

Date: December 10, 2018  
Time: 3:00 p.m.  
Place: Town Hall, City Hall

---

**PRESENT:**

**Board**

A. Law Director, Development Services, (Chair)  
J. Dobrovolny General Manager of Engineering  
P. Mochrie Deputy City Manager  
G. Kelley General Manager of Planning, Urban Design & Sustainability

**Advisory Panel**

A. Brudar Representative of the Design Professionals (Urban Design Panel)  
A. Norfolk Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission  
B. Jarvis Representative of the Development Industry  
D. Pretto Representative of the General Public  
R. Chaster Representative of the General Public  
R. Rohani Representative of the General Public  
R. Wittstock Representative of the Design Professions  
S. Allen Representative of the General Public

**Regrets**

D. Neale Representative of the Design Professionals (Urban Design Panel)

**ALSO PRESENT:**

**City Staff:**

D. Wiley Development Planner  
J. Park Development Planner  
M. So Manager, Development Review Branch  
J. Freeman Project Facilitator

**325 Carrall St - DP-2018-00379- HA-2**

Bruce Hayden Human Studio Architecture and Urban Design Ltd.  
Pamela Doherty Human Studio Architecture and Urban Design Ltd.  
Peter Atkinson Human Studio Architecture and Urban Design Ltd.

**Recording Secretary:** D.Fung

---

**1. MINUTES**

It was moved by Mr. Dobrovolny and seconded by Mr. Mochrie and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on Nov. 13

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None

**3. 325 - 333 Carrall St - DP-2018-00379- HA-2  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Human Studio Architecture and Urban Design Ltd.  
Request: To retain and restore the two-storey façade of the existing municipally designated Heritage building and develop a 7-storey, mixed-use building dwelling units above, consisting of 15 Micro Dwelling units and one Live-work unit over one level of underground storage.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Ms. Wiley, Development Planner, introduced the project to the board and Panel members and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report. The recommendation was for support of the application, subject to the conditions noted.

Ms. Wiley took questions from the Board and Panel members.

**Applicant's Comments**

The Applicant thanked Staff for the Staff Committee Report. The Applicant is in general agreement with the report and is comfortable that they are able to meet the requirements.

The Applicant would like to request the following consideration to the report conditions:

1. Minor considerations to be worked out with Staff
2. Regarding the condition 1.2 to remove the 4<sup>th</sup> storey amenity room 'pavilion', the Applicant feels strongly the kind of small units in this project requires a high quality amenity room which provides a character and quality that's different than the units themselves. Having a ground level amenity room will not provide the high quality amenity. The Applicant refers to the Burns Bog building across the street as an example of a design which makes the smaller units livable. To only have an outdoor amenity deck and a ground floor amenity room would be disrespectful of future residents. A study was done with the Geosim modelling which showed that the addition is not visible at all from the ground level from all significant locations.
3. Regarding the articulation and simplification of the block, the Applicant looked into other options like having a cube on top of a cube, and found that the building appeared visibly heavier. The Applicant feels strongly that this is the right design solution and most respectful solution to the existing building.

4. Regarding the loading space requirement, the Applicant feels that having a loading space in the lane would not be used due to constrained space and residents would simply pull up to load instead. The retail space is slightly above the space threshold which requires a designated loading space and there are many units in the Gastown area which do not have designated loading space so it's not unprecedented.

The Applicant took questions from the Board and Panel members.

#### Comments from other Speakers

None.

#### Panel Opinion

Ms. Brudar, chair of the Urban Design Panel, noted a correction to the report that the Urban Design Panel supported this project without recommendations.

Ms. Brudar commented that this is one of the few projects that were so well received by the Panel and the words, outstanding and excellent, were used throughout all the commentary.

Ms. Brudar noted that the Panel fully supported the massing and the height of the addition. It was felt that the infill building was exceptionally well designed with a level of detail isn't often seen at this stage.

Ms. Brudar reiterated that the Panel felt that the Applicant went the extra mile to design this project to fit the neighbourhood and has designed the project masterfully within the guideline but in very contemporary fashion. The project was exceptionally well accepted by the Panel.

Ms. Brudar commented that the Panel fully supported that relaxation of the extra 7ft. on the roof noting that it is not perceived.

Ms. Brudar commented that there was a lot of discussion on the simplification of the addition above the existing building with no consensus and only expressions of opinions from different Panel members. The Panel didn't have issues with the height but just how the boxes were stacked. The addition is differentiated from the infill building and the heritage building and the Panel felt it was an excellent approach to solving this problem and no recommendation was made.

Ms. Brudar commented that rooftop amenity is very important part of the project and removing this would be detrimental to the livability of the residence given the small units. The Panel was shown the 3D animation and noted that it's not possible to see the addition if you are walking on the street level. As well, it is rendered in very different materials and becomes an interesting detail of the project rather imposing.

Ms. Brudar noted that the Panel supported that there is no loading and suggested a compromise of having a passenger space provided for smaller vehicles and reducing the large garbage.

Ms. Chaster commented that it is such a challenging site with the access and the configuration and the existing heritage and commended the Applicant for delivering such a handsome product.

Ms. Chaster was happy to see the extent of the whole storey of underground storage and excited to see a project with zero car parking stalls and a bunch of bike parking stalls.

Ms. Chaster commended the Applicant for fighting for a higher quality amenity space.

Ms. Chaster expressed concerned about the recommendation to move the top floor amenity and was happy to see the extent of research going into developing the amenity program that's going to support the size of the units.

Mr. Rohani commented that this is such a fitting project for the location. It's a unit type that is in such a high demand in the city.

Mr. Rohani commended the Applicant for designing all the amenity space noting that it's clear that the Applicant is not squeezing the space for as much rentable FSR as possible

Mr. Rohani commented that there should be a balance between the amount of loading to provide and maintaining heritage space, noting that the majority of loading will occur in the first few months. Mr. Rohani expressed support for maintaining more heritage space over having loading space.

Mr. Jarvis commented that this is a small but ambitious project and commended the Applicant on how they put this together, noting that it is a really cool project in a really important location.

Mr. Jarvis supports the relaxation of the loading and suggested that some space to be found on the street to add another class A stall. Mr. Jarvis expressed that the Heritage façade revitalization is more important than the loading and the ground floor retail space is a small CRU with an insignificant volume which would not necessarily warrant a full loading space.

Mr. Jarvis commented that this is an ambitious and complicated project and therefore costly and can see why Applicant does not want to use the DCL waiver so that they can get the rent to fund the cost.

Mr. Jarvis expressed support for the stacking and the mass and the amenity space as it stands.

Mr. Norfolk commented that Gastown Historic Area Planning Committee (GHAPC) was supportive of the rooftop addition. In consultation with Heritage Commission members, the conclusion was that this project works because it maintains the sense of the Gastown atmosphere and worth replicating.

Mr. Norfolk commended using the same brick along the lane.

Mr. Norfolk noted that there was consensus that the rooftop addition was done nicely by breaking up the massing so as to not look like a lump and was in favour of a deep setback if achievable and recommended against simplifying it.

Ms. Allen reiterated that the Applicant should considering using the retail tool kit and application for DCL waiver rates. This Pigeon Park neighbourhood is a tight community and there are lots of opportunities to be compatible with the new residents, thinking about the retail uses and social sustainability as well as connecting to the community. Ms. Allen notes that it can be something that pays off by having a long term opportunity for the building to last and be durable and the people be very connected to it versus the financial trade-offs of devaluing due to section 219.

Ms. Pretto highlighted that one of the challenges will be building in a tight site in a vibrant area.

Ms. Pretto suggests the reduction or removing of 1.2 and 1.4 from the report as it relates to the amenities room and the massing due to the fact that Urban Design Panel and Heritage Commission both speak so highly of this project. Further to that, on the massing on the infill building, only the elevator core viewable. Ms. Pretto recommends against reducing or adding a hatch which will create a maintenance issue and cost.

Ms. Pretto commented that on consideration 1.3 regarding the number of units, smaller micro units give us affordable units and making them larger makes them less affordable.

Ms. Law thanked the advisory Panel for their comments and notes that there was unanimity of support for this project.

### Board Discussion

Mr. Dobrovolny commended the Applicant design team on their exceptional job on the project and commented that it's exciting to see a project come in with some sense of scale and respect everything that's there and do a wonderful job with the heritage.

Mr. Dobrovolny is supportive of waiving the residential parking requirements.

Mr. Dobrovolny comments that waiving the loading requirement would not be supportable since this location does not have alternatives which would not impact others in the neighbourhood. There is a VPD spot and a handicap spot which gets used regularly. The alley may not be big enough to allow any stopping and loading without blocking the entire alleyway. Mr. Dobrovolny notes that the report requires that the loading and parking be met to Engineering's satisfaction and it's within the Director of Planning approval to vary the requirements.

Mr. Dobrovolny expressed frustration that this project did not go to the Vancouver Heritage Commission. Fortunately, the Applicant proposal was approved by the Heritage representative.

Mr. Dobrovolny moved to approve the recommendations without the requirement for removing the pavilion and noted the recommendation from the Panel and the Applicant that it's not readily visible from the street and there isn't any concern. For micro units like this, the more amenity space there is, the more it will serve a very well used purpose.

Mr. Mochrie commends the Applicant on the project for being fabulously well done.

Mr. Mochrie shares the concern about loading in this part of the neighbourhood and uncertainty of the tenancy around this CRU which could affect this but is supportive of the recommendations without changes to the loading.

Mr. Mochrie commented that the decision on not applying for the DCL waiver could have an impact on how well this project is accepted in the neighbourhood.

Mr. Mochrie advocates that the Applicant and the owner take into consideration the checklist and guidance from the City for options around rent paying tenants for that potential space.

Mr. Kelly thanked the Applicant design team for a creative approach to a tricky infill site.

Mr. Kelly acknowledged the importance of the representation of the Urban Design Panel and the Heritage Commission and their agreement of support for this project.

Mr. Kelly committed to look into the role of the Heritage Commission to these types of projects and will report back on how the Heritage Commission is being used by Staff.

Mr. Kelly clarified the understandings of the motion as it stands to include that the 7ft. height relaxation on the infill block is acceptable, that there is removal of condition 1.2.1 requiring the removal of the pavilion, and that the loading requirement is to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering and subject to the Director of Planning's approval to waive the requirements.

Mr. Kelly introduced a friendly amendment to encourage the Applicant is to consult the community retail tool kit and to strongly consider the DCL waiver rents.

### Motion

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

THAT the Board **APPROVE** the Development Application No. **DP-2018-00379** in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated October 19, 2018, with the following amendments:

1. Removal of condition 1.2

4. **OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

5. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:15 pm.