

<i>COUNCIL AGENDA/INFORMATION</i>		
📁 Closed	Date: _____	Item # _____
📁 Reg. Council	Date: _____	Item # _____
📁 Supplemental	Date: _____	Item # _____

_____	_____
Director	CAO

**DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER**  
750 – 17<sup>TH</sup> STREET, WEST VANCOUVER, BC V7V 3T3

## COUNCIL REPORT

Date: June 3, 2013 File: 1010-20-12-069  
 From: Andrew Browne, Senior Community Planner  
 Subject: **Official Community Plan Amendment, Rezoning, and Development Permit Application for the 1300 Block south of Marine Drive**

---

### RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. Development Application No. 12-069, by Grosvenor Capital Corporation for the 1300 block of Marine Drive, advance in the development consideration process;
2. The applicant work with staff to complete refinements to the proposal as follows:
  - a. Resolution of land uses in the vicinity of 13th Street while striving for a viable, continuous, and occupied street-front and recognizing the function of the area as a gateway both to the Ambleside commercial area and to Ambleside Park;
  - b. Architectural refinements including:
    - i. a stronger gateway architecture at Marine Drive and 13th Street;
    - ii. modifications to building elevations to fully integrate recently added vertical elements into the existing architecture;
    - iii. stronger codification of architecture by land use;
    - iv. division of the Bellevue building elevations into smaller elements;
    - v. consideration of additional ‘wall’ area in lieu of spandrel glass panels; and,
    - vi. consideration of the selective use of additional materials to assist in the differentiation of the two buildings.
  - c. Consideration of additional residential units and/or second-floor office use;
  - d. Ensure that proposed commercial spaces are adaptable to a range of tenants consistent with the applicant’s retail strategy (e.g. availability of mechanical ventilation, reconciliation of potential internal layouts with external door and patio locations);
  - e. Coordination of residential floor and unit plans with revised building elevations;
  - f. Development of details, dimensions, and maintenance plans for green roofs, green walls, and terrace perimeter landscaping; and,

- g. Various public realm and landscaping revisions to ensure consistency with the Ambleside Streetscape Standards, while allowing for contextual and sympathetic upgrades beyond the Standards;
3. Staff bring forward draft bylaws and a development permit package for Council consideration after refinement, design development, and additional Design Review Committee evaluation;
4. Staff commence actions necessary to close the District-owned laneway in the block, raise title, and perform any related work; and,
5. Staff return to Council on July 22, 2013 with a progress report on a potential Community Amenity Contribution.

## **Purpose**

To provide Council with the outcome of the Design Review Committee's May 30th consideration of the revised proposal (Appendices E & F), to recommend final refinements to the proposal, to affirm next steps, and to recommend that staff be directed to begin preparation of the necessary implementing bylaws and permits.

## **1.0 Background & Policy**

### 1.1 Prior Resolutions

May 13, 2013 – Council affirmed the Process and Consultation Plan, directed that the revised proposal be referred to the Design Review Committee (DRC) for evaluation of the applicant's response to Council's direction of March 4, 2013, and directed that staff return to Council with recommendations for final revisions and potential direction for bylaw preparation.

March 4, 2013 – Council set direction for revisions to the application and asked that the proposal come back to Council prior to returning to the DRC.

November 19, 2012 – Council directed that community consultation begin, that the proposal be referred to the DRC for comment, and that staff report back to Council on the outcome of those events.

### 1.2 Official Community Plan (OCP)

Further review and consideration of the Ambleside Town Centre was identified as a priority in the 2004 OCP. Over the next several years the District and the community worked towards determining a new vision of Ambleside as the heart of West Vancouver, and after much discussion and consideration the *Ambleside Town Centre Strategy* was created. Council amended the OCP in July 2008 to give effect to many of the actions, policies, and guidelines set out in the *Strategy*. Amongst other items, the OCP directs the District to reinforce the role of Ambleside as West Vancouver's Town Centre (Policy LE2) and integrate strategies for the Town Centre, Arts and Culture, Ambleside Park, and the Argyle Waterfront (Policy LE2.1).

Implementation of the *Strategy* is through an integrated approach to Ambleside revitalization as illustrated in Appendix A (known as “the Ambleside puzzle”).

In 2008, amendments were also made to the OCP with respect to Built Form and Neighbourhood Character policies for Ambleside; of particular importance is Policy BF-C4 (see Appendix B). This policy provides for the 1300 block south of Marine Drive, as well as two other blocks in Ambleside, to be suitable for consideration of densities above 1.75 FAR and buildings over four storeys if the development results in:

- a community amenity contribution that offsets the increased density and could include community space, additional public parking and rental housing; and,
- a superior building and site design, including increased open spaces or public square, walkways, and enhanced view corridors.

### 1.3 Bylaw

Present zoning of the block varies by parcel and includes C2, CR2, and PU1. The C2 zone allows a variety of commercial, office, and retail uses, and residential uses above the first storey. CR2 zoning allows full- and self-service gas stations, and the PU1 zone allows for public institutional uses such as municipal buildings and police and fire stations.

## 2.0 **Balanced Scorecard**

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES	MILESTONES
1.3.2 – Initiate Public Safety Building Development – Police Station Relocation – City Hall Block	- Proceed with and complete rezoning of 1300 Block
1.4.5 – Advance major development applications consistent with the District vision	- Implement and process 1300 block Marine Drive

## 3.0 **Analysis**

### 3.1 Evaluation of revisions by the Design Review Committee

On May 13, 2013 Council requested that the DRC evaluate Grosvenor’s revised proposal in the context of Council’s direction of March 4, 2013. The DRC did so at its meeting on May 30, 2013 (Appendix C) and resolved the following:

THAT the Design Review has reviewed the Mixed Use Development for Grosvenor Capital Corporation at 1300 Block Marine Drive and recommends advancing to Development Permit level drawings for further Committee review considering the following comments:

- Look at the gateway aspect at Marine Drive/13<sup>th</sup> addressing form, traffic patterns, use and character
- Integrating more office space in the building, and not at grade

- Do not agree with the residential at grade
- Animating 13<sup>th</sup> Street, and look at the opportunity to increase connectivity to Ambleside Park
- Look at legibility of materials and uses to contain residential character distinct from other uses
- Further design development to address the coherence of the horizontal and vertical elements
- Consider a community benefit of some affordable housing within the project
- Consider increasing number of residential units within the same square footage
- At the next stage provide the proposed target tenant mix
- The hierarchy of the paving

Committee members noted the significant amount of progress made on the project by the applicant team, and that they generally felt the applicant had listened to their earlier concerns and responded appropriately. The general sentiment was that the proposal required some improvement and refinement but was on course.

Upon further query by a Council liaison, and later by members of the public, the Committee expressed its comfort with the proposed height and density and felt that the applicant had responded appropriately to the substance of the Committee's previous concerns, while noting that certain targeted improvements to building architecture remain crucial (e.g. gateway architecture).

Much discussion ensued on the relative merits of locating residential townhouses and office space in the vicinity of 13th Street, noting that residences were perhaps not the best linkage to the park, and that the placement of office space on Marine Drive created a missed opportunity. Additional comments included the importance of identifying how the retail strategy unites with the building's design, and the importance of continuous weather protection for sidewalks and the galleria.

A significant amount of discussion was focused on architecture. There was a general feeling that the buildings may have lost some of their cohesiveness through the addition of vertical elements that are not yet fully integrated into the existing architecture. In addition, a desire for the Bellevue Avenue elevation to be broken down into smaller visual areas was expressed, with Committee members noting that the elevation felt somewhat too large and corporate. Finally, members noted the potential for the architectural expression to be more codified by land use (i.e. difference in appearance for residential vs. commercial portions of the buildings), and for the potential of additional building materials to provide better differentiation between the two buildings.

### 3.2 Recommended refinements for the final Development Permit package

The recommended refinements to the proposal are discussed below, and reflect a synthesis of feedback from both the DRC and staff.

a. Resolution of land uses in the vicinity of 13th Street while striving for a viable, continuous, and occupied street-front and recognizing the function of the area as a gateway both to the Ambleside commercial area and to Ambleside Park;

As a reaction to staff and Council feedback, and in the hope of avoiding stagnant and un-leased retail space, the applicant made revisions to include residential townhouses and flex retail/office space in the vicinity of 13th Street. The DRC noted concerns with this approach, namely that residential townhouses were not a suitable linkage to Ambleside Park, and that ground-floor office was a misstep.

The Official Community Plan provides some guidance on these matters. Policy BF-C 4.2 notes that the District should be encouraging concentration of commercial uses principally between 14th Street and 18th Street, while policy BF-C 4.4 calls for increasing the proportion of residential use in the 1300 and 1800 blocks of Marine Drive, including the option for 'flex' uses such as live/work.

As the longest block in the Ambleside commercial area, and the farthest east, the 1300 block is not without its challenges. However, the west side of the site benefits from strong linkages to an existing retail presence on Marine Drive, and Grosvenor has built on this strength by splitting the long block into two buildings. This mid-block link allows new pedestrian window-shopping 'circuits' in the galleria and 14th Street plaza.

Street-front office would not normally be considered appropriate in an established commercial area, however in this instance there is no continuous retail presence to be sustained east of 13th Street. What would undoubtedly be inappropriate in the centre of the Ambleside commercial area may well be the most appropriate land use at its periphery.

Above all, staff are mindful of the importance of sustaining a viable, continuous, and occupied street-front. While ground-floor office may not have the most engaging presence, it is a better alternative than retail space which cannot be leased or, worse, showcases a succession of failed businesses. Perhaps the gateway to Ambleside is best represented by a stable office anchor that provides a sense of arrival to a commercial district.

With respect to the residential townhouses proposed for Bellevue Avenue and 13th Street, it is likely the case that retail viability is even more challenging here than at Marine Drive and 13th Street. While some intriguing ideas have been offered (e.g. park supportive retail or equipment rental), it is not at all clear that these ideas are commercially viable in the short- or long-term without significant and ongoing subsidy.

With respect to alternative uses for Marine Drive at 13th Street, the original application included an *Artists for Kids* space that was proposed as a potential component of an anticipated Community Amenity Contribution. This notion has not met with much public enthusiasm to date, and in any case art galleries do not necessarily present dynamic exteriors to the street. Nonetheless, this or some other arts- or civic-related use does remain an option.

The question of what land use will have the most success in the vicinity of 13th Street has been wrestled with for some time by both the applicant and staff. While staff have asked the applicant to study the commercial viability of these spaces in more detail, it remains the opinion of District staff that the provision of residential townhouses and flex office/retail space is the most promising programming for an area that may otherwise be marginal with respect to achieving a volume of foot traffic that is viable for traditional storefront retail.

In addition to the above, staff have recommended that the applicant work to create a stronger gateway architecture at Marine Drive and 13th Street, and that linkages to Ambleside Park can be achieved by means of an improved streetscape and enhanced pedestrian crossings.

b. Architectural refinements including [...]:

Staff and the DRC concur that, while the proposal is vastly improved from the original submission, further improvement is necessary. A more forward and confident architectural statement is appropriate for the gateway corner of Marine Drive and 13th Street to indicate a sense of arrival into the Ambleside commercial area, and additional potential exists to marry the architecture with whatever land use is deemed most preferable for the space.

The architect has also been asked to consider the architecture of the entire program in respect of the amount of glazing provided, especially in light of the possibility that some portion of glazed area may actually conceal conventional wall-systems as a result of upcoming Building Code changes related to energy performance. Additional wall area could help the buildings fit better within the architectural context of Ambleside.

In addition, the DRC suggested that:

- the Bellevue elevation feels too office-like and should be broken into a series of smaller volumes as were applied to the Marine elevation;
- the use of additional materials and/or colours may assist in further differentiating the two building masses; and,
- some work remained to fully integrate recently added vertical elements into the existing architecture.

c. Consideration of additional residential units and/or second-floor office use:

The current proposal includes 100 residential units (increased from the 88 originally proposed). While the applicant is reconciling revisions to the building elevations with unit plan layouts, it would be ideal if additional units could be found in the building floor plans. In the event that second-floor office is able to be accommodated, the applicant would not be expected to field additional units.

- d. Ensure that proposed commercial spaces are adaptable to a range of tenants consistent with the applicant's retail strategy (e.g. availability of mechanical ventilation, reconciliation of potential internal layouts with external door and patio locations):

While particular tenants or classes of business obviously cannot be guaranteed, staff would like to ensure that the spaces envisioned as, for example, restaurants, are able to accommodate that use without future complication (e.g. odour control and prevention of bylaw enforcement complaints) and are documented within the Development Permit where appropriate.

- e. Coordination of residential floor and unit plans with revised building elevations:

While the number of residential units proposed increased from 88 to 100, floor plans, and unit sizes and types were not specifically detailed pending consideration of the revisions in general terms by the DRC. This detail will now be generated by the applicant, and it is likely that recommended architectural changes may also have an impact on unit layout.

- f. Development of details, dimensions, and maintenance plans for green roofs, green walls, and terrace perimeter landscaping; and

Terrace perimeter landscaping is desirable, but challenging over time in terms of access, maintenance, waterproofing, and permanence. Details of plant species, density, maintenance, et cetera are also to be provided for the proposed green roofs and walls.

- g. Various public realm and landscaping revisions to ensure consistency with the Ambleside Streetscape Standards, while allowing for contextual and sympathetic upgrades beyond the Standards.

Small corrections are required for consistency with the Ambleside Streetscape Standards, including tree positioning at the bus bump-out, and orienting the basalt banding perpendicular to the Marine Drive curb adjacent to the east building. Some fine-tuning of public art podium locations is likely also required.

Staff also recommend that the applicant consider streetscape improvements serving to better connect the site south toward the 14th Street pier and east toward Ambleside Park.

### 3.3 Lane closure

It may be necessary for staff to commence certain actions relating to the closure of the District-owned laneway in accordance with its obligations under the Purchase & Sale Agreement. This would come forward as a separate report likely in July.

### 3.4 Community amenity contribution

Should Council choose to advance the development application forward, as recommended, staff will commence work on a potential community amenity contribution and provide a progress report in July.

### 3.5 Conclusion

The DRC has evaluated the revisions made by the applicant in response to Council's direction of March 4, 2013, and determined that the project is ready to move forward to final Development Permit drawings. Staff recommend that the application move forward to bylaw preparation, return to DRC in July, and return to Council for consideration following the August break (see Appendix D for the full application timeline).

## 4.0 **Options**

*(as recommended by staff)*

A. Advance the application forward in the development consideration process following refinements and further review as recommended by staff in the report dated June 3, 2013;

*(or, alternatively)*

B. Provide different or modified direction (to be specified) and/or request additional information (to be specified); or,

C. Reject the application.

Author

\_\_\_\_\_  
Andrew Browne

Appendices:

A – Ambleside 'Puzzle'

B – Official Community Plan excerpts related to Ambleside

C – Minutes of 30 May 2013 Design Review Committee meeting (unadopted excerpt)

D – Application timeline

E – Project data sheet

F – Drawing booklet

# APPENDIX A



## **APPENDIX B**

### **OCP excerpts related to Ambleside**

**Policy BF-C 2:** Support the commercial centres by encouraging residential uses.

- Encourage mixed commercial/residential development within commercial areas while retaining commercial frontage at street level where appropriate.

**Policy BF-C 3:** Enhance Ambleside Town Centre as West Vancouver's recognized Town Centre.

**Policy BF-C4: Consider buildings over four storeys on three special sites along Marine Drive – 1300 block south, 1400 block north, and 1600 block south.**

- The size and configuration of these larger sites can provide greater design opportunity, and flexibility to consider proposals with varying height is considered to be in the public interest.
- Notwithstanding building guidelines applicable in Ambleside, buildings on these special sites shall remain at two storeys as provided for in the zoning bylaw and increases in height would be considered as part of a rezoning application for specific site development.
- Any such application shall include an illustration of the development that could occur within the same four storey height and Floor Area Ratio of 1.75 that could be approved on sites elsewhere in Ambleside. A process of preliminary evaluation of the development proposal in comparison to this standard shall occur involving the local residential and business community and advisory committees of Council. Based upon that preliminary assessment, Council will decide whether to proceed with further review and formal consideration of bylaw amendments and development permits.
- Height in excess of four storeys would only be considered if it resulted in a superior building and site design, including increased open spaces or public squares, walkways and enhanced view corridors. A variation in FAR above 1.75 would only be considered in relation to offsetting the cost of providing assets such as community space for an art gallery, civic meeting space, additional public parking and rental housing.
- The site specific public amenity contribution for inclusion in the new zoning would be negotiated as part of the application.

**Policy BF-C 4.5:** Enhance Ambleside Town Centre's sense of place and uniqueness, including its growing role as a home for civic and cultural activities.

- Provide multiple opportunities for community meeting places and the use of streets and plazas as venues for civic events, including extended open spaces and landscaping on 14<sup>th</sup> Street and 17<sup>th</sup> Street below Marine Drive and civic spaces on the larger special development sites identified in Policy BF-C4. Such civic streets would be beautified and provide visual connections to the waterfront recreation and cultural facilities, but remain as normal traffic streets except for occasional community events. Access and use of adjacent private lands would form part of negotiations during rezoning applications.

**Policy BF-C 4.6:** Strengthen the connections between the waterfront and the Town Centre, with increased cultural and recreational activity and stronger functional links.

- Encourage commercial activities on the north/south streets to increase pedestrian interest and activity, and to draw people both from the waterfront and down to the waterfront

**Policy BF-C 4.8:** Provide street design improvements and parking facilities that complement and enhance the Ambleside Town Centre.

# APPENDIX C

## Minutes of May 30, 2013 Design Review Committee Meeting (unadopted excerpt)

### 4.2 GROSVENOR CAPITAL CORPORATION 1300 BLOCK SOUTH SIDE MARINE DRIVE, MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT; FILE: 1010-20-12-069

#### **Background:**

Andrew Browne introduced the project. He advised that Council requested the Committee evaluate the revised submission for consistency with direction expressed by Council on March 4, 2013. He reviewed Council's March 4, 2013 and noted specific items that staff would like the Committee to consider.

#### **Project Presentation:**

Using power point presentation and renderings James Patillo, Senior Vice President Grosvenor Americas opened the presentation. He advised that the resubmission addresses all of the recommendations by Council but still maintains integrity of design. He understands the significance of this building and excited about prospect of what it will mean in West Vancouver.

Architect James Cheng, addressing the Committee's comments and Council's recommendations, went over the changes to the building design including:

- building height reduction of 27 ft. for west building and 26 ft. for east building via reducing floor to ceiling height of residential units by 1 ft. and eliminating one residential storey in each building;
- an increase in number of residential units from 88 to 100 units;
- a reduction in height and area of roof top equipment building;
- steps taken to make the two buildings distinct;
- introduction of vertical elements and rectangular facade elements; and
- refinements to building bulk.

Landscape Architect John Wong went over revisions to the landscape plan, noting consistency of the public realm treatment to the approved Ambleside Streetscape Standards.

#### **Committee Questions:**

The Committee provided questions, with the applicants' response in *italics*, including the following:

- How would you compare your submission to the Merrick Building?
- Unit size reduction, would we be seeing these floor plans? *The project is still very much in flux, but once we get the go ahead to proceed, these plans will be finalized and included in the next submission*
- How do the vertical elements relate to the plans? *Relate to the party walls.*
- Have you looked at ideal tenant mix for the project? *The mix is important to the success of the project and to ensure uses at different times of the day; at a high level, the strategy is small scale retail with a local commitment – more like Crema than Park Royal Village.*

- How the community spaces in this community relate to West Van events such as Harmony Arts? *Will extend community events down to this end of Ambleside and see as key link to Ambleside Park.*
- How much clearance between the benches on Marine Drive and the building? *Set building back to include the benches and maintain full width sidewalk.*
- Two types of tree grates are shown? *These have been provided as examples but have not decided which one to use. Will only use one design.*
- Was consideration given to link up to Ambleside Park rather than bringing in residential which kills activity in this area? *Originally had park supportive retail but feedback was that Ambleside Park has unique character and identity and to not merge with Ambleside retail.*
- Have you addressed car lights shining into retail units at 13<sup>th</sup> townhouses? *Ground floor living area and bedrooms on second floor, and at night there is less traffic in this area. Good to have eyes on the street from CPTED principal.*
- Package provides superimposed context pictures, missing are views from water and the park.
- Why isn't there office space or at least some on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor? *Goal of Ambleside is to have animated pedestrian experience; feel residential on 2<sup>nd</sup> floor best supports this objective; also, office on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor does not activate the street.*
- What is purpose of the bridge that connects the two buildings? *Connects amenity area of the two buildings and would be open to invited guests to provide a viewpoint to participate in what's going on in atrium.*
- Have you considered not covering the atrium space? *People complained no outdoor covered space in West Vancouver; given climate conditions would provide year round usability.*
- Have designated areas for cafes or restaurants? *Not specifically, but all corner areas have sliding partitions and south facing units have capability to be used for restaurants.*
- Is there a continuous overhang on Marine Drive for weather protection? *Everywhere except townhouses.*

### **Committee Comments:**

Members' comments on the application included:

- Very clear and comprehensive presentation.
- Are there units in the building that might not be as saleable as others, that could be offered to people with disabilities. *The applicant clarified that the entire building is designed for universal accessibility.* The DRC member clarified that the concern was more about affordability than accessibility.
- Question the appropriateness of the overall vernacular for Ambleside as building looks more like it should be in False Creek. Ambleside buildings all seem to have 'heavier' elements, while this building has a lot of glass, and thus appears 'corporate'. As a gateway the first impression is that this building is an office building. Find the corner articulation points into the intersection as an intrusion. Elevations along the street are much more interesting and could be carried into the gateway corner.
- Great improvement and appreciate all the effort and time given to walk around Ambleside to help inform the design, all the comments well handled. Don't know how vertical massing elements relate to floor plans, liked the building the way it was before and don't like big blocky elements as they add too much

mass; not entirely convinced verticality does anything to reduce the mass. Concern about wood fenestration durability and longevity.

- Pedestrian experience is at the first level of a building; make sure width of the sidewalk, extent of the covering of the sidewalk and the use of the warming wood elements will be adequate for the pedestrian experience.
- Seems to be a lack of cohesiveness to the outside of the building; lost the gel that held it together. South elevation looks much more corporate than north elevation, with more glass looks like an office building.
- Very significant improvement from previous iteration but more work to do to get to next stage. Architectural language could be more codified by use. Question glazing and how it relates to upcoming changes to energy codes, wonder if needs to be revisited. Retail tenant mix needs to be identified at the outset as it will have a much better chance of activating Ambleside and being successful. Office space on corner 13<sup>th</sup> and Marine is a lost opportunity needs to be revisited. Important look at how retail/community space functions with Harmony Arts etc. Believe a building of this size should offer some office space, feel this is a disconnect as understand office space in demand in Ambleside.
- Very much improved and appreciate addressing comments. On Bellevue side looks like a single building not sure if due to same materials or amount of glazing. Don't like residential on south east corner, prefer some other use there.
- Street trees at townhouses are different from the rest of the block; stick with one species along Bellevue. Don't agree galleria paving should take precedent over the Ambleside Streetscape Standard paving, as feel sets hierarchy that atrium more important than Marine Drive. Art piece on south east feels like an obstacle to pedestrian use; south west needs to be more of an obstacle and go into view line space to be more of a feature location. Boulders as seating look 'lumpy'; provide stone seating and boulders but don't rely on boulders to do both. No planting plan provided for roof plan. Fence and hedge along rail property impedes car doors; consider removing hedge and replace with low ground cover and make fence more aesthetic. Bamboo species shown in atrium space is invasive and hesitant to put on slab. Revisit clearance between bench and some of planters.
- Commend architect for providing a brand new vocabulary for West Vancouver; however, at 13<sup>th</sup> Street the project seems to die. Take ideas from 14<sup>th</sup> Street and replicate to make this whole block become a festive block and become a great pavilion for the park. Architecture needs more work to enhance experience and gateway arrival into the whole area and link to the park.
- Consider putting a bump out at north east corner right turn lane allows reduce in width of crosswalk at Marine, creates more space at North east corner. Recommend consultants review the parking angle on Bellevue to ensure usability – may be necessary to use 45° angle parking rather than the 60° shown. Concerned about pedestrian safety getting to and from cars parked on the south side of Bellevue; recommend removing hedge and putting in a walking surface also provide a mid-block crosswalk. Like to see transition extending westerly to show how connect existing configuration of Bellevue west of 14<sup>th</sup>. Consider relocation of ramp to gate off the 14 unsecure residential parking spaces.
- Do not like the residential at south east corner.

- Reduced building height directed by Council is achieved by taking off one floor, reducing the residential floor to ceiling heights by 1 ft. plus significantly down-sizing the roof top mechanical structure.
- Building improved significantly; still somewhat conceptual and look forward to further development. Gateway aspect needs more work, materiality relentless and glazing needs to be addressed to give the building more of a break up. Consider breaking the two buildings using canopies for covered outdoor space and give more of a real break.

The presenters provided clarification and responded to some of the comments supplied.

Councillor Soprovich advised that he wants the process to be transparent and is concerned that what is stated around table tonight used in full statement for staff to move forward and not miss anything in presentation to Council. He questioned staff that if work with Grosvenor would be based on information tonight and when will it be coming back to this Committee. Geri Boyle advised that unadopted minutes would be provided in the report to Council that staff is targeting for June 17 and that Council would set the next steps for the project. If Council concurs and the material is ready, the project could possibly proceed to final development permit level drawings for DRC review at its meeting in July or September.

Councillor Cameron referred to the previous meeting in which staff had asked the Committee to comment on the proposed height and density and if appropriate for this site. He asked the Committee to clarify their views on these two issues. The Chair asked if anyone had comments on height and density, it was commented that massing is more the concern.

**Resolution:**

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Design Review has reviewed the Mixed Use Development for Grosvenor Capital Corporation at 1300 Block Marine Drive and recommends that the project advances to Development Permit level drawings for further Committee review considering the following comments:

- gateway aspect at 13<sup>th</sup> Street addressing form, traffic pattern, character and use;
- integrating of more office space in the building, not at grade;
- do not agree with the residential at grade;
- to animate 13<sup>th</sup> Street, with the opportunity to increase connectivity to Ambleside Park;
- look at legibility of materials and uses to contain residential character distinct from other uses;
- further design development to address the coherence of the horizontal and vertical elements;
- consider increasing number of residential units within the same square footage;
- provide review of target proposal for tenant mix; and
- to consider the hierarchy of the paving.

**CARRIED**

## APPENDIX D – Application timeline

#	Date	Milestone & Description
1	18 Oct 2012	Complete application received.
2	19 Nov 2012	RTC #1 – Council authorized public consultation.
3	13 Dec 2012	DRC #1 – Recommended resubmission.
4	17 Jan 2013	Open House #1 – WVCC Atrium
5	19 Jan 2013	Open House #2 – WVCC Atrium
6	23 Jan 2013	Public Meeting #1 – Kay Meek
7	4 Mar 2013	RTC #2 - Presented consultation results and Council affirmed direction for revisions.
8	13 May 2013	RTC #3 – Returns revised concepts to Council, referred to DRC, set next steps.
9	30 May 2013	DRC #2 – Recommended advancement to development permit drawings.
10	17 Jun 2013	RTC #4 – Recommends application advance in approval process.
11	22 Jul 2013 *	RTC #5 – Progress report on Community Amenity Contribution.
12	22 Jul 2013 *	RTC #6 – Lane closure process.
13	25 Jul 2013 *	DRC #3 – Review of progress on final revisions directed by Council in June.
14	Sep /Oct 2013 *	RTC #7 – Council receives draft bylaws (may give 1 <sup>st</sup> reading)
15	TBD	Open House #3 – Public information meeting (pre-public hearing)
16	TBD	Open House #4 – Public information meeting (pre-public hearing)
17	Oct 2013 *	Public Hearing
18	Oct / Nov 2013 *	Council may give 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> reading
19	conditional	RTC #8 – Confirms conditions precedent to adoption have been met (adoption of bylaws and development permit issuance).

---

\* Dates are tentative.

## APPENDIX E – Project data sheet

	Original	Revised (May)	Difference
<b>FAR</b>	2.99	2.90	(0.09)
<b>Net Floor Area</b>	256,060 sq ft	248,307 sq ft	(7,753 sq ft)
<b>“Visible” FAR <sup>1</sup></b>	2.99	2.86 <sup>1</sup>	(0.13)
<b>Height, Storeys</b> <b>West Building (14<sup>th</sup>)</b> <b>East Building (13<sup>th</sup>)</b>	8 storeys 7 storeys	7 storeys 6 storeys	(1 storey) (1 storey)
<b>Height, Feet <sup>2</sup></b> <b>West Building (14<sup>th</sup>) <sup>2</sup></b> <b>East Building (13<sup>th</sup>) <sup>2</sup></b>	106.25 ft <sup>3</sup> 94.75 ft <sup>3</sup>	79.00 ft <sup>4</sup> 68.50 ft <sup>4</sup>	(27.25 ft) (26.25 ft)
<b>Floor-to-Ceiling Height</b> <b>Residential</b> <b>Rooftop Mechanical</b>	11.50 ft 11.50 ft	10.50 ft 8.00 ft	(1.00 ft) (3.50 ft)
<b>Footprint, Rooftop Mechanical (per building)</b>	~ 2065 sq ft	~ 340 sq ft	(~ 1725 sq ft)
<b>Residential Units</b> <b>Number</b> <b>Net Average Size <sup>5</sup></b>	88 units 2084 sq ft	100 units 1771 sq ft	12 units (313 sq ft)
<b>Residential Floor Area <sup>6</sup></b>	212,810 sq ft	208,371 sq ft	(4439 sq ft)
<b>Townhouse Floor Area</b>	nil	7,790 sq ft	7,790 sq ft
<b>CRU Floor Area</b>	43,250 sq ft	35,482 sq ft	(7,768 sq ft)
<b>Office Floor Area</b>	nil	4,454 sq ft	4,454 sq ft

<sup>1</sup> With the introduction of two-level townhouses within the existing commercial ceiling height in the vicinity of 13th & Bellevue, the portion of FAR attributed to the second level of the townhouses is in effect incorporated into the existing massing of the building and is not “visible” FAR.

<sup>2</sup> Building heights have been normalized to use the grade at Marine Drive at the Galleria (16.75 ft), being the approximate mid-point grade of the block.

<sup>3</sup> Includes the previous rooftop mechanical penthouse due to its significant height and size.

<sup>4</sup> Excludes the rooftop mechanical penthouse due to it being relocated to elsewhere in the building, and excludes the revised elevator overrun due to the reduction in its size and height.

<sup>5</sup> Excludes common hallways and building circulation space, as is standard. Previously some measures of average unit size may have included some of these elements.

<sup>6</sup> Includes all residential floor area, including two-level townhouses.

	<b>Original</b>	<b>Revised (May)</b>	<b>Difference</b>
<b>Setback from West Building to 14th St PL</b>	~ 24.8 ft	~ 20.5 ft	(~ 4.3 ft)
<b>Min. Setback from East Building to Marine Dr PL</b>	~ 8.7 ft	~ 4.2 ft	(~ 4.5 ft)
<b>Galleria, Narrowest Point</b>	39.5 ft	38.6 ft	(0.9 ft)
<b><u>Parking Required</u></b>			
<b>Total</b>	285 stalls	300 stalls	15 stalls
<b>Commercial</b>	109 stalls	100 stalls	(9 stalls)
<b>Residential</b>	176 stalls	200 stalls	24 stalls
<b><u>Parking Provided</u></b>			
<b>Total</b>	314 stalls	310 stalls	(4 stalls)
<b>Commercial</b>	124 stalls	101 stalls	(23 stalls)
<b>Residential <sup>7</sup></b>	190 stalls	209 stalls	19 stalls
<b>Residential Visitor</b>	11 stalls	13 stalls	2 stalls

---

<sup>7</sup> Includes all parking stalls provided for residential uses, including residential visitor stalls.