

**Date: DECEMBER 15, 2026**

**Time: 3:00 p.m.**

**Place: MS Teams Webinar**

**PRESENT:**

**Board Members:**

Michelle Au, Director, Permitting Services (Chair)  
Corrie Okell, General Manager, Development, Buildings, and Licensing  
Lon LaClaire, General Manager, Engineering Services  
Matt Shillito, Director of Special Projects Planning, Urban Design, and Sustainability

**Advisory Panel:**

Aik Ablimit, Representative of Urban Design Panel  
Arno Matis, Representative of Design Profession  
Hitesh Neb, Representative of General Public  
Sam Ibrahim, Representative of General Public  
Winki Tam, Representative of General Public  
Lily Chan, Representative of General Public  
Alex Putrenko, Representative of Development Industry  
Joe Carreria, Representative of Development Industry

**1200 Burrard - DP-2025-00554 – DD**

**Delegation:**

Mitch Sakumoto, Merrick Architecture

**City Staff:**

N. MacPherson, Development Services  
C. Ouyang, Development Planning

**1050 Beach Ave (Vancouver Aquatic Centre) - DP-2025-00685 – R1-1**

**Delegation:**

Derek Fleming, Acton Ostry Architects  
Ted Watson, MJMA Architect  
Cheryl Bouwmeester, PWL  
Kyle Briggs, Bunt and Associate

**City Staff:**

S. Sajjad, Urban Design  
H. Kobayashi, Urban Design  
S. Farmand, Landscape  
G. Sneddon, Development Services  
T. Fernandes, Urban Forestry  
B. Ozols-Mongeau, Urban Forestry  
J. Smallwood, Development Services  
K. Yamashita, Parks Board  
W. Truong, Engineering Services  
M. So (Chair), Development Services  
J. Hodgson, Engineering Services  
P. Cheng, Urban Design & Development Planning

**Recording Secretary:**

M.Sem

**1. MINUTES APPROVED**

It was moved by Corrie Okell and seconded by Matt Shillito and was the decision of the Board to approve the October 6, 2025, meeting minutes.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

**3. 1200 Burrard Street (COMPLETE APPLICATION) DP-2025-00554 – DD**

Applicant: Merrick Architecture

Request: To perform interior and exterior alterations by enlarging the main lobby of the building by adding approximately 1042 square feet in this existing commercial building on this site, thereby granting an increase in Floor Space Ratio using transferable heritage density or purchase of heritage amenity shares in accordance with the decision of the Development Permit Board.

**Planner's Comments**

Claire Ouyang, Development Planner, presented the proposal and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report.

**Applicants' Comments**

The applicant will work with staff to meet the conditions for approval.

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

**Speakers' Comments**

No Speakers.

**Panel Comments**

Aik Ablimit noted the thoughtful design resolution improves the building's functionality and how it potentially meets the street. The streetscape could be enhanced. Suggested further design to the plaza.

Arnos Matis noted support to the addition. The new glazing and moving of the lobby helps define the street edge of the building more and brings more activity closer to the street. Enhancement to the plaza is a good move to add further activation to the outdoor space.

Alex Putrenko noted support to the addition. It will provide activation and vibrancy to the corner and make the area a bit safer.

Joe Carreira noted support to the addition. It will bring some activity to the street, and the plaza area can afford to increase the lobby.

Hitesh Neb noted support to the addition. The plaza needs a bit more work.

Lily Chan noted no concerns. The ask is modest and the renovation improves the streetscape.

Sam Ibrahim noted support to the change. It a better improvement to the public realm and definition of the building.

Winki Tam noted support to the change. It enhances visibility for everyone's benefit inside and outside.

**Board Discussion**

Matt Shillito noted support for this proposal, it's a modest proposal and keeps with the design intent of the original building.

Matt Shillito noted the positive improvements to the proposal - it will better engage the street with more active frontage closer to the street and the addition of the café, a more functional lobby space, the plaza and outdoor seating and plantings are all positive additions in the way the building meets the street.

Corrie Okell noted support for this proposal.

Lon LaClaire noted support for this proposal.

All board members voted in favor of the application to move forward subject to the conditions noted in the Staff Committee Report and the amended conditions.

**Motion**

The decision of the Board: THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application DP-2025-00554 subject to the conditions in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated December 15, 2025.

**4. 1050 Beach Ave (Vancouver Aquatic Centre) - DP-2025-00685 – R1-1**

Applicant: Vancouver Board of Parks and Recreation Province of British Columbia

Request: To develop a new two-storey Community Centre containing swimming pools and a fitness centre, with at grade parking on this site, having vehicular access from Beach Ave.

**Planner's Comments**

Shadi Sajjad, Development Planner, presented the proposal and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report.

**Applicant's Comments**

The applicant will work with staff to meet the conditions for approval.

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

**Speaker's comments**

**Jon Girard** noted opposition to the project. Jon commented this was a pre-determined decision manufactured through systematic corruption of the public process, betraying voter expectations and democratic accountability. He noted it was supposed to be 135,000 square feet as per RFP documents obtained but is now constrained to the existing footprint while removing the trees, pursuing the land grants and requesting the high relaxations.

**Carola Mansfield** noted opposition to the project. Carola agreed with Jon Girard's comments and noted the parking allowance is insufficient and will deter usage of the facility, causing problems for the surrounding residents and businesses.

**Alex Hobbs** noted opposition to the project, asking the Board not to approve a design that reduces the existing 50 metre to 25 metre pool. Alex spoke to the benefits of a 50 metre pools in terms of accessibility, safety and public health.

**Rosanne Wozny** noted opposition to the project, voted for a 50-metre pool and not a 25-metre pool and expect the democratic process to be respected and it is not respected.

**Warren Dueck** noted opposition to the proposal. Warren spoke to the undemocratic process of voting for a 50-metre pool and instead of the proposed 25 metre pool.

**Michael Robert Caditz** spoke to the procedural fairness, reasonableness and governance of the proposal presented. Michael recommends that this application be referred back to city staff and the Park Board to obtain informed consent for the application before reconsideration.

**Katherine Caditz** noted opposition to the proposal because staff recommended this project with inconclusive, inaccurate, and misleading information. Katherine noted public voted for a 50 metre and not 25 metre pool.

**Nelson Quiroga** noted opposition to the project, if the project does go ahead, it must be for the 50-metre pool as specified in the binding plebiscite voted for by owners in 2022 and not a 25-metre pool. Nelson, also noted there is no consideration to the people who will be disrupted for 3-5 years of construction, recommending it should be done at a different location and the old one kept open in the meantime.

**Samuel Mustone** noted opposition to the project, noting public voted in support for a 50-metre pool.

**Kathryn Shaw** noted opposition to the project, disappointed in the lack of transparency in the process, noting public voted in support for a 50-metre pool.

**Chris Speropoulos** noted opposition to the project and supports a 50-metre pool downtown.

**Suzanne Masse** noted opposition to the project, waste of \$170 million of taxpayer money for a facility with a pool half the size of the current VAC.

**Kathleen Emerson** noted opposition to the project, voted for a 50-metre pool and wouldn't have given assent to the plebiscite if known it was going to be a 25-metre pool.

**Steph Hoddy** noted opposition to the project, noting the decisions about the new Aquatic Centre were based on mis-information and in a very undemocratic fashion, having a smaller pool is not scaling up to the needs of the growing population, the Architect made it look pretty, but this building is not fit for purpose and needs a redesign.

**Mary Georgilas** noted opposition to the project. Mary noted in 2022 she voted in the plebiscite to approve funding to renew, rehabilitate or replace the 50-meter pool. She suggest finding another solution that will not disrupt the current activities there now.

**Jillian Maguire** noted opposition to the project, noting the Parks Board was un-informed when making their decision, the current proposal needs to go back to Parks Board to make an informed decision.

**Susan Boutwood** noted the original RFP specified the renew facility will include a 50-metre pool, how did it end up with a 25-metre pool? how did it happen with no publicly available and contractually binding documents available?

### Panel Comments

Aik Ablimit noted this is a fantastic civic project and one that is much needed.

Aik noted it will be a real asset to the waterfront and community, the building connects to the seawall and further open up the public realm.

Arno Matis noted support to the relaxation of density, height, parking and loading.

Arno Matis noted support for the project.

Alex Putrenko noted support to the relaxation of density, height, parking and loading.

Alex Putrenko noted support for the project.

Joe Carreira noted support to the staff's recommendations to support the relaxations.

Joe Carreira echoed Arno Matis's comments on loading – over required.

Joe Carreira noted support for the project.

Hitesh Neb noted support for the relaxations.

Hitesh Neb noted City of Vancouver deserves and requires a 50-metre pool, it shows a break down in the athletic programs in the city.

Lily Chan noted the density and height relaxation is not significant.

Lily Chan noted the surrounding areas and green space should be expanded in proportion to the increase in density.

Sam Ibrahim agrees with Hitesh Neb the importance of a 50-metre pool in the City of Vancouver.

Sam Ibrahim noted the design is well put together, it is within the allowable zoning bylaws and the request for these relaxations is supportable.

Winki Tam noted the proposal delivers a civic facility that's modern, accessible and seismically resilient, it is a clear improvement over the existing condition. The change from a 50 meter to a 25-meter pool is incredibly disappointing to many but denying or deferring this permit may result in cost escalations

Winki Tam noted support for this project.

**Board Discussion**

Corrie Okell thanked the speakers, applicant, staff and panel members.

Corrie Okell noted support for this project.

Corrie noted the intent of bringing this project forward to the board is to review and approve the application as it relates to zoning and development bylaw, applicable guidelines and policies while ensuring regulatory compliance. Corrie noted this application does comply with the land use form and massing as well as other required elements such as landscaping and parking.

Corrie Okell noted this civic facility is well designed and appreciates the minimal disturbance to the site which enables a more efficient construction time.

Lon LaClaire thanked the speakers, applicant, staff and panel members.

Lon LaClaire noted no concerns with the height and density and appreciate this project is conforming to the land-use, zoning and development guidelines.

Lon LaClaire noted he is not concerned with the parking supply.

Lon LaClaire encouraged applicant and staff to work on how the three loading bays can be better managed.

Matt Shillito thanked the speakers, applicant, staff and panel members.

Matt Shillito noted support for this project.

Matt Shillito noted support for the height and density relaxations from the R1-1 zoning.

Matt Shillito noted the loading requirements are appropriate in terms of the design of the building and the parking provision is appropriate for the location.

Matt Shillito noted appreciation for respect to the original design but also updating and significantly improving it, creating more transparency and engagement between the building, the program, and the outside surroundings.

Matt Shillito commends the applicant and design team for designing to passive house certification standards.

All board members voted in favor of the application to move forward subject to the conditions noted in the Staff Committee Report and the amended conditions.

**Motion**

The decision of the Board: THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application **DP-2025-00685 – R1** subject to the conditions in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated November 26, 2025.

**Meeting adjourned at 5:42pm**