

Date: Tuesday, January 22, 2018
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT:

Board

P. Mochrie Deputy City Manager
A. Law Director, Development Services, (Chair)
G. Kelley General Manager of Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability
J. Greer Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
C. Nelms Deputy General Manager

Advisory Panel

H. Besharat Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
A. Norfolk Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission
R. Rohani Representative of the General Public
D. Pretto Representative of the General Public
B. Jarvis Representative of the Development Industry
R. Chaster Representative of the General Public

Regrets

A. Molaro Assistant Director Urban Design
R. Wittstock Representative of the Design Professions
J. Dobrovolny General Manager of Engineering

ALSO PRESENT:

City Staff:

T. Potter Development Planner
P. St. Michel Development Planner
K. Imani Project Facilitator
C. Stanford Project Facilitator
C. Joseph Engineering

2501 Spruce (1110 W Broadway) - DP-2017-00933- ZONE C-3A

Delegation

Walter Francl, Architect, Francl Architecture
Margot Long, Landscape Architect, PWL
Matt Meehan, Owner/Developer, Concord

88 Pacific Blvd - DP-2017-00918- Zone - BCPED

Delegation

Amela Brudar, Architect, GBL Architecture
Joey Stevens, Architect, GBL Architecture
Emily Brett, Architect, GBL Architecture

Recording Secretary: C.Lade

1. MINUTES

It was moved by J. Dobrovolny, seconded by P. Mochrie, and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on January 8, 2018.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 2501 Spruce Street - DP-2017-00933- ZONE C-3A (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: GBL Architects

Request: To develop a new 10 storey residential tower (37 market dwelling units) and a 2 storey commercial/office podium (approximately 465 m², or 5000 sq.ft.) for a FSR of 3.3 (3.0 permitted plus a 10% Heritage transfer allowance from 40 Powell Street). There is both indoor and outdoor amenity space for residents and office users at level 2. Two levels of underground parking (50 parking spaces) are accessed from the lane, with four surface parking spaces directly off the lane.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mr. Potter, Development Planner, presented the proposal and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Potter then took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Applicant's Comments

The applicant noted the work in response to the conditions. The one point is in regards to condition 1.3. The applicant noted the different aspects of the elevations, such as the layout and energy performance, as well as the proportions. The applicant noted the inherent differences between the east and west elevation that would make the changes unique.

The Applicant took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Comments from Speakers

Speaker one, Paul Molund, noted three points. The first is the building would block his view of False Creek at the neighbouring site. As a research scientist, Mr. Molund noted the adverse health effects of living on a busy street in context of the proposal. Mr. Molund also mentioned the issue of new developments amplifying noise.

Advisory Panel Discussion

Helen Besharat, Urban Design Panel Chair, noted UDP feedback on the east west elevation in terms of design conditions.

Mr. Jarvis, noted that the zone meets certain conditions. Mr. Jarvis noted there could be ways to improve the east west elevation.

January 22, 2018

Mr. Norfolk, Heritage Commission, noted support for heritage transfers. Mr. Norfolk noted that the retention of the façade is a missed opportunity in terms of there being character merit on the building. Mr. Norfolk urged further study on Broadway in terms of character.

Mr. Rohani, noted support for the project and supported the proposed materials.

Ms. Pretto, noted support for the application, and noted support for the colour and materials in the application. Ms. Pretto expressed support for the façade, the expression and the livability of the building as well.

Ms. Chaster noted support for the east west elevations. As well, Ms. Chaster expressed support for the 2/3 bedroom units and urged the applicant noted that better bike access be considered.

Board Discussion

Mr. Mochrie noted support for the project and the logical conditions. The building supporting the heritage density was a positive aspect and noted the challenges of view loss.

Mr. Kelley appreciated the advisory panel comments and support. The view issue would only be addressed with a significant shift of the building.

In response, Mr. Potter noted the ground level components would not be feasible if the building were to be shifted.

The applicant also noted shifting the building would make the site too close to the neighbouring site redevelopment.

Ms. Nelms noted the engineering aspects were functioning well.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Mochrie and seconded by Ms. Nelms, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the **APPROVE** Development Application No. **DP-2017-00933** in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated December 13, 2017, with the following amendments (in italics):

1.2 design development to improve functionality of ground floor and retail, as follows:

- iii. improve the prominence/visibility of residential and office entries;

Note to Applicant: The intent of this condition is to achieve approximately 0.5 FSR for retail space, and to ensure functional retail units that could accommodate a variety of tenants. *This could be achieved by shifting the core south.*

1.3 Design development to improve architectural form and character, as follows:

- v. *provide continuous rain cover and canopies along the Broadway wrapping around the corner to the residential entry off Spruce (min. 1.8 m deep, 4 m. above sidewalk);*

4. 88 Pacific Blvd - DP-2017-00918- ZONE BCPED (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Frankl Architecture

Request: To continue the use of three existing temporary Presentation Centre buildings on this site with associated surface parking previously permitted on expired and time limited Development Permit (DE409317), along with the provision of new temporary publicly accessible open space functioning as an interim park, until development of Sub-area 6C and the commencement of implementation of the permanent park and public open space in accordance with the Creekside Park extension and Northeast False Creek (NEFC) area plan.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mr. St. Michel, Development Planner, presented the proposal and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. St. Michel then took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Applicant's Comments

The applicant noted a conflict, using plant materials, and urged staff to acknowledge the re-use of plant materials in the park. The applicant aspired to use the site for events in future. The applicant noted the steps taken to reach the deadline of the remediation as well as the drainage of the site.

Mr. McNaney, Project Director of Northeast False Creek, urged re-use of materials by the applicant in the park green space for sustainability reasons.

The Applicant took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Comments from Speakers

Speaker one, Patsy McMillan, Chair of the False Creek residents association, noted the project details and the timeline for the site and urged June construction completion so the site can be used. The wet part of the site is hoped to be treated. There should be a limit on events that do not meet noise by law code, as well as neighbourly lighting was encouraged. Ms. McMillan noted the bike share should not be part of the green space, but a bike parking space should be implemented. Ms. McMillan also urged washroom construction would be strategically placed, and thanked the staff, and supported the application.

Speaker two, Gregory Astop, noted parking necessities for parking for film industry professionals to do business in the city. The speaker delegation noted the temporary spaces

January 22, 2018

needed for filming crew to park were slowly disappearing, and that it is a paramount issue in terms of 5-10 year plan for parking for crews. Parking is an important component for the survival of the film industry and the jobs go along with the industry.

Speaker three, Ms. Del Sol, noted the necessity for a space for community to connect and noted concern for the loss of large spaces to convene in the city.

Advisory Panel Discussion

Mr. Jarvis, noted the application was handsome for a temporary use. Mr. Jarvis noted the temporary uses for the film industry, but advised against using private land for the industry uses.

Mr. Norfolk, Heritage Commission representative, noted there was no heritage component to the site.

Mr. Rohani, noted support for the project and is excited to see the park. Mr. Rohani did not know the solution for parking for the film industry. Mr. Rohani urged a permanent park sooner than later despite the challenges.

Ms. Pretto, noted loss of event space in the area. Ms. Pretto noted there are ways to make event spaces were able to be flexible, and asked staff to continue to push event space use in the city.

Ms. Chaster thanked the speakers for participating as well as staff. Ms. Chaster noted the loss of the event space but was encouraged the park space. Ms. Chaster noted the importance of the film industry in the city and hoped staff would consider film industry needs.

Board Discussion

Mr. Mochrie noted the complex trade-offs for the project, and noted the microcosm of demands on land space at the site. Mr. Mochrie noted the events impact need to separate considerations. Mr. Mochrie noted the communication needed to be opened up for the film industry to develop the application. Mr. Mochrie noted the importance for the film industry and staff to consider other uses going forward.

Mr. Kelley, noted communication needed to be extended to city staff for the film industry needs. Mr. Kelley thanked Concord for persisting on the development and working with city staff.

Ms. Nelms supported the application and appreciated the strong relationship of Concord with the community, as well as working with staff on the ambitious time line.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Kelley and seconded by Mr. Mochrie. , and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the APPROVE Development Application No. **DP-2017-00918** in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated January 11, 2018, with the following amendment:

No. 1.1 (vii) be revised to include the words in italics below:

- 1.1 design development to the proposed temporary publicly accessible open space, generally in accordance with the sketch concept plan attached as Appendix C, to accommodate:

- vii. furnishings and washrooms;

Note to Applicant: *Provide garbage and recycling receptacles and explore the feasibility of providing temporary universally accessible washrooms onsite. At a minimum, a location and servicing hook-ups (water, sewer, electricity and utilities) for an Automated Portable Washroom should be provided.* Transportation recommends that 50% of the public seating should be accessible seating evenly spread throughout proposed temporary publicly accessible open space and meet accessibility standards.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:47 pm.