the depth of the tower (102 ft.) is greater than the guideline recommended maximum (90 ft.) the primary portion of the façade facing London Place, having a dimension of 22.99 m (75.4 ft.) is at the lower end of tower widths described within the guideline.

To address neighbourliness, privacy and access to daylight between residential buildings the Downtown South Guidelines recommend a 24.4 m (80 ft. tower separation) for those portions of building above 70 ft. in height. This is generally achieved through individual developments each providing a 12.19 m (40 ft.) setback from a shared property line. The proposed tower placement exceeds this recommended setback from both adjacent shared property lines. However, within the immediate context the tower placement does not achieve the recommended 24.4 m (80 ft.) tower separation with the existing London Place (originally built as an office building, converted to residential in 1994) as it only provides a setback of 3.5 m (11.5 ft.) from the shared property line as illustrated on page 10.
The proposed tower has been positioned to maximize its distance between nearby adjacent buildings. On the south side of the tower, the on-site tower setback of 18.3 m (60 ft.) is combined with the 3.5 m (11.5 ft.) setback provided by London Place results in a total tower separation of 21.8 m (71.5 ft.).

The guidelines also call for a 9.14 m (30 ft.) setback along the lane for those portions of buildings above 70 ft. in height. Combined with the lane width of 6.1 m (20 ft.) and rear setback for the property across the lane would achieve the recommended 24.4 m (80 ft.) separation between buildings. The application proposes a rear setback of only 4.4 m (14.5 ft.), combined with the lane width and tower setback provided for the social housing development at 1134 Burrard achieves a total tower separation of 19.8 m (65 ft.). Staff note the two buildings have been offset as much as possible employing stepped massing combined with the units layouts for both buildings been configured and oriented to address privacy and view outlook, and as such, staff support the reduced tower separation between these two buildings.
The Guidelines for New Development Adjacent to Hotels recommend a minimum setback of 1.524 m (5 ft.), combined with a 70 degree vertical light angle to address neighbourliness, privacy and access to daylight between new development and existing hotels and rooming houses. The application as illustrated below achieves this recommended minimum resulting in a 20.5 ft. setback between the proposed tower and the Murray Hotel lightwell.

Tower Proximity with Murray Hotel

Private View Impacts: Given the limitations with shifting the proposed tower further north towards the Murray Hotel and the proposed tower separation of 21.8 m (71.5 ft.), 2.9 m (9.5 ft.) less than in the guideline recommended tower separation of 24.4 m (80 ft.), a further assessment was undertaken to evaluate the private view impacts between London Place and the proposed building.

In recognition of the reduced tower separation and to address livability and privacy concerns between the proposed building and London Place, the proposed building’s corner units at have been designed with their primary living space oriented towards the street and the lane. For those units (above the 70 ft. height limit applicable to the guideline tower separation), a total of ten units, (one unit per floor - level 9-18) will have their primary orientation across the site towards London Place.

Within London Place, two units per floor (level 6-9 and one unit per floor (level 10-12) for a total of 11 units have their primary orientation across the site towards the proposed tower. In terms of actual view reduction between the proposed building and its reduced tower separation of 21.8 m (71.5 ft.) versus a building achieving the guideline recommended tower separation of 24.4 m (80 ft.), the
reduction in the comparable view aperture for the residents of London Place is only 4 to 5%. See Appendix H, page 1.

While the proposed tower siting has impacts on its immediate neighbour, London Place, staff believe that the impacts are modest and within the realm of acceptance within this high density residential neighbourhood given the physical constraints of the site, the preservation of the heritage asset including the retention of SRO units, staff support the variations from the guidelines for tower floor plate and dimensions, setbacks and the reduce tower separation.

Public Realm Interface: As housing is the principal use encouraged along Hornby Street, the proposal has incorporated a well composed stacked townhouse mass with a streetwall expression. Staff are seeking detailed information to confirm material treatments, adequate soil depth, treatment of stairs, guardrails of the public realm interface. See Condition 1.3.

Landscape and Open Space: The provision of high quality, usable semi-private open space for common use by the residents of the development is an important element in making individual developments more livable in a high-density setting. The proposal includes two landscape areas for the use of the residents, a landscaped courtyard between the tower and the adjacent Murray Hotel and the landscaped podium. Overview of the low rise components roofscape are important for both near views within the proposal and for the surrounding developments, staff are generally satisfied that the proposed treatment of these surfaces meets this objective. However, staff are recommending the design development to podium open space to provides opportunities for social activity, such as additional seating, a children's play area or tables and chairs for outdoor eating. See Condition 1.4.

Heritage Preservation and SRA Retention: The Murray Hotel is listed in the “B” category on the Vancouver Heritage Register and also contains 108 SRA-designated rooms. The application proposes upgrades to the heritage façade and to the bathroom facilities. All 108 SRA-designated rooms will be retained and tenants will be able to continue living in the building throughout the construction period. To mitigate expressed and possible tenant concerns, a complete construction schedule and/or tenant relocation plan will be required. The tenant relocation plan will be established to manage operation issues, mitigate resident displacement, and address concerns that may occur during construction. See also Housing Policy commentary on page 16 and Condition 1.2.

● Conclusion: This application presents difficult choices in the balancing of impacts on specific neighbours, while attempting to maintain the development potential of this site. Staff believe that this proposal generally meets the intent of the provisions of the zoning and design guidelines and are recommending approval in principle, subject to Council designation of the Murray Hotel as a Heritage building and the conditions contained within this report.

URBAN DESIGN PANEL

The Urban Design Panel reviewed this application on September 10, 2008, and provided the following comments:

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-0)

● Introduction: Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the proposal for a 18-storey building with a 3-storey podium. The proposal includes the retention of the Murray Building (Heritage ‘B’ Listed) which will contain 108 SRA units. The site is located in the Downtown South Guideline in the sub area called Burrard/Granville.

Ms. Molaro described the context for the site and described the surrounding buildings noting the building to the south called London Place, a 15-storey commercial building that was converted to residential from the 3rd floor up in 1994.
The proposal is seeking a 10% heritage density for the upgrading of the façade on the Murray Hotel. The site is affected by a view cone (Charleson Seawall to the Lions) and limits the total height including the mechanical appurtenances to 185.5 feet. Ms. Molaro described the proposed size for the buildings noting the floor plate in the tower will be approximately 7,140 square feet which is over the guideline recommendation of 5,700 for a site of this frontage and the maximum recommended 6500 sq. ft. Ms. Molaro asked for the Panel’s advice on the floor plate size. With respect to tower separation, the proposal achieves a tower separation of 71.5 feet whereas the guidelines call for a minimum of 80 feet. Staff acknowledge that achieving the guideline minimum of 80 feet between the proposed building and the London Place will be difficult as well as meeting the guideline for new buildings adjacent to light wells. The light well on the Murray Hotel side is to have a 17.0 foot separation which is close to meeting the guidelines.

With respect to the tower separation, staff are willing to consider something less on the basis of heritage preservation but also on achieving a high degree of liveability in terms of privacy interface between the units whose sole outlook is directly across to the London Place and vice versa. Other guideline setback criteria call for the tower placement to be 6 foot front yard setback as well as 30 foot rear yard setback for buildings over 35 feet in height. Again, staff acknowledge a rear yard setback is something to consider but still want to achieve a high degree of liveability for those units, particularly at the lower lane levels and its interface with future developments across the lane. In addition, the guidelines call for a lane treatment with a 10 foot landscape setback.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:
1. Overall building massing and distribution of the density on the site
   a) Tower dimensions, tower floor plate, rear and front yard setbacks and tower separation;
   b) Neighbourliness of the proposed building related to tower massing and unit orientation with existing and future neighbours on existing units (London Place - Murray Hotel);
   c) Streetscape response including street definition;
   d) Is there an opportunity for better distribution of massing re: tower.

2. Liveability of proposed units
   a) Through townhouse units facing into the underside of the tower;
   b) Along the lane (future context).

3. Viability of the covered landscaped open space
   a) at tower entry;
   b) extension of rear courtyard under the tower.

4. Other items
   a) Streetscape interface with Murray Hotel (Heritage ‘B’);
   b) Materials proposed for the development.

5. Sustainability

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** Richard Henriquez, Architect, further described the proposal stating that their primary concern was saving the Murray Hotel which is a listed heritage building with valuable affordable housing units. Mr. Henriquez added that they had designed a companion piece for the Murray Hotel. He noted that there are restrictions on the site because of the view cone and the guidelines and are bounded by a brick-clad concrete office and residential building to the south. The building maintains an urban street edge on Hornby Street while providing semi-private spaces for the townhouses. The Murray Hotel façade is mirrored through brick, steel and glass screens at the base of the tower.
Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plans noting the planted courtyard in the space between the two buildings. The space between the proposal and the Murray Hotel has been created for a sense of separation with a green screen. It will be a shade garden and will come under the building and out to meet the sidewalk. All the roof decks will have plantings on them with groupings of bamboo.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Consider attention to CPTED issues;
  - Further consideration should be given to the landscaping especially in the lane and the north courtyard;
  - Consider improving oblique views from units facing the London Place building; and
  - Consideration for more sustainable measures.

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and commended the applicant team for a finely crafted piece of architecture on a challenging urban infill site.

The Panel supported the building massing and density as they thought there were no other options with the restrictions on the site and gave a simple form to the project. They also supported the floor plate size and the separation between the adjoining building (London Place). The Panel thought the street response was clever and liked the way the fins on the townhouse units matched the set back of the Murray Hotel. One Panel member noted that diversity was needed in the residential projects in the downtown and commended the architect for designing something different than the usual tower with townhouses at the base. The Panel thought the setbacks worked on the site with several Panel members suggested the tower could go higher.

The Panel agreed that saving the Murray Hotel was enough of a benefit to the City that the relaxations to the tower separation guidelines were warranted. One Panel member cautioned the applicant against using similar coloured brick to the Murray Hotel as it needed to look different from the heritage. The Panel supported the streetscape interface with Murray hotel and thought it was well handled. Most of the Panel liked the light well and the landscaped area between the tower and the Murray Hotel. One Panel member suggested adding some lighting on the hotel to make an interesting element at night as part of the experience of looking out and entering through that area.

Regarding liveability, they Panel thought it was well done even though there were a couple of odd unit layouts but they felt they were an opportunity to offer some affordable housing. Overall they thought the units were well designed. One Panel member suggested changing the layout of the kitchen in the through units to add more light into the back of the suite. One Panel member was somewhat concerned with the townhouses under the tower that have bedrooms with little light access. However other panel members were not concerned by the shadowing of the townhouse units by the tower overhang.

The Panel liked the void space under the tower as it extended the courtyard. They also liked that the streetwall expression of the Murray Hotel had been extended to the base of the tower and had added a lot of visual interest to the building by re-interpreting the traditional masonry expression. A couple of Panel members thought the lane way could be enhanced and encouraged the applicant to revisit the wall and make sure it isn’t a palette for street art. They suggested pulling the wall back and dressing it up as the lane is a bit harsh in terms of treatment and overlook.

The Panel thought the proposed materials were right and would give an overall elegance to the project.
A couple of Panel members thought the landscaping was on the right track, but needed more work and suggested simplifying the landscaping to make it more urban, more crisp and as well make sure the planting don’t get too high and reduce light into the units. A couple of Panel members were concerned with that the interior and exterior amenity spaces are at opposite ends of the building. They noted that the space needs to attract people to come and use it.

Regarding sustainability, the Panel thought the site helped with passive design and that the amount of glazing that is exposed will be minimal. They suggested looking at the design to see where passive design can be improved and to take the sustainable features to a higher level. One Panel member noted that the long façade faces south-west and will receive a lot of solar gain. Another Panel member suggested that further subtle articulation to the south west façade could improve oblique views, light access and thermal performance.

- Applicant’s Response: Mr. Henriquez thanked the Panel for their comments.

ENGINEERING SERVICES

The recommendations of Engineering Services are contained in the prior-to conditions noted in Appendix A attached to this report.

CRIME PREVENTION THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN (CPTED)

The recommendations of CPTED are contained in the prior-to conditions noted in Appendix A attached to this report.

HERITAGE PLANNING

Heritage Value:

The Murray Hotel has heritage value as an example of a midsized downtown residential hotel with notable architectural features and a history that tells us about residential hotel architecture in Vancouver and the role of small developers in building the city. Constructed between 1912 and 1915 for original owner and contractor Fred Murray, the building was designed by architect E. E. Workman. The building’s architectural qualities are reminiscent of the Richardsonian Romanesque style, which is typified by heavier pilasters, rounded stone arches and a rusticated base. Other notable features include the elaborate metal cornice with dentils, the brick façade, and the arched windows. It was originally built as an apartment building containing studio and 1 bedroom units, but was converted to a hotel shortly after its completion. In 1919 the hotel was leased to the “Royal North West Mounted Police” (which later was amalgamated with the Dominion Police to form the Royal Canadian Mounted Police) and used as temporary barracks for 2 years. For the majority of the building’s life it has served as long term hotel/rooming house providing low income housing and was designated as Single Room Accommodation in 2003. Other distinguishing details are the recessed light wells on both interior side walls. The building is listed in the “B” evaluation category on the Vancouver Heritage Register.

Vancouver Heritage Commission:

On September 8, 2008, the commission reviewed the application on 1155 Hornby Street and unanimously passed the following resolution:

THAT, regarding the project at 1119 Hornby Street (Murray Hotel - Project Address: 1155 Hornby Street), the Vancouver Heritage Commission (VHC) supports the project as presented at its September 8, 2008 meeting, specifically noting the following:
i) support for the Draft Statement of Significance with the following additions to the character-defining elements:
   • south light well wall finish; and
   • the original configuration of the transom windows of the ground floor front façade;
ii) support for the conservation plan as presented with the addition of the finish to the south light well wall, and masonry around the windows seismically tied, if required on the Murray Hotel façade;
iii) support for relationship between the Murray Hotel and the new development as presented;
iv) support for the proposed tower location noting its relaxation;
v) support for the front yard relaxations as proposed; and

FURTHER THAT the VHC supports designation of the Murray Hotel and the restoration covenant.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

The upgrades to the building associated with heritage façade retention would improve the building condition however the infrastructure of the building will need major renovations in the future given the age of the building. Given the type of work proposed the applicant does not require an SRA permit. On the basis that this designated building could receive City heritage incentives for future renovations through rezoning, Housing supports this project. Housing supports that the building remain as an SRA with the limited heritage upgrade as long as it is done without displacing any tenants and continues to accommodate permanent residents as required by the SRA By-law.

Housing Policy

Housing Policy supports the development application. The project supports the implementation of Council’s Housing and Homelessness Strategy 2012-2021 which identifies the strategic direction to encourage a housing mix across all neighbourhoods that enhances quality of life through the priority action to protect the existing rental stock.

The applicant intends to continue the operations of the Murray Hotel under its current mission statement and hotel policies to “provide accommodations without the criterion of financial or social status for those capable of independent living and for whom other types of accommodations are not readily available.” All current residents of the Murray Hotel are recipients of income assistance. All 108 SRA-designated rooms will be retained and tenants will be able to continue living at the Murray Hotel throughout the course of the renovations.

To mitigate expressed and possible tenant concerns, a complete construction schedule and/or tenant relocation plan will be established as a condition of the development permit. The tenant relocation plan will describe measures to manage operational issues, mitigate resident displacement, and address concerns that may occur during construction. (see Condition 1.2)

Social Infrastructure

Play Area and Amenity Rooms

The proposed 20 storey tower and 6 street oriented townhouses, which comprise this development application, contains 45 units with two or more bedrooms (27% of total units) which may be suitable for families with children. The High Density Housing for Families with Children Guidelines should therefore be considered and incorporated into the plans for this site.

The applicant has provided a multi-purpose amenity room with a kitchen on the main floor with an accessible washroom located nearby on the same level, which is generally consistent with High Density
Housing for Families with Children Guidelines; however, there is no outdoor area proposed which is suitable for children’s play. Design development is needed to the podium level outdoor common amenity area located adjacent to the lane, to make it universally accessible and to include a children’s play area. (see Condition A.1.23)

Urban Agriculture

The City of Vancouver Food Policy identifies environmental and social benefits associated with urban agriculture and seeks to encourage opportunities to grow food in the city. The Urban Agriculture Guidelines for the Private Realm encourage edible landscaping and shared gardening opportunities on private land.

Design development to the podium at the lane is needed to make it universally accessible and to incorporate landscape elements such as edible landscaping and/or garden plots consistent with the Urban Agriculture Guidelines for the Private Realm. These landscape elements should be design to benefit from on-site composting and rainwater collection systems, and have the necessary infrastructure, such as tool storage, hose bibs and potting benches which support urban agricultural activity. (see Condition A.1.24)

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BRANCH

Site Profile was submitted with the original development submission in 2008. No Schedule 2 uses and no “yes” answers were noted on the Site Profile. The recommendation of Environmental Protection is contained in Appendix A. (see Condition A.3.1)

PROCESSING CENTRE - BUILDING

This Development Application submission has not been fully reviewed for compliance with the Building By-law. The applicant is responsible for ensuring that the design of the building meets the Building By-law requirements. The options available to assure Building By-law compliance at an early stage of development should be considered by the applicant in consultation with Processing Centre-Building staff.

To ensure that the project does not conflict in any substantial manner with the Building By-law, the designer should know and take into account, at the Development Application stage, the Building By-law requirements which may affect the building design and internal layout. These would generally include: spatial separation, fire separation, exiting, access for physically disabled persons, type of construction materials used, fire fighting access and energy utilization requirements.

Further comments regarding Building By-law requirements are contained in Appendix C attached to this report.

NOTIFICATION

Notification post cards were sent previously on September 30, 2008 and on March 15, 2010 to the neighbouring property owners advising them of the application, and offering additional information on the city’s website. The first notification resulted in 8 objections and the second notification resulted in 18 objections. The neighbours were opposed to the reduction in the 80 feet tower separation and the stated that the overall scale of the development was too much density for this site. Neighbours were concerned that this would lead to loss of natural light, view loss, reduction in privacy, increase in traffic, and increase in noise.

On June 1, 2012, 2345 notification post cards were sent to neighbouring property owners advising them of the application, and offering additional information on the city’s website.
There were 16 formal responses to the notification: 1 in support, 1 neutral and 14 opposed to the development proposal. Summary of objections are as follows:

- concerned that none of the comments and concerns made between London Place and the City with the previous development schemes have been addressed;
- too much development in this area and lack of park or public space to offset high density development in this area;
- strongly object to reducing tower separation guideline from required 80 feet to 71.5 feet and the rear setback from 4.57 m to 4.40 m;
- proposed townhouses will come too close the residential suites of the third floor of London Place;
- height of the building is exceeding view cone;
- scale of tower at 20 storeys is too much density, height and scale for this small site and will reduce the quality of life for residents of London Place(1177 Hornby) by eliminating much of the natural light; reducing privacy; increasing traffic; and decreasing property values for London Place;
- suggest incorporating the SRO accommodation into the new and improved design for 1155 Hornby instead of squeezing it in between London Place and Murray Hotel; this could provide larger setback and allow more light and preserve more views;
- proposed parking entrance will increase traffic and be dangerous for London Place residents (e.g. back lane is also used for taxi and HandyDart drop off/pick up as the front Hornby Street has stopping restrictions due to the newly added Hornby Street bike lane);
- new tower is not respectful of the existing heritage building (i.e. Murray Hotel); and
- light study does not take into account that the proposed tower will block out only direct sunlight that north facing apartments of London Place are currently receiving (i.e. morning sun), as well as afternoon sunlight reflected back to them from Wall Centre.

**Staff Response:**
The Downtown Official Development Plan (DODP) and Guidelines for this site, located within the Burrard-Granville sub-area of Downtown South, anticipate this area develop incrementally from a low density mixed development into a high density residential neighbourhood. The guidelines seek a strong street wall enclosure with a minimum height of 30 ft. and a maximum height of 70 ft. The podium transitions down in scale to address the neighbourliness impacts from the lower units in London Place to a height of approx. 25 ft., 5 ft. less than the guideline recommended street wall height of 30 ft.

While the tower siting does not achieve the guideline’s recommended tower separation of 80 ft. it does exceed the minimum recommended setback of 40 ft. given the preservation and relationship with the Murray Hotel, staff support the modest reduction in tower separation to 71.5 ft., noting the view aperture of the units within London Place are reduced by only 4 to 5% compared to a tower that achieved the guideline tower separation of 80 ft.

Some of the community feedback on this application was a concern around additional traffic in the lane as generated by this site. Staff feel that the site is design appropriately with the parking entry at the lane.
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT STAFF COMMITTEE COMMENTS:

The Staff Committee has considered the approval sought by this application and concluded that with respect to the Zoning and Development By-law and Official Development Plan it requires a decision by the Development Permit Board.

With respect to the decision by the Development Permit Board, the application requires the Development Permit Board to exercise discretionary authority as delegated to the Board by Council.

Staff Committee recommend that the Board exercises its authority under the provision of Section 3.9 of the Downtown Official Development Plan and Section 3.2.5 of the Zoning and Development By-law, including Heritage Policies and Guidelines adopted by Council, to permit an increase in the maximum permitted floor area by 2,439 sq. m, subject to Council approval of the designation of the ‘Murray Hotel’ at 1119 Hornby Street as a protected heritage property.

J. Greer  
Chair, Development Permit Staff Committee

A. Molaro, Architect AIBC  
Senior Development Planner

B. Mah  
Project Coordinator

Project Facilitator: D. Jung
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT STAFF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a list of conditions that must also be met prior to issuance of the Development Permit.

A.1 Standard Conditions

A.1.1 provision of fully dimensioned floor plans and parking plans;

Note to Applicant: Add perimeter dimensions to the floor plans, including dimensions to all exclusions from FSR and balconies. Clarify all yard setbacks from the property lines for the parking structure, podium and tower. Show all property lines on the site plan and floor plans, and section locations on all plans with correct references. Confirm use of the commercial space on the main floor of the existing Murray Hotel. Delete one of the stairs going up from level 20 to the elevator/mechanical penthouse. Clarify the vertical clearance of the disability parking spaces in parking levels P1 and P2, including all entrances, exits, drive aisles, other access to and egress from these spaces. Correct the numbering of the parking spaces on parking level P2 and bicycle summary on parking level P1. Provide a FSR and unit summary on the cover sheet. All measurements must be either metric or Imperial, not a mix of both.

A.1.2 provision of clear, complete, color-coded FSR drawings, including a summary of all exclusions for each level;

Note to Applicant: To claim for exterior wall exclusions, wall details are required clearly showing the type, materials, and thickness of wall and portion of wall to be excluded from FSR. The wall schedule should be included as part of the color-coded FSR drawings and letter from the Building Envelope Professional. Total numbers from all summaries at each level should match those in the FSR summary on the cover sheet. Storage area in the basement of the Murray Hotel needs to be added to the total FSR. Clarify and provide a summary of the semi-private open spaces (common courtyards).

A.1.3 provision of detailed calculations of the height of the tower and elevator/mechanical penthouse;

Note to Applicant: Using City building grades at the corners of the site, interpolate to the critical points (usually towards the lowest corner) of the tower and elevator/mechanical penthouse. The critical points and distances from the property lines should be clearly shown on a separate site/roof plan with the site dimensions and calculations, sealed and signed. Clarify all top of parapet wall elevations on the building elevations and sections.

A.1.4 details of balcony enclosures;

Note to Applicant: To qualify for an exclusion from floor space ratio (FSR) calculations, an enclosed balcony must be a distinct space separated from the remainder of the dwelling unit by walls, glass, and glazed doors (hinged or sliding), have an impervious floor surface (tiles or stone), a flush threshold at the bottom of the door (for disabled access), large, openable windows for ventilation, and distinct exterior architectural expression. In addition, each dwelling unit should have no more than one enclosed balcony, and all balconies, both open and enclosed, should be clearly identified on the floor plans. Notation should also be made on the plans stating: “All enclosed balconies shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the Council-approved Balcony Enclosure Guidelines.” Limitations on the amount of exclusions and enclosures permitted are described within the regulations of the respective District Schedule or Official Development Plan that apply to the specific site. For further details and specifications on enclosure requirements, refer to the Council-approved Balcony Enclosure Guidelines.
A.1.5 clarification of the horizontal angles of daylight from the habitable rooms adjacent to and facing the existing Murray Hotel at each floor level, and the vertical angle of daylight;

A.1.6 design development to locate, integrate and fully screen any emergency generator, exhaust or intake ventilation, electrical substation and gas meters in a manner that minimizes their visual and acoustic impact on the building's open space and the Public Realm;

**Note to Applicant:** Consideration should be given to switching the locations of parking air intake and exhaust shafts.

A.1.7 addition of the following notes on the plans:

“The design of the parking structure regarding safety and security measures shall be in accordance with Section 4.13 of the Parking By-law.”;

“The design of the bicycle spaces (including bicycle rooms, compounds, lockers and/or racks) regarding safety and security measures shall be in accordance with the relevant provisions of Section 6 of the Parking By-law.”;

“The acoustical measures will be incorporated into the final design and construction based on the consultant’s recommendations.”;

“Adequate and effective acoustic separation will be provided between the commercial and residential portions of the building.”;

“Mechanical equipment (ventilators, generators, compactors and exhaust systems) will be designed and located to minimize the noise impact on the neighbourhood and to comply with Noise By-law #6555.”; and

“One electrical outlet will be provided for every two Class A bicycle spaces.”;

A.1.8 submission of an updated acoustical consultant's report which assesses noise impacts on the site and recommends noise mitigation measures in order to achieve noise criteria;

A.1.9 confirmation that at least 20 percent of all off-street parking spaces will be available for charging of electric vehicles;

**Note to Applicant:** Although this is a Building By-law requirement under Part 13 of the Vancouver Building By-law, the Director of Planning is seeking acknowledgement that this condition can be met during the Building Application review of this development. For more information, refer to the website link: [http://vancouver.ca/sustainability/EVcharging.htm](http://vancouver.ca/sustainability/EVcharging.htm).

**Standard Landscape Conditions**

A.1.10 design development to the amenity deck to provide opportunities for social activity, such as additional seating, a children’s play area or tables and chairs for outdoor eating;

A.1.11 provision of a lane edge planter that is raised 1'-6” above grade in order to protect the proposed trees and shrubs from vehicles using the lane;

**Note to Applicant:** The detail of the raised planter should be included in the architectural section on page A2.03.

A.1.12 provision of a notation on the architectural elevation drawing (page A3.01) indicating the materials to be used for the street facing retaining walls in front of the townhouse entrances;
A.1.13 provision of a vine for the ground floor hanging green screen that will attach by tendrils to the
green screen structure, rather than by attachment directly to a surface;

Note to Applicant: The adhesive qualities of the proposed Boston Ivy Vine may damage the
wall of the adjacent Murray Hotel, particularly if the vine ever needs to be removed.

A.1.14 clarification on the Landscape Plan the location of Landscape Section A-A;

A.1.15 provision of a high efficiency irrigation system for all planters, including the upper terrace
areas;

Note to Applicant: Hose bibs shall be provided in all private patio that show individual
planting pots and small planters [Notations to that effect should be added to the drawings].
The irrigation system design and installation system shall be in accordance with the Irrigation
Industry of B.C. Standards and Guidelines.

A.1.16 provision of the following notation on the Landscape Plan for new street trees: “Final spacing,
quantity, tree species to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering services. New
trees must be of good standard, minimum 6cm caliper, and installed with approved root
barriers, tree guards and appropriate soil. Root barriers shall be 8 feet long and 18 inches in
deep. Planting depth of root ball must be below sidewalk grade. New street trees to be
provided adjacent to the development site, to be confirmed prior to the issuance of the
building permit. Call Park Board for inspection after tree planting completion.”;

Note to Applicant: Contact Eileen Curran, Streets Engineering [604.871.6131] to confirm tree
planting locations and Park Board [604.257.8587] for tree species selection and planting
requirements.

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)

A.1.17 design development to take into consideration CPTED principles including:
(a) reducing opportunities for theft in the underground parking areas;
(b) reducing opportunities for mischief and vandalism such as graffiti; and
(c) reducing all wall recession and keeping niches to a minimum;

Standard Heritage Conditions

A.1.18 submission of a complete heritage conservation plan, to be prepared by a heritage consultant
that includes the following:

• updated Statement of Significance (SoS); and
• outline specifications of proposed conservation procedures which are consistent with
acceptable conservation techniques and methodologies including any cleaning, restoration
or repair procedures to heritage surfaces or features;

Note to Applicant: The heritage conservation plan must conform to best practices as detailed
in the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada.

A.1.19 provision of a colour scheme and paint samples of the various components of the heritage
building proposed to be painted, including, but not limited to window and door frames,
cornices and decorative elements (See Vancouver Heritage Foundation brochure titled “Paint”
for general preparation and maintenance issues, and their brochure titled “True Colours” for
determining historic colours www.vancouverheritagefoundation.org/oldhouse.html);
A.1.20 submission of drawings (including sections) for the proposed storefront reconstruction based on archival photographs including proposed materials, dimensions, finishes, window and door schedule;

A.1.21 provision of overall signage concept/location and operating mechanism;

**Note to Applicant:** Elevations should note that signage is illustrative and that a separate sign permit is required to consider/approve the location and type of signage.

### Housing Policy

A.1.22 provision of more detail plans with room numbers for the Murray Hotel;

**Note to Applicant:** The current business license for the Murray Hotel lists 87 residential rooms (4 dwelling units, 38 housekeeping units, and 45 sleeping units). Reconcile and update the business license to reflect the number of rooms as shown in plans.

### Social Infrastructure

A.1.23 design development to the outdoor common roof deck on the podium at the lane to provide universal accessibility and to incorporate a children’s play area;

**Note to Applicant:** Particular care should be given to avoid the use of toxic plants and landscaping materials in and around common outdoor amenity areas. Edible landscaping is encouraged. Play equipment is not required, and creative landscape/play features (such as balancing logs and boulders, a small/tangible water stream or feature, creative motor-skills developing feature, etc.) which provide a myriad of creative play opportunities for a range of ages is encouraged.

A.1.24 design development to the podium at the lane to include edible landscaping and/or garden plots, on-site composting, tool storage, hose bibs and potting benches which support urban agricultural activity, and to make some garden plots universally accessible as per the “Urban Agriculture Guidelines for the Private Realm”;

**Note to Applicant:** Consideration should be given to a rainwater collection system to assist with irrigation.

### A.2 Standard Engineering Conditions

A.2.1 arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services, for site consolidation of all the lots;

**Note to Applicant:** The applicant may find that it is desirable to subdivide the North ½ of Lot 32, Lot 33 & Lot 1 into one lot, and Lots 34 & 35 into a second lot. This is acceptable provided that the Murray Hotel does not encroach onto the southerly lot, or that arrangements are made, to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services, for any related encroachments or cross-boundary easements. The large landscaping feature consisting of concrete piers and hanging green screen would be straddling a potential property line along the south side of the hotel; also a garbage room is being provided in the new building for the use of the hotel. Another option would be to create an airspace parcel(s) and a remainder parcel.

A.2.2 arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services, for a new encroachment agreement for all existing and proposed encroachments of the Murray Hotel Building onto City property, as existing Easement and Indemnity Agreement R66623 does not cover all of the building encroachments;
Note to Applicant: An application to the City Surveyor is required. For general information, see Encroachment Guide
The developer should be advised that building encroachments onto City street will cause problems if strata titling a property due to Section 244(1)(f) of the Strata Property Act. In such cases, the City of Vancouver may not necessarily support the provision of the required easements for any parts of the building on City street. If strata titling of the Murray Hotel is proposed, the applicant is advised to seek independent legal advice on the matter.

A.2.3 arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning in consultation with the General Manager of Engineering Services, for the appropriate agreements to secure access and use of the required parking spaces for the Murray Hotel located on the tower site;

Note to Applicant: The Murray Hotel must have access to the parking stalls provided as part of this development. If the Hotel is intended to be subdivided then an easement and legal covenant is required to secure off-site access and use of those stalls.

A.2.4 arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning in consultation with the General Manager of Engineering Services, for appropriate access agreements to proposed Murray Hotel garbage facilities located on the tower site;

A.2.5 clarification as to whether the encroaching filler pipe in the lane covered by Easement & Indemnity Agreement 463201M) is still in existence and still in use;

Note to Applicant: If no longer in existence or use, arrangements must be made, to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services and the General Manager of Engineering Services, for release of this charge.

A.2.6 clarification of the cavity in the lane at the rear of the hotel;

Note to Applicant: Section 1 indicates a cavity in the lane at the rear of the hotel which does not appear to be involved with the filler pipe. Clarification of this cavity is required, and, if still existing, decommissioning and removal is required, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services.

A.2.7 provision of all City building grades on ground floor plan;

Note to Applicant: Two building grades (32.25 and 32.54) are missing on Hornby Street.

A.2.8 provision of Downtown South streetscape design adjacent the site, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services;

Note to Applicant: Submit a copy of the landscape plan directly to Engineering Services for review.

A.2.9 written confirmation that all utilities will be underground, within private property and a pad mounted transformer is within private property; and

Note to Applicant: The General Manager of Engineering Services will require all utility services to be underground for this “conditional” development. All electrical services to the site must be primary with all electrical plant, which include but not limited to, junction boxes, switchgear, pad mounted transformer are to be located on private property. There will be no reliance on secondary voltage from the existing overhead electrical network on the street right-of-way. BC Hydro is to be contacted in the initial stages of the development design to
determine their electrical service requirements. Any alterations to the existing overhead/underground utility network to accommodate this development will require approval by the Utilities Management Branch. The applicant is required to show details of how the site will be provided with all services being underground. Please contact Bill Moloney at 604.873.7373 for further information.

A.3 Standard Environmental Protection Branch Conditions:

A.3.1 a qualified environmental consultant must be available to quantify, characterize and manage suspect environmental media encountered during subsurface work.
B.1 Standard Notes to Applicant

B.1.1 The applicant is advised to note the comments of the Processing Centre - Building contained in the Staff Committee Report dated July 4, 2012. Further, confirmation that these comments have been acknowledged and understood, is required to be submitted in writing as part of the “prior-to” response.

B.1.2 It should be noted that if conditions 1.0 and 2.0 have not been complied with on or before January 30, 2013, this Development Application shall be deemed to be refused, unless the date for compliance is first extended by the Director of Planning.

B.1.3 This approval is subject to any change in the Official Development Plan and the Zoning and Development By-law or other regulations affecting the development that occurs before the permit is issuable. No permit that contravenes the by-law or regulations can be issued.

B.1.4 Revised drawings will not be accepted unless they fulfill all conditions noted above. Further, written explanation describing point-by-point how conditions have been met, must accompany revised drawings. An appointment should be made with the Project Facilitator when the revised drawings are ready for submission.

B.1.5 A new development application will be required for any significant changes other than those required by the above-noted conditions.

B.1.6 The issuance of this permit does not warrant compliance with the relevant provisions of the Provincial Health and Community Care and Assisted Living Acts. The owner is responsible for obtaining any approvals required under the Health Acts. For more information on required approvals and how to obtain them, please contact Vancouver Coastal Health at 604-675-3800 or visit their offices located on the 12th floor at 601 West Broadway. Should compliance with the Health Acts necessitate changes to this permit and/or approved plans, the owner is responsible for obtaining approval for the changes prior to commencement of any work under this permit. Additional fees may be required to change the plans.

B.2 Conditions of Development Permit:

B.2.1 All approved off-street vehicle parking, loading and unloading spaces, and bicycle parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with the relevant requirements of the Parking By-law within 60 days of the date of issuance of any required occupancy permit or any use or occupancy of the proposed development not requiring an occupancy permit and thereafter permanently maintained in good condition.

B.2.2 All landscaping and treatment of the open portions of the site shall be completed in accordance with the approved drawings within six (6) months of the date of issuance of any required occupancy permit or any use or occupancy of the proposed development not requiring an occupancy permit and thereafter permanently maintained in good condition.

B.2.3 All approved street trees shall be planted in accordance with the approved drawings within six (6) months of the date of issuance of any required occupancy permit, or any use or occupancy of the proposed development not requiring an occupancy permit, and thereafter permanently maintained in good condition.

B.2.4 All services, including telephone, television cables and electricity, shall be completely underground.

B.2.5 Amenity spaces (multi-purpose, video and exercise rooms) of 151 m², excluded from the computation of floor space ratio, shall not be put to any other use, except as described in the
approved application for the exclusion. Access and availability of the use of all amenity facilities located in this project shall be made to all residents and occupants of the building; AND

Further, the amenity spaces and facilities approved as part of this Development Permit shall be provided and thereafter be permanently maintained for use by residents and users of this building.

B.2.6 The enclosed balconies are to be maintained at all times in accordance with the balcony enclosure details on the approved plans and are not to be used as an integral part of the interior space of the building.

B.2.7 In accordance with Protection of Trees By-law Number 9958, all trees are to be planted prior to issuance of any required occupancy permit, or use or occupancy of the proposed development not requiring an occupancy permit, and thereafter permanently maintained in good condition.

B.2.8 A qualified environmental consultant must be available to quantify, characterize and manage suspect environmental media encountered during subsurface work.

Note to Applicant: In the event contamination is discovered during subsurface work, the following will be required:

- Environmental Soil Reports to be provided and forwarded to Environmental Protection for further review and comment;
- a Ministry of Environmental instrument of approval (Certificate of Compliance) to the applicable land use; and
- submission for a Waste Discharge Permit for dewatering activities for the project.

B.2.9 An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan is required at the Building Permit application stage for review and acceptance.

B.2.10 This site is affected by a Development Cost Levy By-law and levies will be required to be paid prior to issuance of Building Permits. For more information, please refer to the Development Cost Levies Information Bulletin, available at the Planning Department Reception Counter, or online at vancouver.ca/financegrowth. The next increase is scheduled for September 30, 2012; projects without a Building Permit in process will be charged at a higher rate. Additional information about the increase can be found at vancouver.ca/commsvcs/planning/infobul1.pdf.
Processing Centre - Building comments

The following comments have been provided by Processing Centre - Building and are based on the architectural drawings prepared by Henriquez Partners dated July 11, 2008 for this Development application. This is a preliminary review intended to identify areas in which the proposal may conflict with requirements of the Vancouver Building By-law.

1. Building safety facilities such as central alarm and control facility, fire fighter’s elevator, and stairwells equipped with standpipe connections shall be coordinated with the location of the firefighter’s entrance.

2. Building construction is required to be noncombustible.

3. Highrise building and VBBL 3.2.6. requirements for high buildings apply to the entire building.

4.* All entrances, exits, drive aisles and other access to off-street disability parking spaces, and egress therefrom must have a minimum vertical clearance of 2.3 m, as required by the Parking By-law.

5.* The building is required to provide accessible routes for access to persons with disabilities to all common areas, storage, amenity, meeting rooms, etc. The bicycle storage rooms on Level 1 do not comply.

6.* The building is required to meet Enhanced Accessibility provisions.

7.* At least 2 exits are required from Parking Level 1 East side.

8.* At least 2 accessible paths of travel to 2 separate exits are required from the parking floors containing stalls for persons with disability.

9.* Additional exit may be required from storage garage where security gate is provided.

10. Storage garage security shall conform to 3.3.6.7.

11. Exit lobby is located within an interconnected floor space and thus not permitted.

12. Limiting distance is too short at the townhouse windows on a slant facing the interior property line.

*Items marked with an asterisk have been identified as serious non-conforming Building By-law issues. The 2008 Building comments have been included in this report as much of it is still applicable.
The following comments are based on the architectural drawings prepared by Henriquez Partners dated Apr. 18/12 which have been submitted for the Development Application, DE412314. This is a cursory review in order to identify issues which do not comply with 2007 Vancouver Building By-law.

1. Use the following diagram for H/C clearances for doors into bicycle rooms, storage rooms in the parkade, doors to access the elevators from the H/C parking, etc.

2.* Access to two exits is required for each level of parkade, on both sides of an overhead gate, and pedestrian access to exits is to be separate from a drive aisle steeper than 5%. Level P2 needs to be reviewed.

3. Ground Floor:
   a) The principal entrance is to have a vestibule per ASHRAE 90.1, 2007.
   b) The route to the residential garbage/recycling is to be H/C accessible.
   c) Only one of the exits is permitted to pass through an “exit lobby”.
   d) An exit is required to be protected out to the public thoroughfare, so is not permitted to pass through a loading bay.
   e) A garbage area is not permitted to discharge directly into an exit, and is required to have man-door access to 2 exits.

4.* Level 2: If the Terrace is an amenity for the Tower suites, it is required to be H/C accessible.

5. Spatial Separation should be reviewed for exposures.

6. Roof top mechanical rooms are not permitted to open directly into an exit.

*Items marked with an asterisk have been identified as serious non-conforming Building By-law issues.

Written confirmation that the applicant has read and has understood the implications of the above noted comments is required and shall be submitted as part of the “prior-to” response.

The applicant may wish to retain the services of a qualified Building Code consultant in case of difficulty in comprehending the comments and their potential impact on the proposal. Failure to address these issues may jeopardize the ability to obtain a Building Permit or delay the issuance of a Building Permit for the proposal.
## Plant List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Genus Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Var. Type</th>
<th>Growth Season</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quercus phellos</td>
<td>Dutch Elm</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>B 2-4</td>
<td>30'-35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ulmus americana</td>
<td>American Elm</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>D 5-8</td>
<td>30'-35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>False Acacia</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>D 12-16</td>
<td>30'-35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Acer saccharum</td>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B 4-6</td>
<td>30'-35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Populus deltoides</td>
<td>Japanese Maple</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B 4-6</td>
<td>30'-35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Betula nigra</td>
<td>Black Birch</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B 4-6</td>
<td>30'-35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fagus grandiflora</td>
<td>European Beech</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>D 5-8</td>
<td>30'-35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Taxus baccata</td>
<td>European Yew</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B 4-6</td>
<td>30'-35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Viburnum opulus</td>
<td>European Viburnum</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B 4-6</td>
<td>30'-35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Viburnum opulus var. Plicatum</td>
<td>Japanese Viburnum</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B 4-6</td>
<td>30'-35'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

1. All nurseries to be delivered to the plantlist specified in this document. The plantlist is subject to the approval of the landscape architect and landscape engineer association.
2. Any changes or additions will require written approval.
3. Five percent of all plant materials will be delivered as specified, and the remainder will be delivered in future harvesting cycles.
4. Plants will be supplied in 4-inch containers and 6-inch diameter pots.
5. All plant materials will be delivered to the landscape architect and landscape engineer association for approval.
6. The landscape architect will provide a written report for each plant species delivered, including soil conditions, irrigation requirements, and maintenance instructions.
7. Consultations to confirm plant quantities and specifications are required.
8. The plantlist is subject to change at the discretion of the landscape architect and landscape engineer association.
9. Prior to the start of construction, all landscape materials will be delivered and planted according to the plantlist.
10. All plant materials to be delivered are subject to the plantlist and any applicable regulations.
EXISTING CONDITION

1. CRACKED AND DETERIORATED PLASTER
2. PLASTER, PREVIOUS PATCHES
3. PAINTED PLASTER
4. DAMAGED AND DETERIORATED MASONRY
5. HISTORIC PAINTED WALL COATS
6. PAINTED SHINGLED
7. METAL WORK WITH RUSTED ANGLES, DETERIORATED PAINT
8. WOOD FRAME WINDOWS DETERIORATED PAINT
9. METAL FRAME WINDOWS DETERIORATED PAINT

EAST ELEVATION - EXISTING CONDITION
LEGEND

1. REPAIR DAMAGED PLASTER TO MATCH EXISTING
2. REPAIR AND REPOINT DETERIORATED MASONRY
3. REPLACE DAMAGED STONE UNITS TO MATCH EXISTING
4. PRESERVE HISTORIC PAINTED WALL DECOGS
5. REMOVE EXISTING PAINT FROM BRICKWORK
6. REPAIR AND REFRESH METAL WORK
7. REPLACE WOOD FRAMED WINDOWS
8. REPAINT METAL FRAME WINDOWS

NOTE
Refer to conservation specifications for detail.

NEW PAINT SCHEDULE BASED ON HISTORIC PAINT ANALYSIS.

EAST ELEVATION
PROPOSED CONSERVATION WORK

APPENDIX 7.1
WEST ELEVATION
PROPOSED CONSERVATION WORK

LEGEND

1. Repair damaged plaster to match existing.
2. Repair and repoint latticed stone masonry.
3. Replace damaged brick units to match existing.
4. Preserve historic painted wall and gons.
5. Remove recent paint from brickwork.
6. Repair and repaint metal work.
7. Repaint wood frame windows.
8. Repaint metal frame windows.

NOTE
Refer to conservation specifications for detail.
New paint schedule based on historic paint analysis.
### 1.6.1 Development Options Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme 1</th>
<th>Scheme 2</th>
<th>Scheme 3</th>
<th>Scheme 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Double-loaded corridor streetwall; assumed development of corner or Helmken and Hornby.</td>
<td>6-Storey streetwall matches the height of the Murray Hotel with set back tower.</td>
<td>Demolition of Murray Hotel; double-loaded corridor streetwall set back from London Place.</td>
<td>Proposed tower.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advantages**
- Good clearance of Burrard Street buildings across the lane. Saves SRO and Heritage resources.
- Good relation to Murray Hotel. Saves SRO and Heritage resources.
- Economical parking structure.
- Good relation to all London Place and Murray Hotel units. Economical construction. Saves SRO and Heritage resources.

**Disadvantages**
- Poor relation to 2 units per floor in London Place. View loss. Extra costs in heritage repair and inefficient parking.
- Poor relation to 2 units per floor in London Place. View loss. Extra costs in heritage repair and inefficient parking.
- Does not save SRO or Heritage resources.
- 71ft versus 80ft setback to London Place. Extra costs in heritage repair and inefficient parking.
This project is truly an example of urban infill under complex and idiosyncratic site/adjacencies.

The two guideline setback relaxations requested are the 80ft space between tower guideline and the 15ft rear yard setback. Both of these setbacks could be easily achieved with demolition of the Murray Hotel. The current homeless crisis in Vancouver plays a significant part in this proposal as the hotel is home to slightly over 100 SRA units. Our proposal is to retain and designate the Murray, its 108 SRA units, and keep the residents housed while upgrading and fully restoring the exterior façades.

This proposed design must balance the following influences:

- Maximize the distance (proposed at 71'6") from the adjacent southern London Place Tower to ensure privacy
- Maximize the courtyard between the south side of the Murray Hotel and the new tower, (proposed at 21ft)
- Decrease the width of the tower (proposed at 74ft) in order to achieve the above goals
- Ensure streetwall continuity on Hornby Street while minimizing impact to the London Place Residential units
- Locate the tower mass so as to not impact the eastern views from the 6 storey medical building across the lane.

- Maximize the setback (proposed at 80ft min.) from the new proposed SRA Building across the lane currently being planned by BC Housing
- Maximize the rear yard setback (proposed at 12ft to building face with localized balconies projecting 8 feet towards the lane)
- Keep the building under the View Cone B1 from the Seawall in False Creek
- Provide compact, affordable market housing: 490sf 1-bedroom and 749sf 2-bedrooms
- Design an affordable Leed® Silver highrise with hotwater radiant heating and no air-conditioning
SCHEME 2
6-Storey streetwall matches the height of the Murray Hotel with set back tower. Assumed development of corner of Helmken and Hornby.
SCHEME 3
Demolition of Murray Hotel set back from London Place. Assumed development of corner of Helmken and Hornby. Articulation to match height of Murray Hotel.
SCHEME 4
Preferred tower. Townhouses on south companion piece to north.
1.7.2 Streetscape Continuity

Urban Street Edge

The building maintains an urban street edge on Hornby Street while providing semi-private spaces for townhouse residents.

Three-storey townhouses on the southern part of the Hornby frontage are set 2.45m back from the property line and on average 3'-6" above grade. Terraced planting screens a private patio overlooking the street providing separation while allowing for 'eyes on the street'.

Brick, Steel and Glass

The Murray Hotel façade is mirrored through brick, steel and glass screen at the base of the tower. Consisting of a similar tripartite façade expression, the raised screen allows views in and out of the Murray Hotel lightwell.
1.7.3 INTERFACE WITH LONDON PLACE

A planted courtyard in the intervening space between the two buildings enhances the views from the units above.

Maximize privacy, minimize outlook

The tower is set 21.78m (71'-6'') away from London Place, exceeding the typical 60" between building façades common in Yaletown. The tower has been carefully designed to maximize privacy and minimize outlook. Balconies were eliminated from the facing units and two of the four south-facing units have their principal outlook to the east and west.
1.7.4 INTERFACE WITH EXISTING MURRAY HOTEL

GREEN COLUMNS
The tower sits 6.591m (21' 7'') from the Murray Hotel's lightwell. A long planter holds a series of three 6'0'' diameter covered 'green' columns. The top of each column holds a cylindrical planter containing bamboo. Green screens span between these structures creating a vertical garden that allows for visual privacy and provides a pleasing outlook. The spacing of the columns allow for diagonal views through to the lane and Hornby Street.
LONDON PLACE
Two units in London Place are affected by the proposed development. The proposed setback of 71' 6" results in a 5% increase in view blockages when compared to the 80°-0" guideline for tower separation. The proposed tower addresses privacy and overlook with the elimination of all south-facing balconies and by orienting all but two of the nine units per floor such that their principal outlook is to the lane and street instead.

NEIGHBOURING DEVELOPMENT
The preferred orientation of the tower minimizes view blockages from the new social housing project at 1134 Burrard Street.