

Date: Monday, November 26, 2018
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

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

Advisory Panel

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

Regrets

S. Allen Representative of the General Public
R. Chaster Representative of the General Public
D. Pretto Representative of the General Public
R. Rohani Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

J. Greer Assistant Director, Development Services
G. Schaefer Development Planner
M. Castillo Development Planner
C. Stanford Development Services
J. Borsa Development Services
C. Joseph Engineering

2030 Barclay - RM-5B**DP-2018-00694**

Delegation

Richard Henriquez, Architect, Henriquez Partner
Cam Haliser, Architect, Shift Architecture

439 Powell (SHORT) - DEOD**DP-2018-00665**

Delegation

Anthony Boni, Architect, Boni Madison Architects
Richard Wong, Owner, Ming Sun Benevolent Society
Graham Plant, Developer, CPA Development Consultants

Recording Secretary: K.Cermeno

1. MINUTES

Chair Law noted the approval of November 13, 2018 minutes have been deferred to the next meeting of Dec 10, 2018.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 2030 Barclay - RM-5B
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Rob Elliot

Request: To develop this site with a 10-storey building with 19 dwelling units, and three levels of underground parking accessed from the lane including a heritage density transfer of approximately 3,568 square feet from a donor site owned by Zen Family Holdings Inc.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mr. Schaefer, 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. Schaefer took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Applicant's Comments

The applicant noted they are confident to work with staff in resolving any concerns and conditions.

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

Comments from Speakers

Speaker one, Veronica Delorme, noted she has been living in the East end since 2003 and is here to speak in opposition of the development. Ms. Delorme noted this will set a precedent in this quiet low key neighbourhood. Ms. Delorme fears the west end will become an area that is less affordable and congestion will increase. The buildings will be above the height recommended and this will mean less affordable housing and an increase in unaffordable smaller units. In addition, having two parking spots per suite will be destructive to a neighbourhood that prides on being walkable. Ms. Delorme expressed concern that this will mean other parts of the West End Community Plan will also be ignored. Ms. Delorme noted she is curious why the City ignores its own community plans. This plan emphasizes the lack of affordable housing.

Speaker two, Rob Grant, a retired architect, noted 5 principles that this development is not in keeping with. Principle one, achieve a green and environmentally sustainable pattern. Principle two, support a range of affordable housing option that will reach the diverse needs of the community. Principle three, foster a robust and resilient economy. Principle five, provide and support a range of sustainable transportation options, at two spots per unit the applicant is encouraging automobile dominance and congestion. Principle seven, foster a sustainable, resilient, safe and healthy communities. Mr. Grant noted the Development Permit Board has a clear choice; it can make a choice that is solely based on the bylaws or can abide by the West End community plan that involved countless hours by community members and residents to create a livable community.

Speaker three, Cynthia Flunt, lives in 1960 Robson Street. Our view looks out to an 8 storey and 13 storey developments. Most of the time these units are dark nobody is in there. This is not good for the public realm of the neighbourhood. There is an increase of unoccupied units. Ms. Flunt noted she is concerned with the parking provided especially when there is car shares and transit all over the area. It is a walkable area that should remain this way. Ms. Flunt noted it is not acceptable that no one with a modest income will be able to live in this area?

Speaker four, Anthony Kupershmid, Executive Director of the west end senior's network, noted they are not taking a position but more have a question to clarify some concerns. This applicant appears to be in violation of the West end community plan, is there information available where one can view other exceptions to the West End Plan?

Mr. Jarvis asked in response to the last speaker if a staff could clarify if this particular proposal can be considered as an exception to the West End Community Plan.

A staff noted that during the planning process the public was ensured that the zoning in place would remain, and this particular project is in line with the intent of the plan that allows incremental change in redevelopments. In this case since it is a hotel that is being developed there is no rate of change that would apply to rental developments.

Mr. Kupershmid noted he wanted to state for the record that many members of the public do perceive this as a violation to the West End Plan.

Panel Opinion

Ms. Brudar noted the support of the Urban Design panel. The proposal itself is interesting and provides an orthodox building. There are different heights at almost each block on the west end. There was a lot of conversation around the architectural expression, the building does not follow the right angle orientation as the rest of the street, however the panel felt it was a different design that is welcomed. In regards to the balconies, planning captured the concerns well in its comments. When it comes to the amenity lobby, again it is not a usual approach, however the opportunities presented allow for good circulation and social interaction. When it comes to the breezeway suggest a picket fence or netting to allow for circulation.

Mr. Jarvis noted the architecture is supportable.

Mr. Jarvis noted in regards to the amenity spaces there is room for social interaction with the two spaces being joined together. Possibly a temporary divider can be included if there are two different events occurring.

Mr. Jarvis noted his approval of the breeze way concept.

Mr. Jarvis noted the West End community plan was one of the most robust consultation and one that was heavily consulted.

Mr. Jarvis on behalf of Mr. Wittstock noted his support for the unique architecture.

Mr. Wittstock noted he is not keen on separating the amenities from the lobby as it appears to be micromanaging.

Mr. Wittstock supports the open breeze way concept and that the project would improve with less parking.

Mr. Norfolk noted his involvement with the West End Plan from the heritage angle.

Mr. Norfolk noted the whole plan was based on a deal to protect the neighbourhoods, as described in 7.2, the scale of the neighbourhoods, in return for which the community agreed to very tall buildings on the corridor. The community saw this as the deal.

Mr. Norfolk noted if the plan has failed to deliver on the deal that is something the public is upset about and seven organizations have sent a letter to mayor and council for a meeting. This project is not working in the view of the residents.

Mr. Norfolk noted the real issue is the approval of 1150 Barclay and this application has caused a cascade of a chance to assemble the old co-ops and the early strata's to build this particular form and that will lead to this particular form becoming the dominant feature.

Mr. Norfolk noted this kind of development will take over the neighbourhoods if it's not reigned in.

Board Discussion

Mr. Dobrovolny moved to recommendations.

Mr. Mochrie seconded.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted his support for the project.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted in regards to the parking there is no maximum in this area however noted that there is a common theme that extra parking spots are being used more for storage.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted there is a gap between what the public thought would come out of the West End Community Plan and the technical zoning that is in place and how it is being applied.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted it is important for the applicant team and staff to reach out to the communities to close this gap.

Mr. Mochrie noted his support for the application.

Mr. Mochrie noted he shared the overall concern with the excessive parking.

Mr. Mochrie noted this application does meet the constraints of the zoning which was in place prior to the West End Community plan.

Mr. Mochrie noted the architecture typology is different from what is seen in the West End however it is very well done and fits in well.

Mr. Kelley noted his support for the application.

Mr. Kelley agreed there needs to be a conversation about the intent of the plan and how it is being met.

Mr. Kelley noted the application is following the rules including the plan and existing zoning, therefore the panel is not in a position to change that.

Mr. Kelley noted a helpful amendment would be a consideration that the applicant continue to work with staff on the amount of parking provided.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DP-2018-00694-RM-5B, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated October 31, 2018.

3. 439 Powell (Short) - DEOD (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Boni Maddison Architects

Request: To develop a six-storey, mixed-use building with retail at grade and 55 units of social housing above.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mr. Castillo, 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. Castillo took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Applicant's Comments

The applicant noted they have met with staff and discussed all comments and conditions and can work together to come to a solution.

The applicant team noted a request in regards to the commercial loading stall. The commercial area is 139 square meters and would like to request if staff could consider something lower than a class B stall as the commercial space is quite small

Another consideration noted is, there has been a request for a car share space included as part of the parking relaxation.

Through conversations with the Society, the applicant team noted the car share is something they are uncomfortable with due to the security issues already present in the area. The society have requested to staff to consider an alternative transportation strategy.

Comments from Speakers

Speaker one, Bing Wong, introduced and provided a background on the Society of Ming Sun Benevolent that was established in 1925. There is 93 years of history with the organization in Eastside Vancouver. The society is about friendship and cooperation. The society helps their Chinese elderly members in culture and welfare benefit, however over the years this help has extended to all individuals of the community in need. One example is the providing of cheap rent. Mr. Wong noted their wish for the City to approve the application for the benefit of low income individuals in Vancouver, as well because affordable housing is much needed in Vancouver.

Speaker two, Richard Wong, his grandfather was a founding member of the Wing Sun benevolent society about 93 years ago. Both Mr. Wong's father was also an active member. Both current members and Mr. Wong are present today to express their strong support for the application. Reasons include the society wants to continue serving their members and operations serving the community at large. With the proposed social housing units the society can maximize their contribution as a non-profit society especially in the area of affordable housing which is very much needed in the Eastside. The proposal would also create new retail units along Powell Street, this will improve the commercial district. The approval of this application will also help preserve one of the few buildings that has been around for more than 100 years, this will preserve a long history that should not be forgotten. Mr. Wong noted they want to preserve the spirit of their pioneer members. If this project is successful this will serve as an example for other non-profit societies and this will propel them to develop more affordable housing. In addition the preservation of such a historical building will increase tourists to come visit Vancouver.

Speaker three, Fiona York, coordinator and administrator of the Carnegie Community Action Project (CCAP) works with residents to speak of the changes they would like to see in the neighbourhood. On behalf of (CCAP) we request the building provide 100 percent shelter and pension rate housing. We believe the contributions of the proposed plan does not outlay or balance the loss of buildings and associated memories without having higher percentage of shelter and pension rate housing. Ms. York noted the community has fought to save this building for its historical significance and housing needed for low income seniors. The proposed structure with minimal reflection of historical preservation, does not significantly contribute to low income housing to this challenged area. CCAP housing report states "The vast majority of current east side residents are far below the 2014 Canada statistics low income cut off line." If we follow what is considered affordable shelter costs should not be more than 30 percent of one's income. Ms. York noted the proposed unit sizes are far below what is considered livable. It is also imperative that this retail space reflects the low income and cultural characteristics of the neighbourhood rather than further gentrifying it. In summary we are requesting that this development of this site does not contribute to gentrification and isolation and displacement and a building that does not reflect the current reality of the site. Ms. York also noted there are no accessible parking spaces.

Speaker four, Lance Burger, business owner and resident at the 300 block of Powell noted he is a contractor by nature and revitalizes old buildings. Mr. Burger noted his opposition to this proposal. He is not opposed to senior housing but opposed to the ongoing saturation of social housing and non-market business in the area. Since the last plan there have been zero Non-social housing developments. Mr. Burger would like the board to know that your decisions are not made in isolation. The neighbourhood is a wash of drug activity, criminal activity, and graffiti and it is getting centralized. I am against the containerization of social issues without

any further support. There are no garbage cans within close proximity, there is a permanent tent city close by, and there are no foot police patrols. What may not sound like planning issues are planning issues because when these buildings go up like every other social operation they are abandoned. Mr. Burger questions what is being considered as a balance neighbourhood. The approval of these types of developments kills the property value which therefore kills the development. A building where you have non market and non-paying residents is a holding ground for an unlivable neighbourhood. Mr. Burger noted for seven months they have tried to get the street cleaned from needles, feces, and yet the City has yet to respond.

Speaker five, Stephen Waddel, an artist that lives and works in the 300-400 block of Powell Street. Mr. Waddel noted his opposition of the proposal. This project as proposed will cause more problems and add more difficulty to the present challenges of the Oppenheimer park area. Context is extremely important when considering what constitutes as Social Housing. 300-400 Powell represent the last remaining fragments of Japan Town; the idea of Japan Town has never been respected or represented. There has never been a single heritage relationship to Japan Town. This is not to be disregarded as a minor tragedy. This building is going to be an alien front to the street; the retail is never going to be anything that will offer a service to the people of this area. Mr. Waddel asked the board to start respecting the heritage of the people that were tossed from this neighbourhood. There is no Urban Plan for this area; this project is completely disregarding what is needed for the people in this area. This is a blanket social housing project.

Speaker 6, Angela Kruger, Is a 5th generation Japanese Canadian. Ms. Kruger also works and volunteers in the Downtown area. Ms. Kruger requested the panel to commit to justice for these communities in form of ongoing funding by providing housing that is needed. Ms. Kruger noted to the panel to keep in mind any conversation of this site or parts of the downtown east side are speaking in place of a context of ongoing violence on indigenous lands. Ms. Kruger noted her concern of some racist language in the development permit report, such as a reference of Japanese Village in pages 8 & 9. Mr. Kruger noted this tribalizes what was decidedly a modernized community. Ms. Kruger asked to consider 439 Powell's proximity to Oppenheimer and how can heritage be mobilized. As we move forward community consultations should be meaningful ongoing programming with multiple communities that are deeply connected to this buildings and this block.

Speaker 7, Kathy Shimizu, noted indigenous people are the original displaced people of the land that is being talked about today. Ms. Shimizu is a third generation Japanese Canadian sensei and works and volunteers as a community organizer in the Downtown Eastside. Ms. Shimizu noted her support. In 2014 the Wing Sun society called for support to help save their building, and was supported by a large group varying from indigenous, low income, Chinese Canadian, and Japanese Canadians. My hope is that this development moves forward with the spirit in mind to serve the needs of the low income community both for housing and space that recognizes our shared history and fight for housing and justice for all. I stand in solidarity with indigenous low income and marginalized individuals who are currently being displaced from downtown eastside due to gentrification. Ms. Shimizu would like to acknowledge that all these big issues that are being talked about a lot of individuals have different perceptions but it is important to consider the people who are there now.

Speaker 8, Grace Eiko Thomson, noted her support for the application. There is a great need for social housing so I request that this application go ahead. Ms. Thomson noted her interest in cross cultural ties and shared a brief history of the Japanese Canadians that had occupied this

space, and asked that they are somehow included in this space so their history is not forgotten and brings to light a harmonious solution for the people of the downtown east side.

Speaker 9, Kirsten Wright, an architect, at first opposed the project because it was poorly advertised. In this community there is not a lot of information that is shared. Ms. Wright noted when development applications are brought forward they should clearly state what the affordable housing intent is. Ms. Wright noted her original perception of what this project was a women's shelter which she is in opposition of, but as it is housing for seniors a bit benevolent of its use. Ms. Wright noted she has lived in the neighbourhood for 25 years and runs a business in the neighbourhood where she employs quite a few people and those people are concerned for their safety. She asks, if this project moves forward, for a robust operations and maintenance plan. If social housing will be further developed I oppose it as it should not be concentrated in one area. We have seen an incredible increase in police incidents and poverty on the streets which has created an unbearable neighbourhood and do believe this to be a failure in planning. There are now stretches of buildings that are un-developable and thus un-sellable. Ms. Wright noted she is not for or against this project.

Speaker 10, Adam Mitchell, a new comer in this neighbourhood, worked in the area for the past 8 years. Mr. Mitchell noted he is not for or against of this project. Mr. Mitchell noted a share concerned of the ghettoization of this neighbourhood. This neighbourhood is becoming less and less livable and desirable. As somebody who hopes to have a family in a city that is already unaffordable that contributes to why I live in this neighbourhood. I have come to love the neighbourhood however there is huge challenges with the planning and context of the area, appears the City wants to see a huge ghettoization. The building I live in is relatively new, it is a mixed use development, and quite successfully co-exists with the social housing in the neighbourhood. Mr. Mitchell noted they work with the society that is in charge of the social housing to ensure certain standards are met. Mr. Mitchell noted he would like to state he is not present to speak against social housing, but against the City's plan to create an unlivable neighbourhood.

Panel Opinion

Ms. Brudar noted this application was not presented at Urban Design Panel. The location is important because it is fronting the block. This will set a precedent as to how this block moves on. Generally the massing is supportable, appears to be aligned with the neighbourhood. The courtyard itself is quite generous. The detail of the window, especially on the elevation, could be done with a more playful expression. Ceiling height is quite low. Loading bay is creating issues for the whole ground floor.

Mr. Norfolk noted his initial introduction to the site was in 2013, when the bricks fell off the front which have now been rescued. This included the involvement of council and mayor. It was concluded that this building could be restored and rehabilitated.

Mr. Norfolk noted there is no change in use and purpose of this building.

Mr. Norfolk noted after inquiring it is believed that a development permit was issued for rehabilitation and continued life of the building.

Mr. Norfolk noted with this proposal there is concerned that the opportunity for rehabilitation has been lost.

Mr. Norfolk acknowledged a letter written by Heritage Vancouver.

Mr. Norfolk noted if this building has to go it is imperative to think about commemoration which is really important, and it is more than just a plaque.

Mr. Norfolk encouraged the board to reinforce this condition of having the community involvement in the development of the programming for commemoration.

Ms. Law on behalf of Mr. Jarvis noted his support of the ceiling heights and character of the building and car share as a workable solution.

Mr. Jarvis noted concern of the ceiling heights for the commercial units.

Mr. Jarvis noted overall he recognizes the need for social housing in this area and site and therefore notes his support for the application.

Board Discussion

Mr. Dobrovolny moved for recommendations.

Mr. Mochrie Seconded.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted his appreciation to all the speakers and recognizes the challenges of this site and across Canada and legitimate issues were raised.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted his frustration with the lack of Heritage preservation that is being seen in front of the board.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted there seems to be a continuous gap that comes forward to the board and would like to have this resolved to have a more workable plan and not see two sides.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted his support for the project as it is very much needed in the neighbourhood.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted he wants to see more support for heritage and better integration between staff and the heritage community moving forward so there is not a gap and different positions.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted he would like to see healthy mix of incomes and uses to improve the health of this neighbourhood.

Mr. Mochrie noted his appreciation to the applicant, staff, and members of the public.

Mr. Mochrie acknowledged the concerns and pressures of this neighbourhood and issues of managing this neighbourhood.

Mr. Mochrie noted in terms of social housing there is a broad definition; however there are issues that extend beyond the jurisdiction of the board.

Mr. Mochrie echoed the need of social housing.

Mr. Mochrie acknowledged the issue of commemoration is an important one and encourages the involvement of impacted groups.

Mr. Kelley clarified this is to be a dedicated Senior Housing.

Mr. Kelley clarified there will be a management and operations plan.

Staff noted this is not something that is required but will be looking into this via agreements of the housing plan and BC housing.

Mr. Kelley noted concerns with the size of the micro-units.

Staff noted per the conditions there is room to review the livability of the units.

Mr. Kelley asked staff about additional resources to deepen the affordability of the units.

Staff noted they are currently in conversations with BC Housing and any extra funding that could potentially be awarded would go towards the affordability of the units.

Mr. Kelley noted the desire by the speakers and members of the Japanese Canadian community to ensure commemoration of the building is done in a meaningful way.

Staff agreed this is an important component that will be carefully looked at.

Mr. Kelley noted there are larger issues at play that will need to be looked at.

Mr. Kelley noted his support for the application.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE the decision to Development Application No. DP-2018-00817-DEOD in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated on October 31, 2018.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:57pm.