

Date: Monday, February 23, 2015  
Time: 3:00 p.m.  
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

---

**PRESENT:****Board**

J. Pickering Deputy Director of Planning, (Chair)  
B. Jackson General Manager of Planning and Development  
P. Judd General Manager of Engineering Services  
S. Johnston Deputy City Manager

**Advisory Panel**

R. Bragg Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
S. Chandler Representative of the Development Industry  
A. Ray Representative of the General Public

**Regrets**

K. Busby Representative of the Design Professions  
J. Ross Representative of the Development Industry  
J. Miletic-Prelovac Representative of the General Public  
P. Sanderson Representative of the General Public  
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

**ALSO PRESENT:****City Staff:**

J. Greer Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development  
M. Holm Engineering Services - Projects Branch  
A. Moorey Development Planner  
J. Borsa Project Facilitator

**1819 WEST 5<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE - DE417855 - ZONE C-3A**

T. Yamamoto Yamamoto Architecture  
T. Orr Orr Development  
A. Orr Orr Development  
D. Stoyko Sharp and Diamond Landscape Architecture  
D. Klein Kane Consulting (LEED<sup>TM</sup> Consultant)

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

---

**1. MINUTES**

It was moved by Mr. Jackson, seconded by Mr. Johnston, and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on February 10, 2015.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

**3. 1819 WEST 5<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE - DE417855 - ZONE C-3A  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Yamamoto Architecture

Request: To develop the site with a 5-storey mixed-use building; retail on the 1st floor, 25 dwelling units on the 2nd to 6th storeys over two (2) levels underground parking (61 parking spaces and 7 commercial parking spaces plus one Class B loading accessed from the lane.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Mr. Moorey, Development Planner, presented the proposal and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report. The recommendation was for support of the application, subject to the conditions noted.

Mr. Moorey took questions from the Board and Panel members.

**Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Yamamoto, Architect, asked to correct the stats for height mentioned in the Staff Committee Report from 58.85 feet to 53.75 feet making it 8.9 feet over the guideline height. He added that they have tried to minimize the height of the commercial while allowing for functional commercial space. They have as well located the commercial entry to the east to get as much height as possible. He also mentioned that he felt the site was a good candidate for density as it is close to public transportation and a lot of amenities in the neighbourhood. Mr. Yamamoto mentioned that the height has been reduced substantially since the first review at the Urban Design Panel. He noted that the building will be one storey less tall than what could be built outright on the site.

Mr. Yamamoto stated that they support the conditions in the Staff Committee Report and agreed to find ways to further reduce the perceived height on the west property line.

The applicant team took questions from the Board and Panel members.

*Note: Mr. Greer mentioned that there was not a discrepancy in the height discussed in the report but only in how it was measured. Both heights as noted in the report are correct.*

**Comments from other Speakers**

Members of the community expressed concerns regarding the following:

- Opposition for the proposed height of the building;
- Concerns regarding the height relaxations being given the application;
- The west elevation is a problem as the proposed blank wall is not neighbourly and could be softened with the use of colour, materials or plantings;
- The elevator over-run on the roof is contributing to the height of the building;

- The applicant's view analysis is misleading and not accurate and will block many of the neighbour's city views;
- Concern regarding what the applicant has done to earn the extra height and density;
- The building should not be any higher than what is allowed in the C-3A guidelines;
- Concerns regarding more traffic considering the amount of parking stalls included in the application;
- It is a dangerous precedent to allow every application to build up to the discretionary height;
- Most of the surrounding buildings are within the height limits of the C-3A zoning;
- Those owners in the adjacent building who are losing their views are also losing some value on their units;
- Services and delivery vehicles to the new building are going to add to the amount of traffic in the area;
- The outdoor patio for the café on the corner of West 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Burrard Street will be too noisy to sit out for a cup of coffee.

### Panel Opinion

Panel members offered a range of comments on the proposal, including:

The Advisory Panel members thanked the speakers for their articulated comments;

- The application went to the Urban Design Panel twice: the first review got non-support;
- The applicant has made a successful effort in creating an architectural form that fits its context;
- The height and form as well as the architectural language are very successful;
- The large balconies will make for nice amenity spaces for the units although common amenity could be added to the roof as well;
- There has been some evolution on Burrard Street, both on the east and the west sides of the street;
- The building suits the transition very well and has an affinity with some of the new buildings that are both commercial and residential;
- The blank wall on the west façade could use some type of articulation to mitigate its impact to the neighbours;
- The blank wall could be insulated to help with the sustainability strategy;
- Regarding the commercial unit, the Advisory Panel did not want to see it stepped down from the street as it might make the unit hard to lease as it was already a compromised space;
- They also cautioned against reducing the height of the commercial space;
- The Advisory Panel thought that the view analysis of both the public and the applicants were accurate; whereas one used a wider angle that showed a different experience;
- The zoning policy speaks to the fact that public views are protected while private views are not;
- The Advisory Panel found that the height and density for the application was acceptable;
- That the applicant has agreed to reduce the building form on the roof that will help the preservation of the view cone which is important;
- As well the transparent railings on the roof will help in terms of private views from the adjacent residential building;
- The livability of the building is excellent as it is supplying a variety of unit types including two and three bedroom units;
- The Advisory Panel was in support for the application.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. Jackson moved approval of the application with amendments to the Staff Committee Report. He mentioned that if it wasn't for the need to reduce the building's height to preserve the view cone, the approach for the first iteration of the building was a more innovative design. Mr. Jackson said he was supporting the development because it was the right thing to do for the neighbourhood in terms of some of the other alternatives for the development of the site. He added that as planning staff, a better job needed to be done in being able to explain to the public where they can find the documentation that allows them to understand that there is a height which is set out as a right but there are many instances that can allow for discretionary height if it meets certain criteria. The public has to be able to find that information easily and there has to be links between documents to help the public know what might occur on a particular site. As well, Mr. Jackson said he wanted to give staff the direction for better coherence in providing that information to the public.

Mr. Jackson said there needed to be additional design development to the west wall and that he liked getting rid as much as possible the elevator over run and reducing the foot print on the roof. He mentioned that the blank wall on the west is a little brutal up against the neighbours and would like to see something less stark for the residents to look at. He added that there is no guarantee that there won't be a redevelopment of the building adjacent.

Mr. Judd seconded the motion with the amendments. He also made a recommendation for amending a condition. He said he agreed that it should be more transparent for people inquiring about a range of possible heights for existing sites. He said that when he joined the Board he found it difficult to understand what the range of possibilities could be for height and that it could be difficult for members of the public as well. He noted that it needed to be made more explicit for the public so they understand what the possibilities could be regarding height for any given site.

Mr. Judd said that he felt the application was appropriate for the site and fits into what the Board can approve. It is going to impact people's views, but virtually every development has some impacts on views. The architecture respects that as much as it can and he added that he thought it was very well done. Overall it is a development he could support with the amendments to the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Johnston thanked the Advisory Panel particularly comments from the Urban Design Panel. As well he thanked the neighbours for their comments. He agreed that as a residence it can be hard to figure out what discretionary opportunities are for developments. The guidelines were written in the area to allow for this kind of increase in height given that the development is on a major arterial in the city. Mr. Johnston said he thought it was a good building and that some of the steps taken will help to reduce the height and hoped the applicant team will take them seriously and change the character of the west wall. As well he thought the applicant would look at ways to reduce the height and the impact that would have on the neighbours.

Mr. Johnston added that the Board was charged with protecting public views and the applicant has done that. He said he realized that some people's views will be impacted but thought it won't be as bad as the neighbours have anticipated. Mr. Johnston added that he wanted to thank staff for work on the project and encouraged the applicant to reduce as much as possible the impact to the neighbours.

**Motion**

It was moved by Mr. Jackson and seconded by Mr. Judd, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE417855, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated January 28, 2015, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.1 in the Note to Applicant to read as follows:

Note to Applicant: Relocate rooftop Mechanical Room to building below. Configure resident roof access and *eliminate* elevator penthouse to comply with Section 10.11.1 of the Zoning and Development By-law.

Add a new Condition 1.2 to read as follows:

*Design development to improve neighbourliness of the west wall including exploring the addition of insulation, metal cladding, colour, texture and a number of other architectural treatments.*

Amend item the third bullet in Condition A.2.5 to read as follows:

delete proposed slab pavers and groundcover on West 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue *or make alternate arrangements suitable to the General Manager of Engineering Services and Legal Services; and*

**4. OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Judd made the following motion:

*That staff explore mechanisms to make the range of heights possible on a given site available to the public on request.*

The motion was supported by Mr. Jackson and Mr. Johnston.

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:27 PM.