#### CITY OF VANCOUVER COMMUNITY SERVICES GROUP

#### DEVELOPMENT PERMIT STAFF COMMITTEE REPORT MARCH 23, 2011

FOR THE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT BOARD APRIL 4, 2011

## 1075 WEST HASTINGS STREET (COMPLETE APPLICATION) DE414163 - ZONE DD

GP/BM/YMcN/DAB/LH

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT STAFF COMMITTEE A Present: B. Boons (Chair), Development Services J. Greer, Development Services P. Storer, Engineering Services R. The, Engineering Services L. Gayman, Real Estate Services D. Naundorf, Social Infrastructure T. Driessen, Park Board	MEMBERS Also Present: G. Papers, Urban Design & Development Planning R. Segal, Urban Design & Development Planning J. Boldt, Heritage Group B. Mah, Development Services D. Autiero, Development Services
APPLICANT:	PROPERTY OWNER:
Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership	Oxford Properties Group
Attention: Peter Odegaard	Oxford Tower Suite 1100
1600 - Two Bentall Centre	130 Adelaide Street
Vancouver, BC	Toronto, Ontario
V7X 1M9	M5H 3P5

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

• **Proposal:** To construct a 35 storey mixed use office/retail tower on the existing University Club (originally 'Quadra Club') site at 1021 West Hastings Street thereby requesting a 10% heritage bonus, the site is to be consolidated with the westerly existing Guinness Tower. The 'University Club' facade is to be retained and the new construction will integrate the parking and services of the existing Guinness parking with the structures below grade.

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 Applicant's Design Rationale
Appendix F Heritage Commission Minutes
Appendix G Urban Design Panel Minutes of October 6, 2011.
Appendix H Issues Report and Council motion, October 7, 2010; Redevelopment of 1075 W Hastings Street & View Corridors

#### • Issues:

- 1. Quality of tower exterior treatment
- 2. Integration of and relationship to heritage structures
- 3. Plaza and public realm design

• Urban Design Panel: Support

#### DEVELOPMENT PERMIT STAFF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE414163 as submitted the plans and information forming a part thereof, thereby permitting the development of a 35-storey mixed use office/retail tower to be constructed with a 10% heritage bonus on the existing 'University Club' site at 1021 West Hastings Street. The 'University Club' facade is to be retained and the new construction will integrate the parking and services of the existing Guinness parking with the structures below grade, subject to the following conditions:

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

1.1 design development to further refine the detailing of all tower facade details to be consistent with the design intent of mullion details, glass color, transparency, fritting and energy performance as portrayed in the drawings and samples submitted and dated February 9, 2011;

**Note to Applicant**: Superior detailing and precise execution of the facades details are critical to achieving the proposed building aesthetic. Large format (approx. 3' x 3') glass samples along with full performance specifications are required. The differentiation of the east façade from the southwest shall be maintained and where possible enhanced.

- 1.2 design development of the lower façade south and west flared "skirts" creating more transition space to the heritage façade by providing:
  - i) a greater horizontal offset from the west wall of the 'University Club',
  - ii) a greater vertical offset from the top of the 'University Club'.
- 1.3 provision of a green wall treatment on the west wall of the 'University Club' with continuation into the new building lobby;

**Note to Applicant**: Careful testing and selection of species that will thrive in the two microclimates (interior and exterior) will be required including submission of large scale (1/4" or 1:50) section of green wall planter and the lower part of stainless steel cabling system as well as a long-term maintenance regime. The planter should be large enough to support the vines for the full three storey height as shown on the architectural West Elevation (Dwg A302) and should have irrigated to ensure robust plant growth.

1.4 design development to provide continuous weather protection along the full length of the building face through the plaza (from Hastings St to Cordova St) to protect pedestrians from rain and potential wind downdraft;

Note to Applicant: The opportunity to design a highly sculpted, varied and/or "floating" canopy will add visual interest to the Public Realm.

1.5 provision of the activation of the lobby and adjacent plaza by maintaining the three doors sets as indicated on plan A-206, and these doors to remain operable during business hours;

**Note to Applicant:** Provide movable tables and chairs of approximately the same number as shown on Landscape Plan L-1. Applicant is strongly encouraged to pursue at least one lobby-level food & beverage outlet

- 1.6 design refinement of the planter/edge between the Cordova driveway and the plaza, to shorten and/or soften the appearance considering safety and pedestrian desire paths to the entrance;
- 1.7 design development to provide high quality materials and a consistent design treatment to extend down the new ramp walls and ceiling that are visible from the adjacent sidewalk.
- 1.8 design development and necessary widening of the parking ramp to the west of the existing Guinness Building to address the following:
  - i) design refinement of the existing parking cap and seat wall shall be worked into the ramp widening;
  - ii) provide new high quality materials and a consistent design treatment along both walls of this modified parking ramp;
  - iii) improve the visual character and pedestrian experience;

**Note to Applicant**: This parking ramp is integral to the revised parking circulation and viability of the tower, and is highly visible from the sidewalk and surrounding plaza overlooks. The existing parking cap is a dark mass projecting into a sidewalk view of Burrard inlet. Minimize the vertical walls and visual bulk of the entire existing cap, and consider new, lighter materials, rather than expanding the bulk of the existing design.

1.9 re-use and rehabilitation of the existing lobby fireplace and the 'Ship Medallion' in the interior of shell portion of 'The University Club', and consideration to retain the timber trusses in the existing dining room of 'The University Club', and the Lobby painted beams, for re-use in the project in an appropriate way, including the possibility of using them in an interpretive manner.

**Note to Applicant**: regarding the timber trusses and painted beams, if these elements cannot be re-used, then it is recommended that the Vancouver Heritage Foundation be contacted with regard to the sale or re-use of the elements elsewhere as salvage. In this respect these elements should be retained and protected during any interim period.

1.10 maximize retention of the existing material of the west façade of 'The University Club', including within the interior of the new tower if viable, to maximize opportunities for building retention and to allow the corner of the heritage building to read more as a complete structure and further, maximized retention of the existing east wall of 'The Quadra Club' if viable;

**Note to Applicant**: provide a report and details of the condition of the existing east and west walls and the strategy for their greater retention, and revise the plans accordingly. If retention of the west wall is not viable, then provide the analysis in this regard. If the west wall cannot be retained, the new wall should compliment the retained southern façade and minimize the visual perception of the fact that only this portion is retained.

1.11 clarification of changes to the floor configuration behind the secondary doors at the east end of the front façade of 'University Club';

**Note to Applicant**: the interior ramp is shown descending to the first door but not the second, which has a threshold at the same level. The existing doors in both locations are to be retained. Therefore, the lower landing should be extended across to the easternmost door. Consideration may be given to reconfigure the stairs so that they abut the eastern wall to allow for possible window display area at the front windows, noting that their aperture is guite restricted.

1.12 consideration to retain the timber trusses in the existing dining room of 'University Club', and the Lobby painted beams, and re-use them, or some of them, in the project in an appropriate way, including the possibility of using them in an interpretive manner.

**Note to Applicant**: if these elements cannot be re-used, then it is recommended that the Vancouver Heritage Foundation be contacted with regard to the sale or re-use of the elements elsewhere as salvage. In this respect these elements should be retained and protected during any interim period.

- 1.13 consider and anticipate future restaurant exhaust venting requirements, per city standards, and incorporate necessary chases, venting routes and exhaust locations at suitable points on the 4 story 'University Club' structures roof and/or perimeter; (See Standard Condition A.1.8)
- 1.14 identification on the plans and elevations of the built elements contributing to the building's sustainability performance in achieving LEED;

**Note to Applicant**: Provide a LEED<sup>®</sup> checklist confirming LEED<sup>®</sup> equivalency and a detailed written description of how the above-noted points have been achieved with reference to specific building features in the development. Both the checklist and description should be incorporated into the drawing set

- 1.15 arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Director of Legal Services, for a right of way for public use over the plaza public realm.
- 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.

### • Technical Analysis:

	PERMITTED (MAXIMUM)	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
Site Size	-	-	irregular
Site Area	-	-	50,420 sq. ft. (survey plan)
FSR <sup>1</sup>	Basic11.010% Heritage Bonus1.1Total12.1	-	Guinness TowerRetail Stores0.09General Offices6.00Subtotal6.09
			New TowerRetail Stores0.25General Offices5.76Subtotal6.01
			Guinness Tower6.09New Tower6.01Total12.10
Floor Area <sup>1</sup>	Basic         554,620 sq. ft.           10% Heritage Bonus         55,462 sq. ft.           Total         610,082 sq. ft.	-	Guinness TowerRetail Stores4,249 sq. ft.General Offices302,731 sq. ft.Subtotal306,980 sq. ft.
			New TowerRetail Stores12,654 sq. ft.General Offices290,500 sq. ft.Subtotal303,154 sq. ft.
			Guinness Tower         306,980 sq. ft.           New Tower         303,154 sq. ft.           Total         610,134 sq. ft.
Height <sup>2</sup>	450 ft.	-	Top of Flat Roof424.5 ft.Top of Elevator Machine Room449.8 ft.Top of Decorative Roof (low point)425.4 ft.Top of Decorative Roof (high point)469.2 ft.
Parking <sup>3</sup>	Retail/Office 493	Retail/Office 391	Guinness TowerStandard211Small Car23Disability0Subtotal234
			New TowerStandard91Small Car48Disability11Subtotal150
			Guinness Tower234New Tower150Disability Parking Space Bonus7Total391
	Small Car (25% x 384) 96	Disability Spaces 12	Small car spaces71Disability spaces11

	PERMITTED (MAXIMUM)		REQUIRED			PROPOSED		
Bicycle Parking <sup>4</sup>	-		Retail/Office	Class A 113	Class B 6	Retail/Offices	Class A 122	Class B 6
	Vertical (30%)	33	Horizontal (70%)	)	80	Horizontal		110
	-		Lockers (20%)		25	Lockers		37
	-		Electrical Outle	ts	61	Electrical Outlets	(1 outlet/2 sp	aces) 58
	-		Clothing Locker Female Male Total	s (0.7 x)	80 <u>80</u> 160	Clothing Lockers Female Male Total		82 <u>70</u> 152
Loading <sup>5</sup>	-		Retail Stores General Offices Total	n/r	Class B 2 <u>5</u> 7	provided	Class A 12	Class B 3
Amenity	Lot E <u>1(</u>	1,895 sq. ft. <u>),000</u> sq. ft. 1,895 sq. ft.	-			9,028 sq. ft.		

<sup>1</sup>Note on FSR/Floor Area: Pursuant to Section 3.9 of the Downtown Official Development Plan, Section 3.2.5 of the Zoning and Development By-law, and Heritage Policies and Guidelines adopted by Council, the Development Permit Board may permit an increase in the floor space ratio of up to 10%, subject to City Council's designation of the heritage building as a Municipal Heritage Site.

<sup>2</sup>Note on Height: The proposed building height is within the maximum permitted 450 ft. height in this sub-area of the Downtown, however, a portion of the building, including its decorative roof, intrudes slightly into View Corridors 9.1, 9.2.2 and 3.2.3. Council considered this matter on October 7, 2010 and advised the Development Permit Board that it supported these intrusions (refer to Downtown Official Development Plan (DODP), Height: page 8).

<sup>3</sup>Note on Parking: Pursuant to Section 4.1.14 of the Parking By-law, each disability parking space provided to satisfy the minimum required parking of such spaces will count as two parking spaces for the purpose of satisfying the minimum required number of parking spaces. Seven disability parking spaces have been used to top up the minimum required number of parking spaces. Standard Condition A.1.1 seeks the provision of an additional required disability parking space.

<sup>4</sup>Note on Bicycle Parking: Standard Condition A.1.2 seeks the provision of 10 additional clothing lockers for the male change room. Standard Condition A.1.4 seeks the provision of three additional electrical outlets.

<sup>5</sup>Note on Loading: The applicant has proposed additional Class A loading spaces to address the shortfall in required Class B loading. Engineering Condition A.2.13 seeks the provision of a loading management plan. The plan is required to profile anticipated and existing loading conditions and to identify sufficient measures to operate the on-site loading without any impacts on the adjacent streets.

#### Legal Description

Lots: D & E, (Reference Plan 9463) Block: 1 Plan: 92 District Lot: 185

#### • History of Application:

- 10 08 24 Complete DE submitted
- 10 10 06 Urban Design Panel
- 11 02 03 Revised Complete DE submitted
- 11 02 28 Heritage Commission
- 11 02 09 Urban Design Panel
- 11 03 23 Development Permit Staff Committee

• **Site:** The development site is located mid-block between Burrard Street and Thurlow Street and fronts both West Hastings and West Cordova. After consolidation with the Guiness Tower the final site will extend from the Marine Building to Portal Park.

• **Context:** Significant adjacent development includes:



#### • Background:

Discussions on this project have been ongoing since approximately mid-2010. The applicants proposed an office tower on the site between the Marine Building and the Guiness Tower that would incorporate the façade of the University Club along with a heritage density bonus, expand and unify the existing Guinness Tower underground parking and rework the existing plaza. The tower form would slightly project into three View Corridors. Staff considered the general concept to be consistent with the intent of applicable policies and guidelines but advised that Council's advice on any view corridor intrusions would be needed. Further, since the height of the tower projected into the Queen Elizabeth View Corridor, the project would be subject to the Higher Building Policy. Council considered the slight intrusions into the View Corridors on October 7, 2010, and advised the Development Permit Board that it supported the intrusions (refer to *Council's Motion* under Height: below).

An originally submitted version of the tower design went before the expanded High Building Urban Design Panel (UDP) on October 6, 2010, and did not gain support. A significantly revised design was reviewed by the same UDP on February 9, 2011, and gained unanimous support.

#### • Applicable By-laws and Guidelines:

- (1) Downtown Official Development Plan (DODP)
- (2) Heritage Policies and Guidelines
- (3) Council motion, October 7, 2010; Redevelopment of 1075 W Hastings Street & View Corridors
- (4) Downtown Design Guidelines & Plaza Design Guidelines
- (5) General Policy for Higher Buildings
- (6) Sustainability

#### • Response to Applicable By-laws and Guidelines:

#### (1) <u>Downtown Official Development Plan (DODP)</u>

Use: The proposed building is predominantly office commercial, and retail commercial at the base and within the reoccupied 'University Club' volume. Both uses are allowed in the relevant Area A of the DD zone, and support Metro Core Jobs goals and other policies.

Density: The proposed density of 12.1 FSR is comprised of the maximum permitted in this sub-area of 11.0, plus 1.1 FSR (10%) permitted under Section 3.9 of the DDOPP and Section 3.2.5 of the Zoning and Development By-law for retention and restoration of the façade of the University Club (refer to (2) Heritage Policies & Guidelines below).

Height: The proposed building heights (424.5 ft, to roof of habitable space and 449.8 ft. to roof of elevator machine room) are within the permitted 450 ft. maximum height. However, the uppermost height of the tower and "decorative roof" (469.2 ft.) protrude slightly into View Corridors 9.1 and 9.2.2 (Cambie and 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Cambie and 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue respectively) as well as Queen Elizabeth View Corridor 3.2.3. On October 7, 2010, Council considered this height and View Corridor implications and advised the D.P. Board (refer also to (3) below):

THAT Council provide advice to the Development Permit Board in its consideration of a development permit for 1075 West Hastings Street that Council is supportive of a slight intrusion into the Cambie Street view corridors 9.1 and 9.2.2, as the building is effectively within the "view shadow" of existing developments; as well as a slight intrusion into the Queen Elizabeth Park view corridor 3.2.3, which is consistent with Council's General Policy for Higher Buildings, with the condition that the ultimate design must be supported by the Urban Design Panel. This absolute height of 469.2 ft. is to the highest point of the curved decorative roof, which encloses ALL mechanical, elevators, window washing and other roof-top elements.

Parking: The consolidated parking proposed meets the minimums required for office spaces exactly and provides 9 spaces more than minimum required for retail. Bicycle spaces and lockers exceed the minimum required. Minor deficiencies are addressed by DPSC conditions below.

## (2) <u>Heritage Policies and Guidelines (See also Vancouver Heritage Commission, Page 14 and Heritage Planning comments, page 15)</u>

The Heritage Polices 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.

Staff propose that the Development Permit Board consider the increase in permitted density by 10% as provided for in Section 3.9 of the Downtown Official Development Plan and Section 3.2.5 of the Zoning and Development By-law. Various options for the preservation of the heritage building were explored, with the conclusion that the only viable scenario was for retention of the façade and a portion of the west wall. Bonus density of 55,462 sq. ft. provides compensation for this extent of heritage retention. Pursuant to this, Council approval will be sought to designate the retained portions of 'The Quadra Club' (referred to as 'University Club' in this report) as protected heritage features (see Standard Condition A.1.17).

#### (3) Council Motion, October 7, 2010; Redevelopment of 1075 W Hastings Street & View Corridors

Council considered the height, view corridors and other factors of an approximately 460 ft tower (original submission) at this specific site, and provided advice to the D.P. Board in the *motion* on page 8 of this report. This revised proposal respects the general height of the submission reviewed by Council, and has less overall intrusion than contemplated previously. The revised scheme no longer intrudes into View Corridor 9.1. The slight intrusion into 9.2.2 is approximately the same volume but more vertical in proportions. Overall, the revised shape of the top of the tower is more striking and a more dynamic element on the skyline, and has less perceived intrusion into view corridors.

#### (4) Downtown Design Guidelines; and Plaza Design Guidelines

The Downtown Design Guidelines set out flexible performance criteria, rather than prescriptive regulations, for achieving high quality development through provision of : useable public open space and enhanced public realm, including provision of weather protected pedestrian routes; high quality architectural design relating in bulk, massing and treatment to its context and contributing to the built environment. The Plaza Design Guidelines provide performance criteria for the design of connected, active, highly useable, safe, inviting public open spaces that introduce nature into the built environment and contribute positively to the public realm.

The proposal includes a public plaza between Hastings and Cordova Streets, which replaces and expands on an existing, underused pedestrian cul-de-sac which has functional problems and CPTED issues. The proposed plaza creates a dynamic place between towers, and provides a mid-block link in a network of pedestrian plazas that traverse from Pender Street to Cordova Street, and then to Canada Place and the waterfront. Weather protection is provided along the majority of the building face and at entries. However, a gap in the canopy close to Cordova Street to allow a portion of the tower façade to visually extend to grade interrupts the weather protection. Staff recommend the weather protection be continuous, with a light, "floating" canopy design through this area that would also protect pedestrians from potential downdrafts off the face of the tower (Condition 1.4).

The plaza design exhibits many of the Plaza Design Guidelines, including: "good visibility and views; linkages; safety; natural elements; seating; high quality and durable materials". To support the guideline promoting "activity generators"; a specific design condition (Condition 1.5) calls for strongly encourages the plaza and/or building lobby to include at least one food and beverage outlet, and movable table/chairs.

The overall massing of the tower has been configured as a delicate, exceptionally slim insertion between the Marine Building and Guinness Tower. The notably small floor plate for office use (8,000 sq. ft.) and 83 ft. width along with the tower's unique curved and flared shape relates sensitively to the two adjacent heritage buildings while creating an appropriate identity for itself. Separation from other nearby towers, including the residential components of the Shaw Tower and Fairmount Hotel, has been maximized and with its slim, small floor-plate massing, Staff conclude that view impacts on neighbours is acceptable in the context of the CBD's high density core. Architecturally, while Staff believe this revised design will be a striking addition to the downtown, its success relies heavily on the quality of the materials and execution of details. Condition 1.1 calls for further refinement and details to ensure this quality, as indicated in the submission, carries through (see also (5) General Policy for Higher Buildings below).

#### (5) <u>General Policy for Higher Buildings</u>

This policy applies to proposals within a small, defined boundary of the CBD (Central Business District), which exceed 450 feet in height, with discretionary review up to an absolute maximum of 600 feet. The proposed absolute height is 469.2 feet. The proposal meets 10 of the 11 topics for this discretionary review, including: is a recipient site for heritage density bonus; does not demolish any class "A" heritage building; provides an on-site open space/plaza; and undergoes a special review process outlined below, which confirms that the building "exhibit the highest order of architectural excellence".

In addition to the current requirements of review by staff, the Higher Building policy also requires assessment for architectural excellence by a special High Building Urban Design Panel consisting of the regular panel augmented by 2 local notable design experts. The UDP unanimously and enthusiastically supported this revised proposal. Staff concur with the Panel wholeheartedly.

In response to some UDP comments to consider making the building even taller, staff notes this would push the tower top further into the view corridors which, based on Council view corridor policy, is not supported and would require a re-submittal and additional review. The applicants declined to pursue this direction.

#### (6) <u>Sustainability:</u>

The proposal targets LEED Gold. The applicant has registered the project under the LEED Green Building Rating system and is demonstrating in their submission a commitment to a high standard of Sustainability that exceeds City requirements under a Development Application. The applicant team has a proven track record for Green Building design and the submission includes specific details and strategies that, if executed, would deliver the targeted performance. These include: incorporating triple glazing with integrated frit to control solar heat gain while optimizing daylighting and improving insulation values; utilizing highly sophisticated mechanical systems (air source variable refrigerant flow system, with modular heating/cooling and heat recovery capability); storm water management; electric car and bicycle recharge stations; etc. Condition 1.14 calls for identification of the components contributing to sustainability performance on plans.

• **Conclusion:** Staff is confident the proposal has undergone a rigorous review and design refinement process, and considers the current proposal to be highly supportable. The tower displays a sophisticated, fluid shape that will contribute to the CBD skyline. The proposal incorporates triple

glazing and other sustainable advances that equal or surpass Green Building objectives. The retention and reuse of the heritage element is well-incorporated, and the tower defers appropriately to the adjacent heritage Marine Building. The plaza and landscape design turns an existing underperforming space into a positive public realm attribute, creating an inviting pedestrian mid-block connection from what is currently occupied by a parking ramp. The public realm design fits into the context and improves public amenity. Staff recommends approval subject to the conditions in this report.

#### URBAN DESIGN PANEL

The Urban Design Panel reviewed this application on February 9, 2011, and provided the following comments:

#### EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9-0)

• Introduction: Garry Papers, Development Planner, introduced the proposal noting that it was the second review and that there had been some significant revision to the design. He also noted that Kohn Pedersen Fox Associates had joined the design team. They are recognized for highly contextual, sustainable and expressive design and they have brought a fresh insight to the project as well as addressing the Panel's previous concerns.

Mr. Papers gave a summary of the context noting the building is immediately adjacent to the heritage Marine Building. The tower is proposed for 475 feet while the maximum height for the zoning is 450 feet. He noted that the Higher Building Policy allows for up to 600 feet with discretionary review. The proposed FSR is 12.1, which is the allowed 11.0 plus exactly the 10 % additional provided by the on-site heritage density transfer. The new design adds a fluid shape in a rectilinear context; roof equipment and elevator are fully enclosed in a new curving roof form. There will be a quiet, deferential backdrop to the Marine Building with a sophisticated and high-performance façade treatment. The design has been tested with multiple eye-level perspective views, and glass color was tested with views on both blue and overcast sky conditions. The tower will be at grade on Cordova Street, with a distinct expression and a canopy at the parking and the second entrance. The Hastings Street façade respectfully holds off the heritage bldg, but with a flared "skirt" to signify entry and give identity. The lower canopies will afford pedestrian rain protection, shade the lobby and block wind shear.

Yardley McNeil, Heritage Planner, gave a brief introduction to the proposal noting that the building was designed by Sharp and Thomson and constructed in 1929 and is a listed "B" heritage building on the Vancouver Heritage Register. She noted that the Panel had seen the project previously and endorsed the relationship between the proposed tower and the conserved portions of the University Club. She also noted that the Heritage Commission saw the proposal and voted to support the proposal. They will be bringing the proposal back to the Heritage Commission as it is a new tower design. The conservation approach is to retain only the façade and to replicate the four storey massing to a depth of 35 feet so as to retain the present volumetric of the University Club as seen from Hastings Street. The interior will be reconfigured into two, double height floors, each containing retail uses. The application is seeking an additional 10% density over the permitted floor area. As part of the process, the applicant will be required to designate the retained façade and a restoration covenant will be applied to the site. Ms. McNeil noted that while City polices would encourage more of the original heritage building to be retained, the proforma resulted in additional density that could not be accommodated on site, given the view parameters set for this area.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following (*indented italics are the October 6, 2010 UDP minutes, "Consensus on key aspects needing improvement*):

- 1) Building Form & Massing: Is the proposed form suitable in the context and creates positive relationships with adjacent buildings?
  - Enhance the architectural integrity, presence and autonomy of the building with consideration to expressing aspects of current architectural innovation.
  - Design development to the top of the building with particular attention to the visibility of the of the elevator tower.
- 2) Materiality and Character: Are the proposed materials, façade composition and exterior treatments well-resolved and of high quality?
  - Design development to the east façade with particular attention to the exterior treatment of the service core.
- 3) Public Realm: Are the proposed ground floor treatments, relationship with the plaza, landscape/streetscape design and materials sensitive and contribute to a dynamic public experience?
  - Design refinement to the lower floor elevation with particular attention to the Cordova Street façade and to the relationship with the University Club building.
  - Design development to increase the vitality of the public realm ground plane including allowing indoor/outdoor permeability particularly with respect to the restaurant.
- 4) Does the proposed design achieve the desired architectural excellence as envisioned in the Higher Building policy?
- Mr. Papers and Ms. McNeil took questions from the Panel.
- Applicant's Introductory Comments: Paul Katz, Architect, noted that the developer is committed to achieving a high quality building using sustainability features and plan on using innovative mechanical and cladding systems. He said they hoped that the building would be an example of the work place of the future. The primary massing is taken from the Marine Building with the view from West Hastings. The concave form will have its own independence but the tower would be prominent as it grows up from the street. Mr. Katz noted that the climate is suitable to glass buildings. While taking into consideration sustainability, the form of the building indicates in its detailing, expression and character, the sustainable features within as well as on the perimeter.

Josh Chaiken, Architect, further described the building noting the expression is differentiated on the east façade from the south and the west and has a fairly modest north exposure. On the east side the spandrels are treated as a shadow box. On the south and the west they are proposing a ceramic frit that will cover the spandrel for a stronger horizontal expression and increase the protection from solar radiation. He noted that the wall expression of the vertical fins is slightly different on the east side as they are shallower than on the south and the west. Mr. Chaiken described the architectural details of the proposal noting they considered the building's grouping with the Shaw Tower and the Pacific Rim Fairmont as well as its grouping with the Marine Building and Guinness Tower.

Mr. Chaiken noted that the roof has been detailed to have some interest in the skyline with the orientation at the top locking into the geometry of the Marine Building. Mr. Chaiken noted that they have created a skirt detail at the ground plane by pulling the wall away to create space above the University Club heritage façade. A commercial podium will be created on Cordova Street as well as an entry. The roof on the University Club could be an amenity for the office floor or could be an extension of the restaurant.

Jane Durante, Landscape Architect, noted that there is already an existing landscape with the Guinness Tower which was built about 40 years ago. The paving pattern on the Guinness Tower is a simple, rectilinear pattern of concrete and pavers which will extend into the lobby of the new tower. On the Cordova Street side there is a wide set of stairs that will become an active mid block connection. A green wall is proposed on the west wall of the University club. It will be constructed using a vine covered stainless steel cable structure.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:
  - Consideration to increase the height of the tower, to enhance skyline variation.
  - Design development to have the skirt peal away above the heritage façade higher than shown.
  - Consideration of continuous weather protection at grade, at the northwest gap shown.
- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the design was vastly improved since the last review and had become an elegant building.

The Panel thought the previous scheme had responded well to the Guinness Tower and the Marine Building but agreed that the curvilinear from was more sophisticated. Most of the Panel was a bit disappointed at the axial view looking west on Hastings Street because of the proximity of the Marine Building and the neighbouring towers, as the height seemed similar. They thought the tower needed more height to give it added drama.

One Panel member suggested starting the slope at the top of the tower at the height of the Fairmont Hotel. The Panel felt that the extra height would only impact the view cone slightly. They also agreed that it would increase the architectural excellence of the project, and create a more dynamic composition of building heights in relation to the Pacific Rim Fairmont and Shaw towers. The Panel liked that the building curved behind the Marine Building as it would give the heritage building the prominence it deserves. Enhancing this curve and/or starting it lower were both mentioned.

The Panel thought the skirt that peals away from the heritage needed to be a bit higher. They appreciated the finesse with the detailing but felt it needed more space in relation to the heritage facade. A couple of Panel members were disappointed that the heritage façade wasn't being retained at 4-storeys and suggested incorporating some of the heritage into the interior of the new building, or that more of the existing interior of the heritage building be incorporated and preserved.

One panel member suggested that more differentiation in materiality and expression be explored between the curvilinear "wrapper" facades and the more planer concave east façade.

The Panel thought the landscaping was well done and liked that it continued through the lobby. They thought the public realm was very well done in terms of materiality and character although they noted that it hadn't departed too much from the previous scheme. One Panel member noted that the square paving grid of the Guinness building could be made more modern or even abstract. Most of the Panel felt there should be a continuous canopy for weather protection at the ground plane. One Panel member noted that the retail on the street would need to be relatable as it could be a challenge.

A couple of Panel members suggested adding a social space in the tower, to better reflect the changing face of today's office work environments, that would be a benefit to the occupants and perhaps could be excluded in the FSR.

The Panel supported the sustainability strategy and agreed that the different treatment to the facades was well done and as well they supported the treatment and colour of the glazing. Two panelists felt the differentiation of the facade treatments could be more strongly expressed.

• Applicant's Response: Mr. Katz thanked the Panel and said that he though most of the comments were very reasonable and hoped to integrate them as the building moved forward. Mr. Katz said he didn't know how to resolve the height but agreed that it would look better a few storeys taller.

#### VANCOUVER HERITAGE COMMISSION

The Vancouver Heritage Commission reviewed the initial application on October 4th, 2010, and resolved the following:

THAT the Vancouver Heritage Commission supports the Statements of Significance for the University Club, Marine Building and Guinness Tower as presented at the October 4, 2010 meeting.

FURTHER THAT the Vancouver Heritage Commission supports the project at 1021 West Hastings Street (Quadra Club (University Club)) as presented at the October 4, 2010 meeting;

FURTHER THAT the Commission requests a more detailed Conservation Plan in consideration of saving some of the interior elements and recommends the designation of the Guinness Tower Building;

FURTHER THAT the Commission recommends greater design consideration with regards to the separation of the Marine Building and the proposed new tower.

The original tower design was not supported by the Urban Design Panel (see the discussion under URBAN DESIGN PANEL on page 10). The revised scheme, which is the current scheme, was reviewed by the Commission on February 28th, 2011 at which the Commission resolved the following:

A. THAT the Vancouver Heritage Commission supports the revised tower design and the relationship between the retained heritage façade of 1021 West Hastings Street, the Marine Building and the Guinness Tower, but requests the applicant reconsider the tapering of the lower overhang skirt over the main entry to lessen the visual obstruction of the west wall of the University Club.

B. THAT the Vancouver Heritage Commission supports the proposed Conservation Plan for 1021 West Hastings Street, requesting that consideration of the interior heritage pieces be incorporated into the design;

FURTHER THAT the Commission requests the Statement of Significance be refined.

Staff considered the designation of 'The Guinness Tower' but concluded that in this case adding the building to the Register, but not designating it, is appropriate. The owner has agreed to this (see Standard Condition A.1.20). Staff concluded that retaining all the interior features is not viable but that certain elements could be saved and incorporated into the project (see Condition 1.9). Separation of the new tower from 'The Marine Building' has been maximized. The skirt of the new tower is to be redesigned to better integrate with the heritage building (see Condition 1.2).

#### ENGINEERING SERVICES

The proposed development has several engineering-related issues including the interactions with the adjacent Cordova Viaduct structure, issues due to the connections with the adjoining Guinness Tower, and a shortfall in required loading.

Cordova St is a bridge structure adjacent to the site. Because of the complexity of modifying and building adjacent to a separate structure, there are certain conditions required including: monitoring the structure during construction; design of the crossing; and agreements for encroachments onto the structure (see Standard Conditions A.2.4 through A.2.7).

The application shows a property line running through the site. The applicant has agreed to consolidate the site rather than work through the series of legal arrangements that would be required should these building remain on separate properties. Standard Condition A.2.1 requires this consolidation.

This application proposes a relaxation of the required number of Class B loading spaces under the new tower from 7 to 3. Staff have serious concerns about the lack of on-site Class B loading spaces, however achieving additional Class B loading on the site would be extremely challenging, given the retention of the Guinness Building and Quadra Club façade. A transportation impact study was submitted during the review process, however Staff are seeking further information as the study does not sufficiently address the ability of the on-site loading supply to meet the loading needs of the two buildings (see Standard Condition A.2.13). There is also insufficient space in the proposed loading area for larger vehicles to manoeuvre. Standard Condition A.2.9 requires the layout to be modified to improve this. With these conditions, Engineering Services supports the proposed relaxation from 7 to 3 Class B loading spaces.

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

#### HERITAGE PLANNING

Heritage objectives for the site are:

- i) maximize the retention of 'The University Club' and seek its rehabilitation and designation as protected heritage property;
- ii) retain as many original interior features of 'The University Club' where viable; and
- iii) retain 'The Guinness Tower' at 1055 West Hastings Street and add it to the Vancouver Heritage Register.

'The University Club' (originally 'The Quadra Club') at 1021 West Hastings Street was constructed in 1929. It was designed by the notable firm of Sharp and Thompson in a Spanish Renaissance Revival style and is listed in the 'B' evaluation category on the Vancouver Heritage Register. It is valued for its exterior aesthetic features, which are concentrated on the south façade of the building, and for being one of the last surviving club buildings from the period. The rear of the building has been extensively modified over the years and is not considered to be of heritage value. The building is also listed on the Heritage Interiors Inventory for some original interior features which survive in the lobby and dining room areas.

'The Guinness Tower' at 1055 West Hastings Street, built in 1967-69, is an excellent example of a late modern high rise commercial building. Features include its recessed base, bronze motifs, and a mural by artist Jordi Bonet. It is not listed on the Vancouver Heritage Register but is identified in the Recent Landmarks Inventory in the 'B' category. The owner has agreed to add the building to the Vancouver Heritage Register, which staff support (see Standard Condition A.1.20).

The retention of 'The University Club' in its entirety is challenging due to the heritage building's existing size, footprint, and location. On-site density bonus is the only viable way to compensate the owner for heritage conservation costs in this case, noting that at this point in time the creation of transferable density for use off site is not possible. View corridor provisions set for the site also limit further height increases beyond what is currently proposed, thereby restricting opportunities to allow for additional on-site bonus density.

The application proposed to retain the south façade of 'The University Club'. Most of the rest of the building is to be demolished to allow for the new tower. The interior floors of the heritage building are proposed to be removed due to conservation challenges associated with the structure of the existing

floors and the change of use from the original club use to commercial uses. The first twenty-five feet of the form of the building will be replicated and integrated into the base of the new tower. A condition of the permit requires that maximized retention of the west wall be pursued and incorporated into the scheme, if viable, to improve the visual integrity of the building (see Condition 1.10).

The Vancouver Heritage Commission reviewed the initial scheme on October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2010 and supported the proposal but requested a more detailed Conservation Plan be submitted, as well as requesting that further separation of the new tower from the Marine Building be explored. On February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2011, the Commission reviewed a revised scheme and an updated Conservation Plan and supported the proposal again, as well as the Conservation Plan, but asked for changes regarding the integration of the new tower with the heritage building. Condition 1.2 addresses this concern. See the discussion under Vancouver Heritage Commission on page 13 for details of the Commission's resolutions.

Real Estate staff conclude that the proposed on-site bonus density is commensurate with conservation costs and it not unduly profitable. A Heritage Revitalization Agreement is not required as the Development Permit Board or the Director of Planning has the authority to grant the requested on-site bonus density, provided it does not exceed 10% over the maximum permitted density, as allowed for in Section 3.9 of the Downtown Official Development Plan, Section 3.2.5 of the Zoning and Development By-law, and the Heritage Policies and Guidelines. Staff support the proposed retention scheme for 'The University Club' and the requested on-site bonus density, which is 10% over the maximum permitted density (see the Technical Analysis on page 5).

#### 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

On September 27, 2010, 1,024 notification postcards were sent to neighbouring property owners advising them of the application, and offering additional information on the city's website. Due to non-support at the Urban Design Panel on October 6, 2010, a second notification was completed advising the surrounding community of the revised application on February 21, 2011.

The first notification response received a total of 10 letters and including petition containing 48 signatures from tenants of the 'Shaw Tower' at 1077 Cordova Street. The second notification, identified the revised design, received four responses to the notification.

These comments include:

- Proposed building will overshadow the significant heritage building (Marine Building).
- The proposed building is too tall for such a small lot.
- Blocking the panoramic views of many residents in the area.
- Increase congestion within the neighbourhood.
- The proposed building will diminish property values in the surrounding area.

#### Response to Notification

Height and Views:

Zoning for this site allows for office towers at a density of 11 FSR up to 450 feet in height. The proposed tower has been very carefully positioned and shaped to optimize existing views from the Marine Building and Guinness Tower, and to maximize sunlight and views to the surrounding streets and plazas. A shorter building would have generated larger, fatter floor plates that would have compromised the plaza and the spacing/views from adjacent buildings. Some private views from adjacent residential sites are impacted, but not unduly for a central CBD location with base zoning.

#### Congestion:

There are multiple transit options in the project vicinity, including a SkyTrain station 900 feet to the south, and office users are ideal candidates for transit and alternative sustainable modes. The parking, traffic and circulation impacts have been evaluated and are considered to be acceptable by staff.

#### Relationships to Marine Building:

The building shape and façade design were carefully studied and revised to pay suitable deference to the Marine Building, especially when viewed west along the Hastings Street axis. Although the tower is clearly visible behind the Marine Building cap, it is a simple pattern of light blue glass that will recede into the sky, providing a quiet backdrop to the Marine Building profile. This design resolution was strongly endorsed by the Higher Building Design Panel's unanimous support.

#### Property Values:

Although Staff cannot speculate on the effect of this project on property values, experience has shown that high quality development consistent with City policies enhance rather than diminish property value.

#### **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 decisions 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 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 10% (55,462 sq. ft.) and an increase in the maximum permitted height of 469.2 ft, subject to Council approval of the designation of the 'The Quadra Club' at 1021 W Hastings Street as a protected heritage property.

With respect to the Parking By-law, the Staff Committee has considered the approval sought by this application and concluded that it seeks a relaxation of loading. The Staff Committee supports the relaxations proposed.

B. Boons Chair, Development Permit Staff Committee

G. Papers Senior Development Planner

B. Mah Project Coordinator

Project Facilitator: D. Autiero

#### 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 compliance with Section 4.8.4 (Required Disability Parking Spaces) of the Parking By-law;

**Note to Applicant:** Based on floor area of the new tower, a total of 12 disability parking spaces is required. Although the Project Statistics indicate 12 disability parking spaces are provided, there are actually only 11 disability parking spaces identified on the overall lower main floor plan (A-205a).

A.1.2 compliance with Section 6.5 (Clothing Lockers) of the Parking By-law;

**Note to Applicant:** Based on the required number of Class A bicycle parking spaces, 80 clothing lockers are required for each gender.

A.1.3 confirmation of the total proposed FSR;

**Note to Applicant:** Set of FSR sheets must be sealed and signed. Clarify all floor levels and subtle variations of the changing floorplates (FSR-103) with dimensions on the new tower and provide confirmation of the existing floor area of the Guinness Building. Clarify if the gray shaded structures (columns, walls) are included in FSR. Clarify the change of use of the lower main floor in the existing Guinness Tower and storage rooms in parking level P-4 under the new tower. Delete new property line and show existing property line.

A.1.4 provision of layout and dimensions of the bicycle parking spaces and maneuvering aisles in the bicycle storage rooms located on parking levels P-2 and P-3 and three additional electrical outlets;

**Note to Applicant:** Dimensions of the bicycle parking spaces and maneuvering aisles are also required in the bicycle rooms located on the lower main floor plan (A-205 and A-205a). An electrical outlet is required for each two Class A bicycle spaces. Update the actual and correct number of vertical spaces, lockers and electrical outlets in the bike storage summary on overall parking levels 1 to 3 and the lower main floor. Bicycle rooms shall be located no lower that the first complete parking level below grade and shall have direct access to outside. There shall be no stairs on the access route, except that the Director of Planning may allow stairs provided a wheel ramp with a minimum width of six inches is provided without cutting into the stair treads.

A.1.5 clarification of the number of small car spaces on parking level P-2, P-3 and P-4;

Note to Applicant: Correct numbering of parking spaces starting at #157 on parking level P-3.

A.1.6 clarification of access to the parking, loading and bicycle parking spaces and amenity space for each building on the two separate sites;

**Note to Applicant:** Consolidation of the two sites would resolve this condition.

A.1.7 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;

#### Standard Landscape Conditions

A.1.8 design development to the plaza paving design to integrate the new building's aesthetics, as well as the patterns of the existing Guinness plaza and Cordova Street and illustrate on the Landscape Plan of the plaza paving design (including materials) extending from the plaza through the interior lobby;

**Note to Applicant**: The same pattern and materials should continue on both sides of the lobby glass in order to clearly express the transparency of the plaza and lobby design. The repeating squares motif reflects the 1960's style of the adjacent Guinness building. Perhaps a transformed or staggered pattern would better suit the new plaza.

A.1.9 design development to create a more visually open landscape ramp, with less channeled walls;

**Note to Applicant**: This can be achieved by reducing the northern wall of the ramp to a 6" - 18" undulating curb. The southern ramp wall can retain a higher undulating profile, but no taller than shown on L-3, Elevation 3. The curved curb of the north wall at the sidewalk entrance should be pulled south to align with the wood seating wall opposite, in order to reduce the tripping hazard for sidewalk pedestrians.)

A1.10 provision of a large scale (1/4"=1' or 1:50) section through the Level 3 deck;

**Note to Applicant**: The section should illustrate the planting depths for the proposed trees. The BCSLA Landscape Standard requires a planting depth of 24 to 36" for large shrubs and small trees.)

- A.1.11 location of all landscape sections on the Landscape Plan;
- A.1.12 provision of a notation on the Landscape Plan of the use of Ipe wood for the plaza benches, as described in the Open Space Landscape section of the development permit application booklet;
- A.1.13 provision of a high efficiency irrigation system for the entry plaza, the plaza green wall planter and the Level 3 terrace planter;

**Note to Applicant**: Hose bibs or individual irrigation lines should be provided for the large pots on the Level 4 amenity deck. Notations to that effect should be added to the drawings. (Note to applicant: The irrigation system design and installation system shall be in accordance with the Irrigation Industry of B.C. Standards and Guidelines)

A.1.14 provision of details and typical drawings of the new "proposed exit stair", "concrete planter", and "seat wall with wood bench top", indicated in the plaza west of the Guinness Building on landscape plan L-1;

**Note to Applicant:** Any other surface modifications required by the revised parking will need to be provided. (See Condition 1.8)

A.1.15 in order to maintain a consistent rhythm of street trees along Cordova, investigation of the possibility of retaining the most easterly of the two street trees that are proposed for removal adjacent to the West Cordova parkade entrance;

**Note to Applicant**: Consideration should be made to narrowing the throat of the curb crossing to avoid conflict with the tree branches.

#### **Standard Heritage Conditions**

- A.1.16 Council can and does approve the municipal heritage designation of 'The Quadra Club' façade and that the associated Designation By-law is enacted by Council;
- A.1.17 arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Director of Legal Services, that the owner enters into a side agreement (219 Covenant) which requires the protection and timely completion of the designated portions of 'The Quadra Club' during construction and that the owner agrees that due compensation has been provided by the City and that the owner will not come forward in the future for further compensation, to the, and that the agreement is registered in the Land Titles Offices, to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services, prior to issuance of this permit;
- A.1.18 provision of an "Assurance of Retention of Existing Portions of Buildings" letter (copy attached) and colour-coded detailed elevation drawings from a Registered Architect or Engineer are to be submitted with regard to 'The Quadra Club' façade;

**Note to Applicant**: Documentation to be provided in triplicate, verifying that the portions of the existing structure shown as being retained can in fact be retained, and that he/she will supervise the construction to ensure the retention occurs.

Notes are to appear on the retention drawings indicating the following:

- (i) that all parts of the building shown as being retained will be retained in place, and not removed from their original location within the building at any time, unless specifically approved otherwise;
- (ii) that 'retained wall' means the retention of the existing wall structure, sheathing (if applicable), and masonry;

In addition, three copies of a letter signed by the Registered Architect or Engineer, indicating the sequence of construction, are to be submitted, in order to ensure that the construction is carried out in a manner that retains the building on the site at all times. A copy of the approved retention drawings and will form part of any approved Building Permit drawings.

- A.1.19 provision of a final colour scheme for applicable portions of 'The Quadra Club' façade as recommended by the Heritage Consultant;
- A.1.20 provision of a letter from the owner which supports bringing forward the addition of 'The Guinness Tower' at 1055 West Hastings to the Vancouver Heritage Register;
- A.1.21 provision of the final version of the Conservation Plan for 'The Quadra Club' and the Statement of Significances (SOS's) for 'The Quadra Club', 'The Guinness Tower' and 'The Marine Building' from the Heritage Consultant, incorporating any changes, and that all are provided as separate documents for inclusion in City records;

**Note to Applicant**: Provide electronic copies of the SOS's (pdf's in addition to the requirements above.)

#### Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)

A.1.22 provision of graffiti protection and anti-skateboard reveals for planters, steps, railings and walls within the plaza area;

A.1.23 provision of theft & mischief in underground parking: provision of doors or gates at exit stairs, recessed to not visually or physically intrude onto plazas or sidewalks, and well lit.

#### A.2 Standard Engineering Conditions

A.2.1 make arrangements to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and the Director of Legal Services for consolidation of the two sites;

**Note to Applicant:** Consolidation of the two sites would resolve cross-boundary issues with regard to access to the underground parking from the neighbouring Guiness site, underground shared facilities including showers, bicycle parking, loading spaces, access corridors and garbage facilities and of the common plaza between the two buildings;

A.2.2 clarification if the pedestrian link shown on page A206, between the site and the Marine Building, is a requirement to meet the Vancouver Building By-Law;

**Note to Applicant:** An easement will be required if this is a Vancouver Building By-law requirement.

A.2.3 arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and Director of Legal Services for any proposed encroachments onto city property prior to issuance of the building's occupancy permit;

**Note to Applicant**: Plan A207 indicates that there may be minimal encroachment onto Hastings Street from the heritage façade. After the improvements have been completed, a BC Land Surveyor's Building Location Certificate is needed to verify if encroachments exist. If so, an application to the City Surveyor will be required. For general information see the Encroachment Guide.

(http://vancouver.ca/commsvcs/developmentservices/subreq/pdf/bldgencroach.pdf).

A.2.4 provision of written consent from the General Manager of Engineering Services for the proposed building structure within the Cordova Street Viaduct Works right of way area (as delineated on Plan BCP9732);

**Note to Applicant:** Indicate right of way plan BCP9732 on drawings.

A.2.5 provision of details of the crossing on Cordova Street and arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services, for modifications to the viaduct structure;

**Note to Applicant**: As this crossing is on structure, the applicant is to ensure that all design drawings related to the crossing preparation and installation have been reviewed and approved by the Engineer of Record of the Cordova Street structure (Sandwell Engineering). The details are to be superimposed on the appropriate viaduct as-built detail/section. Once completed, as-built drawings will be required for the improvement. An encroachment agreement or modifications to any applicable existing agreement will be required to reflect the changes.

A.2.6 provision of a bridge monitoring strategy, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services;

**Note to Applicant**: The applicant is to develop a monitoring strategy for the viaduct to track movements during construction and establish reporting and stop-work thresholds. A \$10,000

deposit will be required for the City to retain the engineer of record to review the monitoring strategy and the results of the monitoring during the critical phases of construction.

Written confirmation is required at Development Permit issuance and payment of the deposit is required prior to Building Permit issuance.

A.2.7 design development of the landscape work and arrangements, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services, for modifications to the viaduct structure;

**Note to Applicant**: The applicant must ensure that proposed landscaping and related improvements fall within acceptable bridge design loading. Review by the Engineer of Record for the viaduct is required. Design of landscape shall be superimposed on appropriate viaduct drawing and once construction is complete an as-built drawing will be required. In addition, an encroachment agreement or modifications to an appropriate existing agreement will be required.

- A.2.8 provision of additional and corrected design grades as noted:
  - on Hastings; (Sheet A102), elevation (46.73) at 4' driveway widening should read 47.48;
  - show DE 52.52 and 53.70 on PL at centre of stairs on Hastings (A-206).
- A.2.9 design development of the parking layout:

**Note to Applicant:** At minimum, this should include the following:

- a) reposition parking spaces 7 & 8 on the lower main floor;
- b) provide additional parking stall width for parking spaces adjacent walls including parking spaces 27, 62, 75, 99, 112, G03, G80, G112, G143, G157, G189 and G223;
- c) rotate parking spaces 144/143 on P4, 101/102 on P3, 64/65 on P2 and 29/30 on P1 to face north and convert the easterly parking space to a small car space to improve two-way vehicle passage; and
- d) redesign disability parking space 19 on parking level P1 to improve functionality.
- A.2.10 design development of the service corridor between the proposed loading facility and the adjacent Guinness Tower to reduce corners and to provide ramps rather than stairs;
- A.2.11 provision of a security gate and section drawing clearly demonstrating provision of a minimum
   3.8 m unobstructed vertical clearance on the loading access ramp at the building line and also within the loading area;

**Note to Applicant**: The section drawing must show the vertical clearance at the building line to the underside of the required security gate when raised, and also within the entire area to be used for loading and manoeuvring of trucks.

- A.2.12 provision of design elevations on both sides of the top of the ramp leading into the loading area;
- A.2.13 provision of a loading management plan to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services;

**Note to Applicant**: The plan shall include a profile of anticipated daily deliveries for the fullydeveloped two-tower site, including types of delivery and service vehicles, purpose, duration and accumulation. This shall be developed with benefit of further studies of the existing Guinness Tower and other existing buildings, if necessary. Such studies must cover peak loading demands during a typical week under typical conditions, including locations used (whether on-site, off-site, or on-street). The plan must identify sufficient measures to ensure that the on-site loading space provisions prove sufficient without any on-street loading activity occurring for the site. The measures may include such actions as employing a full-time Loading Manager, scheduling deliveries/reserving loading spaces, combining service providers, changing delivery vehicle sizes, and/or creating a Loading and Servicing Committee, as well as any other measures deemed necessary to ensure that the loading doesn't impact City street.

A.2.14 confirmation of the functionality of solid waste operations;

**Note to Applicant**: The applicant must confirm that a waste hauler can access and pick up from the location shown. The applicant is required to consult with a hauler and confirm their ability to service the site as reflected on the plans. The applicant has suggested that the garbage storage/compacter location may change to the parking area - if this is the case, overhead clearance becomes critical, as does potential manoeuvring space. Please ensure this aspect of the garbage pick up operation is well studied to ensure smooth operations.

A.2.15 clarification of the pattern on the Cordova Street sidewalk immediately east of the east property line;

**Note to Applicant:** The crossing and ramp design may require adjustment if a standard sidewalk treatment is not provided.

A.2.16 provision of written confirmation that all utilities will be underground and within private property;

**Note to Applicant:** The General Manager of Engineering Services will require all utility services to be underground for "conditional" developments. All electrical services to the site must be primary with all electrical transformers located on private property. There will be no reliance on secondary voltage from the existing overhead electrical network on the street right-of-way. 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. Contact Bill Moloney at 604.873.7373 for further information.

The site must be served by an interconnected water service and the meter room must be located to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services. Contact Engineering Waterworks Design at 604-873-7325 for details.

A.2.17 arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and Director of Legal Services, for the consolidation of the two sites;

**Note to Applicant:** Consolidation of the two sites would resolve cross-boundary issues with regard to access to underground parking from the neighbouring Guinness site, underground shared facilities including shower facilities, bicycle parking, loading spaces, access corridors, garbage facilities and for the common plaza between the two buildings.

A.2.18 arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services, for a canopy application;

**Note to Applicant**: Canopies must be fully demountable and drained to the buildings internal drainage systems. Submit site and elevation drawings of the proposed canopy directly to Engineering Services for review.

A.2.19 arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services, for a crossing application;

**Note to Applicant**: Submit a crossing application and 2 copies of the site plan directly to Engineering Services for review and design. Confirmation of viaduct modifications to accommodate tree removals/landscaping and crossing installation are required.

- A.2.20 arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and Director of Legal Services, for the encroachments of the proposed landscaping on the Cordova Street Viaduct; and
- A.2.21 consideration of the modification of the air supply ductwork on parking level P3 and P2 to allow for the creation of a standard and small car space in the adjacent area.

**Note to Applicant:** There appears to be opportunity to provide additional angled parking spaces through realignment of the ductwork.

#### B.1 Standard Notes to Applicant

- B.1.1 The applicant is advised to note the comments of the Processing Centre-Building, Vancouver Coastal Health Authority and Fire and Rescue Services Departments contained in the Staff Committee Report dated March 23, 2011. 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 **November 6, 2011**, 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.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 prior to the 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 prior to the 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 (fitness facility, lounge and kitchen) of 7,847 ft.<sup>2</sup> and 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 complex.

- B.2.6 Any phasing of the development, other than that specifically approved, that results in an interruption of continuous construction to completion of the development, will require application to amend the development to determine the interim treatment of the incomplete portions of the site to ensure that the phased development functions are as set out in the approved plans, all to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.
- B.2.7 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 these, please contact Vancouver Coastal Health at 604-675-3800 or visit their offices located on the 12<sup>th</sup> 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.2.8 In the event that retention of portions of the heritage building which are to be retained cannot occur as shown on the approved plans, all construction work must cease. Construction must stop as the work is no longer in compliance with the approved permit and the permit would now be considered to be invalid. Replication or replacement of existing portions of the building that were to be retained does not comply where retention is a condition of the permit. Planning staff must be contacted to discuss options including the possibility of new permits in the event the building cannot be retained as shown on the approved plans.
- B.2.9 All windows and doors are as approved on the drawings and any substitutions or changes require the approval of the Director of Planning before any changes are made. Regarding the heritage building, unless noted otherwise, "existing" means the existing window retained and refurbished in place or removed and refurbished and re-installed, as per the approved Conservation Plan.
- B.2.10 Regarding the heritage building, any new trims and wood elements are to be sanded and painted (textured or combed products are not approved) unless specifically approved otherwise.
- B.2.11 All work is to be consistent with the approved Conservation Plan provided by Robert Lemon Architect Inc. dated September 21, 2010, and forming a part of this permit.
- B.2.12 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.

#### Processing Centre - Building comments

The following comments are based on the preliminary drawings prepared by MCMP Architecture dated February 3, 2011 for the proposed development permit. This is a preliminary review in order to identify issues which do not comply with the Vancouver Building Bylaw #9419 as amended (VBBL), and includes a review of Subsection 3.2.5. "Provisions for Fire Fighting".

- \*The property is being subdivided the existing building (Guinness Tower) is required to be fully upgraded per Part 10 of the VBBL. A separate building permit will be required for the Guinness Building.
- 2. \*Firewall or two exterior walls required at the new property line.
  - a) Exit facilities from the existing Guinness Building is required to be fully upgraded.
  - b) Firewall must be continuous vertically from foundation, through the basement levels, up to roof.
  - 3. Fire door required in the existing Marine building which opens into new building. A separate building permit will be required for the Marine Building.
  - 4. \* Existing façade to be incorporated into the new building shall be fully upgraded.
  - 5. \* Spatial separation requirements on the West and East elevations do not comply- the amount of unprotected openings, windows, is over the limit. The amount of unprotected openings at the existing Guinness Building is now over the limit. Guinness Building is required to be fully upgraded.
  - 6. Building construction is required to be noncombustible.
  - 7. Highrise building and VBBL 3.2.6. requirements for high buildings apply.
  - 8. \* The building must be separated from adjacent buildings by measures to limit smoke movement between the Guinness building and the Marine Building.
  - 9. 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 firefighers' entrance.
  - 10. \* Principle entrance is not within 15 m of the fire access route.
  - 11. \* The building is required to provide access to persons with disabilities to all public areas, common areas, storage, amenity, meeting rooms, and to areas where work functions could reasonably be expected to be performed by persons with disabilities.
  - 12. \* All entrances, exits, drive aisles and other access to offstreet disability parking spaces, and egress therefrom must have a minimum vertical clearance of 2.3 m, as required by the Parking By-law.
  - 13. \* At least 2 exits are required from the retail/restaurant floor areas.
  - 14. \* At least 2 accessible paths of travel to 2 separate exits are required from the parking floors containing stalls for persons with disability.
  - 15. \* Additional exit may be required from storage garage where security gate is provided.
  - 16. Storage garage security shall conform to 3.3.6.7.
  - 17. \* Distance between exits are not sufficiently remote from each other. Level P4; 3rd floor.
  - 18. \* Exit lobby is required to have a fire separation between it and floor areas containing an occupancy.
  - 19. \* Dead end public corridors exceed 6 m in length. 2nd floor.

20. \* A fire pump with sufficient space inside a service room located halfway up the tower will be needed.

\*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. If a "prior to" letter is not being sent, the above comments should be sent directly to the applicant.

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.

1021 WEST HASTINGS - OFFICE TOWER DEVELOPMENT	VER DEVELOPMENT	1021 West Hastings 1021 West Hastings Smeet Vaucotyer, Et
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT - FEBRUARY 2, 2011		O X F O R D
March       March         Ma	Number of the second	Control Decision and the control of
M         MID           Requert         1         1         2010           Augusto         1         1         2010         Augusto           Augusto         1         2010         Augusto         Augusto           Augusto         2         2         Augusto         Augusto         Augusto           Augusto         2         2         2         Augusto         Augusto         Augusto           Augusto         3         4         3         Augusto         Augusto	definition of the second of th	A-000
		Terrory (Base of STATAONE WALCH WORLDWY (B. D.

Appendix  $\mathcal{D}$ ; page / of H





1102.862 Weild Kild off

Appendix  $\mathcal{D}$ ; page<sup>3</sup> of  $\mathcal{A} \mathcal{O}$ 





Appendix  $\mathcal{D}; \mathsf{page}^{\mathcal{S}} \mathsf{of} \not \prec \mathcal{L}$ 



Appendix  $\mathcal{D}$ ; page  $e^{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{0}f}} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{O}}$ 








NA 10/0 LIGRADS TRUE WAS PAREEDD MINE ME

NAVO ALEXANDER N 1201 - 1

Appendix, page/0of Hb



Appendix D; page// of the



NA REAL FROM THE SAME THE PRODUCT AND

HEAL LEVEL & DECEMBER OF HEAL PARTY

Appendix D; page of 46



Appendix D: page 3 of Ho



NR BUS FICKARS (SMIT JOY DWINGED MIRE AS BAJON

officies - sentiments endowers an izen - userezzeroze

Appendix D; page 14 of 46



a sector was not investigated and as only because him of your sector and a sector of the sector of the







Appendix  $\mathcal{J}$ ; page/ $\mathcal{S}$  of  $\mathcal{H}$ 





Appendix  $\mathcal{D}_i$  page of  $\mathcal{H}$ 



AppendixD; page<sup>24</sup> of 46



Appendix D; page 20 of H





Appendix 3; page<sup>24</sup>of 46





Appendix D; page<sup>26</sup>of 46





Appendix 2; page of 46









an agus 11051919 namt 1019 namu nasanan nga kanasa gerb 505.4426646.06426666666666666667555 [indu()\_1881666



Annandix D: Daga 35 46



na ma manji meli meli na anan manan na mangi panati manjintingana manan manji kananji (karanjarati ananga



na sen scolare mar 1966 anor varias de porque hargeradarentationadare por concernente por l'arta scolarda



Manah Nobeliah embatikananananananananan <u>i</u>reda. Iretangkanang

NO 1234 1102/94/2 2001 1010











na iza pozalisi mali ida tanu amana zolanda gali izi-dimozitikanikanika (suba), izi dipana, manaki






Appendix D; page# of #





## **Executive Summary**

1021 West Hastings is one of few remaining high-profile commercial waterfront development sites in downtown Vancouver. The site is defined by its Waterfront views, mid-block location, proposed height of 450 feet and its close proximity to both a sensitive heritage building and one that is considered a recent landmark.

The development site forms part of a full block owned by Oxford Properties, which also includes the Marine Building and Guinness Tower. The project mandate is to create a 'AAA' boutique office building that appeals to Vancouver's predominate tenant size (3,000 to 5,000 square feet), capitalizing on the central location and its views to the north shore.

The design of 1021 West Hastings calls for a unique tower form, with heightened attention to detail and contextual relationships at every level in order to achieve the requisite level of architectural excellence. To this end we have drawn from KPF's extensive experience on projects that have similar challenges and aspirations.

The tower shape is conceptualized as a refined slender mass, respectful to those buildings around it, restrained in its formal gestures yet assertive and autonomous. The curvilinear building geometry mediates between the two urban grids that overlap at the site. It also compliments the more rectilinear building forms of the immediate context. The human scale gestures at the base and the urban scale gestures at the tower top were developed integrally with a refined curtainwall expression that wraps the sculptural tower form.

The overall tower massing was also considered in its grouping with the Shaw Tower and the Pacific Rim Fairmont, related in height, as well as its grouping with the Marine Building and Guinness Tower, related as a development block. In these building to building relationships, the pairing of 1021 Hastings with the Marine Building was considered primary. The existing heritage relationships along West Hastings Street will remain intact and more accessible open space will be created with strengthened connections between West Cordova Street and West Hastings Street. Through efficient functional planning, material reduction, employment of triple glazing, and use of new mechanical technology (VRF-variable refrigerant flow) it will achieve a high degree of energy efficiency and sustainability. Regarding the latter consideration, the tower's sustainable attributes will be expressed outwardly with a selective use of a ceramic frit pattern on the tower facades. Peter Odegaard

Appendix F; page /of 2

### VANCOUVER HERITAGE COMMISSION

### MINUTES

### February 28, 2011

A regular meeting of the Vancouver Heritage Commission was held on Monday, February 28, 2011, at 11:08 am in the Strathcona Meeting Room, Sub-ground, City Hall (453 West 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue).

Members Present:	Kim Maust, Vice-Chair Marian Brown Shelley Bruce Terence Brunette David Cuan Charlene Krepiakevich Jack Leung Orville Lim
Members Absent:	Judith Hansen (Leave of Absence) Richard Keate, Chair (Sick Leave) Tanya Southcott (Leave of Absence)
Also Present:	Marco D'Agostini, Senior Heritage Planner (Staff Liaison)
City Clerk's Office:	Tina Hildebrandt Meeting Coordinator

### Attendance

There were no objections to granting Leave of Absence for Tanya Southcott for this meeting.

*Note from Clerk:* Judith Hansen was granted Leave of Absence for this meeting on February 7, 2011.

### Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the February 7, 2011, meeting were approved with the following amendment:

Item 3 (a):

Strike Kim Maust from the Seismic Upgrading Program and Vancouver Public Schools including Statements of Significance Sub-committee.

### 1. Business Arising from the Minutes

None

## 2. Conservation Projects

## 1075 West Hastings Quadra Club (University Club) 1021 West Hastings VHR "B" & Heritage Interiors Inventory DP/Designation Application- 2<sup>nd</sup> review

Applicant:	Mark Whitehead, MCM - Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
	Mark Cote, Oxford Properties Group
	Josh Chaiken, Kohn Pedersen Fox Associates
	Robert Lemon, Robert Lemon Architect Inc.
Staff:	Garry Papers, Planner, Urban Design and Development Planning Centre
	Yardley McNeill, Heritage Planner

Staff and the Applicant provided an update and responded to questions.

Issues:

- (i) The revised tower design and relationship between the retained heritage façade, Marine Building and Guinness tower; and
- (ii) Proposed Conservation Plan.

MOVED by Orville Lim SECONDED by Jack Leung

> A. THAT the Vancouver Heritage Commission supports the revised tower design and the relationship between the retained heritage façade of 1021 West Hastings Street, the Marine Building and the Guinness Tower, but requests the applicant reconsider the tapering of the lower overhang skit over the main entry to lessen the visual obstruction of the west wall of the University Club.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED by Charlene Krepiakevich SECONDED by Shelley Bruce

> B. THAT the Vancouver Heritage Commission supports the proposed Conservation Plan for 1021 West Hastings Street, requesting that consideration of the interior heritage pieces be incorporated into the design;

FURTHER THAT the Commission requests the Statement of Significance be refined.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

\* \* \* \* \*

Appendix G, page / of 4

## **Urban Design Panel**

Minutes

## For: Wednesday, October 6, 2010

## 1. 1075 West Hastings Street (High Building Review)

DE:	414163
Use:	To construct a new 36-storey mixed-use office/retail on this site.
Zoning:	DD
Application Status:	Complete
Review:	First
Architect:	Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
Owner:	Oxford Properties Group
Delegation:	Mark Whitehead, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership Mark Thompson, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects Mark Cote, Oxford Properties Group
Staff:	Ralph Segal and Yardley McNeil

### **EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (1-8)**

**Introduction:** Ralph Segal, Senior Architect/Development Planner, introduced the proposal noting that a High Level Panel was convened for the review of the proposal which comes from Council's Policy to review projects that are deemed to be high buildings in the context of achieving architectural excellence. Mr. Segal described the surrounding context noting that the site currently is the home of the University Club. He noted that although the building is sitting within a 450 foot height zone, the proposal protrudes into the Queen Elizabeth View Cone and is therefore subject to review under the High Building Review Policy. Mr. Segal noted that there is a slight protrusion into the Cambie Street View Cone by a marginal amount. Staff are taking a report to Council to get their endorsement that the building height can project into the Queen Elizabeth View Cone. Mr. Segal said that perhaps the more significant matter is the relationship of the proposed building to the Marine Building and the Guinness Tower.

Yardley McNeil, Heritage Planner, further described the proposal noting that the building was designed in 1929 by Sharp & Thompson and built prior to the construction of the Marine Building (1930). It was originally the Quadra Club and became the University Club in 1957 and later used for the Terminal City Club prior to their move east on West Hastings Street. It is listed as a "B" on the Vancouver Heritage Registry and has several of the interior features included on the Heritage Interiors Inventory, namely the lobbies off West Hastings Street, the spiral staircase and the heavy timber trusses in the rear with turned diagonal members.

It is a four storey massing along West Hastings Street and the intention is to retain only the façade and some of the interior features in exchange for a 9% of additional density on the site. It is important to note that the application will go to the Development Permit Board for decision on the added density. It is has been to the Heritage Commission with some of the issues being the proximity between the Guinness Tower and the Marine Building.

Appendix G; page 2 of 4

The new floors will align with the first and third floors of the heritage façade with the remainder removed to create double height spaces. It was considered that the height of the new tower was a better solution than a lower tower as this leaves free the detail of the Marine Building cap without interfering with the new tower. The Heritage Commission gave their support by a 4 to 3 vote and their motion was to support the project as presented requesting further detail on the conservation plan.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

- 1. Has the proposed design achieved the desired architectural excellence as envisioned in the Higher Building Policy?
- 2. Does the proposed tower's massing, height and character achieve an appropriate relationship to the heritage Marine Building and Guinness Tower?
- 3. Is the proposed new construction appropriately integrated with the retained heritage University Club facade?
- 4. Does the proposed design make a positive contribution to the Public Realm?

Mr. Segal and Ms. McNeil took questions from the Panel.

Applicant's Introductory Comments: Mark Whitehead, Architect, further described the proposal noting that that it is a mid block site that is either partially or completely obscured from almost every view around the city. They tried to find a precedent for the site in the city and found it in Jamieson House which is a 36 floor residential mixed-use building as opposed to office and the Credit Foncier building which is a designated heritage building. Mr. Whitehead noted that their approach was one of restraint. They see the Marine Building as the gem and this building as the back drop that the Marine Building will be read against. It is also in contrast to several other buildings adjacent. Mr. Whitehead discussed the proximity to the surrounding buildings nothing that they had pushed the building to the north as much as possible to create space between it and the heritage façade. It will preserve a view down West Hastings Street of the Guinness Tower and will give a view of the Marine Building. In trying to give the building some identity, they created a reveal top to bottom which relates strongly to the entrance and the entrance canopy. They also created more open space and access through the site for pedestrians with an entry to the lobby on Cordova Street as well as retail space. In terms of the Club, the facade will be retained and the ramp at the front of the facade will be removed to restore it to its original state. There is a blank concrete wall facing the plaza that will also be removed and will be replaced by a fenestrated concrete wall and the ivy will be reestablished as it exists currently. The building will fit into the mullion tower as it comes down to base and will project through the site to a similar plan on the north side which is scaled to the base of the Marine Building and the base of the Guinness Tower.

Mr. Whitehead described the architecture, the proposed materials and color palette for the project. He noted that the top of the building has been designed to conceal the elevator overrun and the water tanks from the West Hastings Street view. Regarding sustainability, Mr. Whitehead noted that the proposal will use triple glazing that will provide comfort for the tenants and effective daylighting. They are also proposing a Variable Refrigerant Flow (VFR) system on the tower that allows heating in one portion of the building while cooling in another. They plan on getting all 10 of the energy points for the project in LEED<sup>M</sup> and are planning to make LEED<sup>M</sup> Platinum certified. He noted that there isn't a certified LEED<sup>M</sup> office building in the downtown core at the moment.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, described the proposed landscaping plans noting that they are looking at high quality materials on the ground plane on the west side of the project with curved ipe benches and a two toned treatment for the pavement which is similar to what is on the Guinness Tower. The landscape will be permeable with linkages across from West Hastings

# Appendix G; page 3 of 4

Street to Cordova Street. There will be a roof deck assessable from the tower on top of the old University Club that links across to the Marine Building.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

### Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

- Enhance the architectural integrity, presence and autonomy of the building with consideration to expressing aspects of current architectural innovation.
- Design refinement to the lower floor elevation with particular attention to the Cordova Street façade and to the relationship with the University Club building.
- Design development to the top of the building with particular attention the visibility of the elevator tower.
- Design development to increase the vitality of the public realm ground plane including allowing indoor/outdoor permeability particularly with respect to the restaurant.
- Design development to the east façade with particular attention to the exterior treatment of the service core.

**Related Commentary:** The Panel did not support the proposal and agreed that the proposed design had not achieved the desired architectural excellence as envisioned in the Higher Building Policy.

The Panel thought the proposal had a simple, clean expression and responded well to the city grid. They felt it was a good urban fit and liked the through connection from West Hastings Street to Cordova Street. However they thought the designed seemed to be stripped down and was lacking in character and that there wasn't enough delight as a 2010 designed building with one Panel member noting that it showed it's history but didn't show the future. One Panel member thought the materiality was mute and timid and that the reveal between the two facades was an opportunity to express some creativity with the use of texture or colored glass or other materials. However, the Panel thought the massing, height and character achieved an appropriate relationship to the heritage of the Marine Building and the Guinness Tower. They thought the massing, height and character achieved an appropriate relationship to the heritage of the Marine Building and the top of the tower. It was noted that it was important to have vibrant and active work places in the downtown core rather than adding another residential building.

Most of the Panel agreed that the building had potential to be a great building because of its iconic shape and encouraged the applicant to think about expressing more sustainable features in the facade. They found that the facade treatment didn't have the kind of integrity it needed in order to stand shoulder to shoulder with the surrounding buildings. However, the Panel thought the new construction of the tower was appropriately integrated with the retained heritage of the University Club facade.

They thought the canopy was a little weak in its design and that there are some façade treatments that didn't work at the base. One Panel member noted that the relationship to the Guinness Tower could be improved by lifting the base up higher to make it stronger and to create some space. Another Panel member noted that façade didn't turn the corner very well and the rear elevation adjacent to Cordova Street didn't have a relationship to any of the surrounding buildings. Also most of the Panel thought the top of the building could be higher around elevator core to reduce it being visible from West Hastings Street. It was noted that the service core will telegraph through the building with one Panel member wondering why the core wasn't closer to the Guinness building as it would strengthen the design. Another Panel member noted that the elevator location needs to be rethought for the parking garage.

Appendix G; page 4 of 4

A couple of Panel members thought the landscape plans were confusing and wondered why it needed to be broken up as it didn't seem to reinforce the architecture. There was some concern regarding shadowing of the plaza during the noon hour with several Panel members suggesting the proposed restaurant on the ground floor should be allowed to expand out into the plaza as it would animate the street more. Another Panel member noted that having a ground floor restaurant was integral to the downtown core.

Regarding sustainability, most of the Panel thought the skin supported the sustainable premise although one Panel member thought it could be expressed more powerfully.

**Applicant's Response:** Mr. Whitehead noted that there are some finer points to take into consideration. He noted that the restaurant is four feet above the plaza and to change that would be mean rethinking the lobby. He added that the thought the comments were thoughtful and appreciated the Panel's input.

Appendix H; page / of 12

Supports Item No. 1 P&E Committee Agenda October 7. 2010



## POLICY REPORT DEVELOPMENT AND BUILDING

	Report Date:	September 23, 2010
	Contact:	Ralph Segal/
		Cory Dobson
	Contact No.:	604.873.7476/604.871.6419
R	TS No.:	08866
V	anRIMS No.:	08-2000-20
	Meeting Date:	October 7, 2010

- TO: Standing Committee on Planning and Environment
- FROM: Director of Planning
- SUBJECT: Issues Report: Redevelopment of 1075 West Hastings Street and View Corridors

## RECOMMENDATION

- A. THAT Council provide advice to the Development Permit Board in its consideration of a development permit for 1075 W Hastings that Council is supportive of a slight intrusion into the Cambie Street view corridors 9.1 and 9.2.2, as the building is effectively within the "view shadow" of existing developments; as well as a slight intrusion into the Queen Elizabeth Park view corridor 3.2.3, which is consistent with Council's *General Policy for Higher Buildings*.
- B. THAT Council support a general approach where the Director of Planning may consider future development to enter into the "view shadows" of existing buildings if they do not create an additional, significant impact on protected public views of the mountains, and that these be consistent with Council policy, including the *General Policy for Higher Buildings*.

## GENERAL MANAGER'S COMMENTS

The General Manager of Community Services recommends APPROVAL of the foregoing.

## CITY MANAGER'S COMMENTS

The City Manager recommends APPROVAL of the foregoing.

## Appendix H; page 2 of 12

Issues Report: Redevelopment of 1075 W Hastings and View Corridors

### COUNCIL POLICY

Downtown Official Development Plan (1975) View Protection Guidelines (1989) Central Business District Policies (1991) Downtown Vancouver Skyline Recommendations (1997) General Policy for Higher Buildings (1997) Metro Core Jobs and Economy Plan (2007)

### SUMMARY

The owner (Oxford Properties) of 1075 West Hastings (formerly 1021 West Hastings) has applied for a development permit to construct a 36 storey office tower, including the retention and restoration of the heritage facade and designation of the University Club (listed on the Vancouver Heritage Register as a "B").

The redevelopment of the site at 1075 W Hastings as an office building would be consistent with existing Council policies for the employment intensification of the Central Business District (CBD) that emerged from the Metro Core Jobs and Economy Land Use Plan. The proposed development would not only provide additional job space within the CBD, but would also support heritage objectives onsite, contribute a unique visual element to the city's skyline, and would result in an office building with superior environmental performance, particularly in terms of energy conservation.

The height of the building is supportable from an urban design perspective. However, the proposal would slightly intrude into three view corridors (9.1, 9.2.2 & 3.2.3); two of these would be within the "view shadow" of existing developments and would therefore have no perceived impact (Cambie Street views 9.1 & 9.2.2), while the other minor view intrusion would be consistent with Council policy of allowing penetration into the Queen Elizabeth View Corridor (3.2.3) through the *General Policy for Higher Buildings*. Appendix A illustrates this minor impact on views.

The purpose of this report is seek Council advice to the Development Permit Board on the specific matter of the acceptability of penetrating protected public views in a manner that is not perceivable to the eye due to "view shadow" conditions, noting that the overall development permit application will be considered within the context of all Council-adopted policy by the Development Permit Board.

The report also seeks Council direction on how to address future requests for development permits or rezonings that arise with similar "view shadow" conditions.

The recommended approach is in keeping with Council's direction in January 2010, to reaffirm and strengthen View Corridors Policy, and specifically to not support more significant protrusions into view corridors. Consideration of very minor intrusions is consistent with the ongoing careful and successful approach to implementing View Corridor Policy.

#### BACKGROUND

The View Protection Guidelines, adopted by Council in 1989, protect 26 public view corridors through downtown to the North Shore Mountains. These guidelines were created to respond to development pressures in the late 1980s and reflect the long held public priority of preserving views and maintaining a visual connection to our natural setting. These corridors

have helped shape our city's skyline and have improved our sense of place by influencing site location and building design to ensure the retention of panoramic and framed views in and around the downtown.

In 1997 the City undertook the Downtown Vancouver Skyline Study to explore potential options for higher buildings in the city to complement the view preservation already in place. The goal of that study was to recommend a preferred prototype for the city's skyline to help determine the high points in our city. Through this process a *General Policy for Higher Buildings* was developed which laid out location and evaluation criteria for significantly higher buildings which was adopted by Council in May 1997. At the same time Council passed a resolution that allows buildings that proceed through this policy to penetrate the Queen Elizabeth Park view corridor (view corridor 3), subject to meeting the criteria outlined in the policy.

In the twenty years following the adoption of the View Protection Guidelines, there are essentially two types of buildings that have entered into the protected public views:

- 1) First are those buildings which were intentionally permitted by Council after considering competing interests. These include the buildings considered through the *General Policy for Higher Buildings* (for example, Shangri-la and Hotel Georgia) as well as those that were specifically considered by Council through area planning and urban design considerations (for example, Shaw Tower and Fairmont Pacific Rim, as part of the Council-approved Burrard Landing CD-1 Guidelines).
- 2) Second are those buildings that were permitted to enter the view corridor due to a technical implementation error which predated the introduction of more sophisticated GIS mapping tools (for example, 1033 Marinaside Crescent). Through the advancement and accessibility of these technological tools, this type of intrusion is less likely to occur today.

Even with these minor intrusions into the original view corridors, the overall integrity of the views has been maintained and the view approved corridors continue to retain their importance to the public.

The term "view shadow" refers to where a building penetrates a Council-approved view corridor and continues to block a portion of that view across an area extending from the view point origin to the mountains (Figure 1).

# Appendix #; page # of 12

Issues Report: Redevelopment of 1075 W Hastings and View Corridors



Figure 1: Conceptual Illustration of a View Shadow

A building completely within an existing building's view shadow would have no perceived reduction of mountain view from the view point origin, noting that confirming this requires careful analysis. While a specific view point origin is designated to identify the view corridors and to measure their height implications for buildings beneath them, the views are experienced in more of a dynamic fashion. For example, there are two precise measurement points on the Cambie Street view corridors (Cambie at 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue, view 9.2; and Cambie south of 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue, view 9.1) but the view is experienced in a dynamic way as one walks or drives down Cambie Street from approximately 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue to West Broadway. This dynamism also needs to be considered when assessing "view shadow" to ensure that any new proposals do not block any additional view.

In January 2010, Council considered the recommendations of Downtown Capacity and View Corridor Study ("Vancouver Views") and adopted resolutions to: 1) Affirm the View Protection Guidelines; 2) Strengthen various protected views; 3) Create three new protected public views; and 4) amend the General Policy for Higher Buildings to increase the standards for architectural excellence and green building performance, particularly in terms of energy performance. City Staff will be reporting back on the implementation of these decisions later this year.

### DISCUSSION

The purpose of this report is to provide Council advice to the Development Permit Board on the acceptability of a minor intrusion of a proposed development at 1075 West Hastings into protected public views in a manner that is unperceivable to the eye due to existing "view

shadow" conditions, and to provide guidance on how to address similar "view shadow" development inquiries in the future.

The proposed development at 1075 W Hastings for a 36 storey office tower is located on a site between the Guinness Tower (a modernist office building listed in the City's "Recent Landmarks Inventory") and one of the city's most important heritage assets, the designated Marine Building at 355 Burrard Street (See Figure 2). This development represents an opportunity to create additional job space in a transit rich location in the CBD, while retaining the façade of the University Club. From an urban design perspective, the development embraces an interesting opportunity to create a contemporary architectural statement between two existing heritage buildings from different eras, and to create an interesting and respectful backdrop to the street-end view of the Marine Building from the east down Hastings Street.

These respective land use, heritage and urban design issues will be explored within the context of existing Council policy when the development permit application is considered by the Development Permit Board, with guidance from the Vancouver Heritage Commission and an augmented Urban Design Panel (see section "Adherence to the General Policy for Higher Buildings" below).



*Figure 2*: Location and context of the proposed 36 storey office development at 1075 West Hastings.

## Assessing the 'View Shadow'

The development permit application for 1075 West Hastings is for an approximately 460 foot tall, 36 storey office tower. This building would intrude into view corridors 9.1 and 9.2.2. In the case of this development site however, the building would be located almost entirely

within the 'view shadow' of existing developments at 1033 Marinaside Crescent and the Shaw Tower at 1077 W Cordova (refer to the Background section of this report for more information on previous view intrusions).

The impact of the proposed tower on the protected views and the massing that is contained within and outside of the "view shadow" is presented visually in Appendix A, and presented numerically in Figure 3 below:

View Corridor	Proposed Building Height	Maximum Permitted Height Under View Cone	Incursion Into View Corridor	Additional Incursion Beyond "View Shadow"
9.2.2 - 12 <sup>th</sup> /Cambie to the North Shore		418 feet / 127 metres (most limiting)	42 feet / 13 metres	64 sq.ft. / 6 sq. m.
9.1 - 10 <sup>th</sup> /Cambie to the North Shore	460 feet / 140 metres	434 feet / 130 metres	30 feet / 10 metres	300 sq.ft. / 28 sq. m.
3.2.2 - Queen Elizabeth Park to the North Shore		365 feet / 111 metres	95 feet / 29 metres (can be penetrated through Higher Building Policy)	3,336 sq. ft./ 310 sq. m. (can be penetrated through Higher Building Policy)

**Figure 3:** Summary of height limitations from each relevant view corridor and the approximate incursion into the view. View Corridor 9.2.2 is the most limiting and would normally define the height, noting that View Corridor 3.2.2 is lower but can be penetrated through the General Policy for Higher Buildings. The column on the right summarizes the additional incursion beyond the existing "view shadow" from 1033 Marinaside Crescent and the Shaw Tower. (Please refer to Appendix A for visual representation of this material)

Staff have reviewed the potential impacts of this development and conclude that the proposed tower is almost entirely within the "view shadow" and the minor amount of additional view intrusion would not be perceivable to the eye (Appendix A).

Staff have also examined this proposal in a dynamic manner by observing the proposed tower from various points moving from 12<sup>th</sup>/Cambie down to Broadway/Cambie (from protected view 9.2 to 9.1). The building is not perceivable from 12<sup>th</sup>/Cambie, appears in a minor way for a moment near 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and then once again disappears behind 1033 Marinaside Crescent by the time one reaches Broadway/Cambie Street.

Staff are satisfied that the applicant has revised the design sufficiently so as to minimize any additional perceivable view impact and recommend that Council direct the Development Permit Board to consider the application as proposed (Recommendation A).

## Adherence to the General Policy for Higher Buildings

Although the proposal is not as tall as some of the highest buildings in the city (such as Shangri-La at 640 feet), it does intrude, to a minor extent, (as illustrated in Appendix A, page 3) into the Queen Elizabeth Park View Corridor which is permitted only for buildings that

Appendix H; page 7 of 12

proceed under the Council-approved *General Policy for Higher Buildings*. This policy ensures that the buildings are evaluated with a high-level of architectural and urban design rigour with a general philosophy that they should earn their height as part of the spectacular skyline/mountain view from Queen Elizabeth Park.

In January 2010, Council also requested as part of the "Vancouver Views" study that the policy be amended to include a higher level of architectural excellence, and superior green building performance, particularly in terms of energy (This matter will reported back to Council later this year).

Although the proposal for 1075 West Hastings is not a significantly higher building in the overall context of downtown, staff have pursued meeting the objectives of the *General Policy for Higher Buildings* to achieve Council's direction for architectural excellence and green building performance by:

- 1) An augmented Urban Design Panel. The proposal will be reviewed by an expanded Urban Design Panel with two additional architects with experience in office building design and green building practises; and
- 2) Superior green building performance, particularly in terms of energy conservation. The architects have provided information on the building's anticipated green building performance. The architects have provided a preliminary LEED<sup>™</sup> scorecard for the building and estimate that it would score 70 points (including all 10 possible "optimize energy performance points), making it LEED<sup>™</sup> Platinum. As such, the building further advances the City's sustainability goals in the realm of office development.

Although this approach is a "lighter" version of the City's previous application of the *General Policy for Higher Buildings*, Staff feel that the approach does meet Council's objectives and is appropriate for the scale and context of the proposed development.

### Implications for Future Development Inquiries in "View Shadows"

There are a number of sites in the downtown that could pursue redevelopment in the future in a similar "view shadow" context. Recommendation B seeks Council approval to direct staff to consider these proposals with the same degree of technical rigour as presented in this report (including analysis from both static view points and "dynamic" moving perspectives of the views). Consistent with existing Council policy, any development that protrudes into the Queen Elizabeth Park view corridor (view corridor 3) would be considered within the *General Policy for Higher Buildings*.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications of this report to the City's operating budget.

#### CONCLUSION

A Higher Building proposed at 1075 W Hastings would have minimal additional impact on protected, public views. The proposed development is not signalling an acceptance in the loss of important public views to the mountains, but rather responds to existing conditions that have made a minor relaxation of the guidelines a logical option with no perceivable impact from the public view point. The proposal also provides an opportunity for directing staff on how to proceed with similar "view shadow" applications in the future. The recommended approval is consistent with Council's recent directions (January 2010) to reaffirm and strengthen view corridors.

Appendix H; page Pof/2

## Analysis of Proposed Development at 1075 West Hastings and "View Shadow"



Figure A: Impact of 1075 West Hastings on view corridor 9.2, from 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue/Cambie to the North Shore Mountains. The tower is almost entirely within the "view shadow" of 1033 Marinaside Crescent, except for a small portion that would for all intents and purposes be unperceivable to the viewer.

Appendix #; page of /2



Figure B: Impact of 1075 West Hastings on view corridor 9.1, from 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue/Cambie to the North Shore Mountains. The tower is almost entirely within the "view shadow" of 1033 Marinaside Crescent, except for a small portion that would for all intents and purposes be unperceivable to the viewer.

## Appendix H: page /Dof /2



Figure C: Impact of 1075 West Hastings on view corridor 3, from Queen Elizabeth Park to the North Shore Mountains. The tower is visible in the view corridor and as such would be considered through the Council-approved General Policy for Higher Buildings.

Appendix H; page 11 of 12



### REPORT TO COUNCIL

### STANDING COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL ON PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT

### OCTOBER 7, 2010

A Regular Meeting of the Standing Committee of Council on Planning and Environment was held on Thursday, October 7, 2010, at 2:09 pm, in the Council Chamber, Third Floor, City Hall.

PRESENT:	Councillor Andrea Reimer, Chair* Mayor Gregor Robertson* Councillor Suzanne Anton* Councillor George Chow* Councillor Heather Deal, Vice-Chair Councillor Kerry Jang Councillor Raymond Louie* Councillor Geoff Meggs Councillor Tim Stevenson Councillor Ellen Woodsworth
ABSENT:	Councillor David Cadman (Leave of Absence - Civic Business)
CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE:	Penny Ballem, City Manager
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE:	Nicole Ludwig, Meeting Coordinator

\* Denotes absence for a portion of the meeting.

## 1. Issues Report: Redevelopment of 1075 West Hastings Street and View Corridors September 23, 2010

Planning Department staff presented the report and responded to questions.

The Committee heard from one speaker in favour of the recommendation.

MOVED by Councillor Louie THAT the Committee recommend to Council

A. THAT Council provide advice to the Development Permit Board in its consideration of a development permit for 1075 West Hastings Street that Council is supportive of a slight intrusion into the Cambie Street view corridors 9.1 and 9.2.2, as the building is effectively within the "view shadow" of existing developments; as well as a slight intrusion into the Queen Elizabeth Park view corridor 3.2.3, which is consistent with Council's General Policy for Higher Buildings, with the condition that the ultimate design must be supported by the Urban Design Panel.

Appendix H; page/2 of/2

2

Standing Committee of Council on Planning and Environment Minutes, Thursday, October 7, 2010

B. THAT Council support a general approach where the Director of Planning may consider future development to enter into the "view shadows" of existing buildings if they do not create an additional, significant impact on protected public views of the mountains, and that these be consistent with Council policy, including the *General Policy for Higher Buildings*.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (Mayor Robertson absent for the vote)