

Date: Monday, April 30, 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  
A. Molaro Assistant Director Urban Design

**Advisory Panel**

A. Brudar Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
R. Wittstock Representative of the Design Professions  
M. Norfolk Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission  
R. Chaster Representative of the General Public  
D. Pretto Representative of the General Public  
R. Rohani Representative of the General Public

**Regrets**

G. Kelley General Manager of Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability  
B. Jarvis Representative of the Development Industry  
S. Allen Representative of the General Public

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

M. Linehan Development Planner  
J. Greer Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development  
T. Tenney Project Facilitator  
C. Stanford Project Facilitator  
C. Joseph Engineering

**936 Main St - 2016-00475- FC-1**

## Delegation

Walter Francl, Architect, Francl Architecture Inc.  
Alain Prince, Architect, Francl Architecture Inc.  
Christian Williams, Owner, 936 Main Street Holdings Ltd.

**1021 Burnaby St - 2017-01212- RM-5A**

## Delegation

Walter Francl, Architect, Francl Architecture Inc.  
Alain Prince, Architect, Francl Architecture Inc.  
Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk Ltd.  
Christian Willows, Owner Developer, N. 234 Cathedral

---

**1150 Barclay St - 2017-01342- RM-5B**

Delegation

Adrian Palfano, Architect, DIALOG

Evan Dysart, Architect, DIALOG

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk Ltd.

Robert Cadez, Owner Developer

**Recording Secretary: K.Cermeno**

**1. MINUTES**

It was moved by Mr. Mochrie seconded by Ms. Molaro and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on April 16, 2018.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

**3. 936 Main St - 2016-00475- FC-1  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Francl Architecture

Request: To retain the existing façade and develop this site with an 8-storey mixed-use building containing Retail (ground floor), Restaurant (ground & 2nd floors), General Office (2nd & 3rd floor), and 25 Secured Market Rental Dwelling units (4th - 8th floors); all over two levels of underground parking providing a total of 12 parking spaces having vehicular access from Station Street.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Ms. Linehan, 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.

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

**Applicant's Comments**

We had productive working sessions with city and looking forward to the opportunity to continue working together.

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

**Comments from other Speakers**

No speakers.

**Panel Opinion**

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

Ms. Brudar noted the project was well received at UDP. It is a modest infill building. There was quite a bit of discussion in regards to the heritage façade. The panel suggested the applicant to increase the gap between the heritage façade and the new build to free it up and allow it to stand out. The base bay approach is a bit unorthodox for the area but was thought to be well handled and refreshing. There was brick everywhere but the rear; the panel felt the project would benefit from having the same treatment on all sides. The amenities are well-handled and quite ample for the size. Another suggestion was weather protection on the rooftop amenity.

Ms. Brudar noted overall it was a well-designed project.

Ms. Chaster noted her support for the project. She liked the mix of units and that it is a 100 percent secured market rental.

Mr. Wittstock noted it is important to have a proper separation between heritage and new construction.

Mr. Wittstock suggested a better solution is to have another story of office and increase the building by a floor to have a more defined separation.

Mr. Wittstock noted one elevator capacity appears inefficient.

Mr. Norfolk noted his support and commended the applicant for not asking for anything in return.

Mr. Norfolk noted the extra two feet is an improvement.

Mr. Rohani suggested more office floor would go a long way.

Mr. Rohani supported the mix of old and new and the frontage on Station Street.

Mr. Rohani noted his appreciation that the developer didn't ask for anything for restoring the heritage façade.

Ms. Pretto noted it was great project great balance of paying homage to the heritage and really playful use of the base and step backs.

Ms. Pretto noted she liked the configurations especially the micro units. Glad to see some two bedrooms.

Ms. Pretto noted she was disappointed that the 8<sup>th</sup> floor could not be used for some functional larger family units.

Ms. Pretto noted her support in regards to UDP recommendations for weather protection.

### **Board Discussion**

No discussion

Mr. Dobrovolny moved for recommendations.

Mr. Mochrie seconded.

All board members noted their support.

#### Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DP - 2016-00475, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated April 4, 2018.

#### 4. 1021 Burnaby Street - 2017-01212- RM-5A (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Francl Architecture

Request: To develop on this site a five storey multiple dwelling building (21 dwelling units) with one level of underground parking having vehicular access from the rear lane. An increase in the Floor Space Ratio (FSR) from 1.5 to 1.65 is sought through a 10% Heritage Density Transfer.

#### Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ms. Linehan, 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. Dinh, 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.

Ms. Linehan and Mr. Dinh took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Ms. Law noted that staff have requested the conditions outlined in the DPB staff committee report be amended to revise condition 1.3 and add condition 1.6 which the board received as follow:

#### **Condition 1.3 amended:**

*design development to the roof top to meet the expectations of the RM-5A Design Guidelines;*

*Note to Applicant: Roof should be finished with materials and details that are attractive as viewed from above. An extensive green roof is recommended. Refer to Landscape Condition A.1.16.*

#### **Condition 1.6 added:**

*design development to provide common outdoor amenity space consistent with the expectations of the High Density Housing for Families With Children Guidelines;*

*Note to Applicant: Outdoor amenity space may be provided on the roof, or at grade. Amenity space in the front yard should incorporate a substantial landscaped border as per Condition 1.1 (i.)*

**Applicant's Comments**

We had productive sessions with Planning and have reached a happy medium in regards to staff recommendations. We would prefer not to explore the amenity space on the roof as there is enough space at grade.

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

**Comments from other Speakers**

Morris Wonsiak was speaking on behalf of the owner of The Milano, the building adjacent to the proposed development. The Milano is currently going through a major membrane repair on the courtyard and in the process of finalizing the courtyard re-landscaping. The contractor and rain shield engineering strongly recommended that as owners of the Milano they protect their building from any water ingress on the side from the new development. The main concern is the west wall of the Milano building that is adjacent to the area that will be excavating, as well, over all damage from the seismic upgrade. What steps are the developers taking to protect the west wall of the building?

Another concern is the proposed landscaping as they will be side by side. The fence needs replacing, is there any interest from development for a joint venture to have a fence that is compatible for both.

Janet Bates noted her support for the comments made by Mr. Wonsiak. A general concern directed to the developers is the building is going into an entertainment center area. The concern is how will the noise be dampen down.

Ms. Linehan noted that there is a condition in the standard conditions A.1.7 to provide an acoustical report to assess the noise impact and recommend mitigation.

Ms. Bates noted the noise levels differ during the day and ask that the acoustic report consider all hours of the day. The density and noise issue would be nice to address especially for those that will be investing in this building. Ms. Bates suggested making the roof look as nice as possible.

**Panel Opinion**

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

Ms. Brudar noted this was a skillfully handled modest infill building. It is in keeping of the West End architecture. The project was well received by the panel. Comments by UDP were mostly about the front landscape area. It was very paved and in keeping with the west end required more landscape, however this is already addressed. The unit in the back of the lane is quite sunken suggestion was to raise the entire building to allow the unit in the back to come out as there is a lot happening in the back. The whole building would benefit from this. UDP liked the understated architecture expression.

Ms. Chaster noted her support.

Ms. Chaster noted the rear edge could benefit from more development.

Ms. Chaster noted she was happy to see the garbage and recycling relocated to the first level.

Ms. Chaster suggested focusing energy on making the lane more pleasing. Happy to see the units are mixed however would have loved to see 3 bedrooms.

Mr. Wittstock noted his support for the project and Ms. Chaster's comments.

Mr. Wittstock noted it was a great little building.

Mr. Norfolk noted in respect to the 10 percent transfer, this is a good candidate.

Mr. Rohani noted his overall support.

Mr. Rohani noted the building did a good job keeping in context with the OCP.

Mr. Rohani noted the concrete materiality is better for noise.

Mr. Rohani noted there could have been more done with the height and landscaping.

Mr. Rohani noted he understands the retaining wall is necessary however it hurts the public realm.

Mr. Rohani noted the applicant did a good job improving the landscape and suggested having more trees in the front.

Ms. Pretto noted the street is strikingly short and surprised there are not more units especially three bedroom units.

Ms. Pretto noted she would have liked to see two more stories with three bedroom units.

Ms. Pretto noted her support for the green roof.

### **Board Discussion**

Ms. Molaro noted this was a great project. There are challenges and comments around the height; 60ft is the maximum height.

Ms. Molaro noted the proposed height is 56ft there is some ability to lift the building but no space or density to add another floor as the density has been maxed.

Ms. Molaro noted the unit in the rear is only 2 and half feet below grade and the applicant team has done a good job at being as close to grade.

Ms. Molaro noted the applicants have found a happy medium with the main floor elevations, it is well resolved.

Ms. Molaro noted concern with added condition 1.6, in regards to the rooftop access.

Ms. Molaro noted when those things are encouraged the neighbourhood is usually notified.

Ms. Molaro noted it is not necessary to require the roof top access but it is necessary to have the treatment.

Ms. Molaro recommended the board members to support the recommended conditions with the amendment to condition 1.6, the first line;

*"Outdoor amenity space may be provided on the roof or at grade"*

Ms. Molaro moved the motion to have this line deleted.

Mr. Dobrovolny seconded the amendment.

Mr. Mochrie noted his support for the amendment.

Mr. Mochrie noted this was a good site and responded well to the various constraints.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted he was happy to support the motion as amended.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted the scale did not seem right and does not make sense when looking at transitions.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted the applicant should be looking at the scale as the transition is poor and a wasted opportunity from one building to the next.

#### **Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DP - 2017-01212, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated April 18, 2018, with the following amendment,

1.6: Delete the line *"Outdoor amenity space may be provided on the roof, or at grade."*

#### **3. 1150 Barclay - 2017-01342- RM-5B (COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: PC Urban

Request: to develop this site with an 11-storey multi-family multiple dwelling with 21 dwelling units, and 2 levels of underground parking accessed from the lane including heritage density transfer of 3279 sq.ft.

#### **Development Planner's Opening Comments**

M. Linehan, 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.

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

#### **Applicant's Comments**

We are fine with the conditions set out by planning and are looking at a podium level amenity space. To add to the planning presentation when we first started quite a bit of work was for a 6ft storey building however half way realized most of the work required additional height.

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

#### Comments from other Speakers

Brad Anderson is an owner at 1127 Barclay Street and representing the strata council located at 1135-1137 Barclay Street. The primary objection is the increase in height from 6 to 11 storeys. In the WEP there are 6 policies, and policy statement 3 is to maintain the 6 storey. It is our position to maintain the 6 storey to keep with the WE quality.

The West End Community Plan should be able to govern here and many residents were involved and contributed countless hours and effort into the WECP. When establishing, it was known that the West End was already dense. This development only provides super high luxury condos and no social housing. If this is allowed, it will set the precedent that future developments will only be high luxury buildings. 6 storeys create a more livable environment. Urge planning council to comply with this.

Dave McIntyre is an owner at 1127 Barclay Street for 30 years and as Chair of the strata council has lots of interest with neighbourhood impact. In regards to the specific design, finds ironic that the justification is there are three existing towers that were planned when there was very little planning done. There will be a lot of view destruction. Planning is supposed to consider the effect of privacy and view obstruction. Drawings don't properly demonstrate the side that has the most impact and least attractive. Encourage board not to approve this development.

Hernando Barlo is a resident at 1169 Nelson Street for 20 years and very familiar with the neighbourhood and supports the project. Mr. Barlo has worked with the City of Surrey for many years in planning. Mr. Barlo understands the challenges that come with this site and as city employees we have to address how to face the challenges. The primary concerns are with crime prevention and the interface with the lane.

Sean Smith is a resident at 1169 Nelson Street, president of the strata, and speaking on behalf of some of the members. The proposed 11 storey is too large for the neighbourhood character. From what is understood about the WECP this is an exception and bending the rules significantly. In regards to the shadow analysis, they appear different and incorrect and requesting this to be addressed for clarity. The current building that is to be replaced was 4 storey and the current building at 11 storey however both have the same number of units. Imagine the asking price is well over 1.2 million therefore this building does absolutely nothing to serve the average income of families and is not intended to serve the families of the city but only benefits the wealthy, investors and real estate. Mr. Smith questions the intention of the developer.

Chris Karu has lived in the west end for 6 years and supports the project in its current form. The project should be approved for a couple reasons, the policy is not meant to be a law the development does follow the basis of the guidelines. Secondly, 2-3 bedrooms are hard to find within the city, most are old and outdated one bedroom. The townhouse form adds to the housing spectrum which admittedly does not follow the form however, the building has elegant architecture and landscape. The slender form does limit shadowing.



Don Tachett is a resident at 1135 Barclay St and speaking on behalf of the majority of the strata. Mr. Tachett would like the panel and advisory board to explain with the guidelines having a precedent set out at 4 storey why is 11 is being allowed especially with numerous verbal and written objections. This only benefits the developer as the above extra height will be to sell units at a premium.

Nan Legate is an owner and resident at 1127 Barclay Street. Ms. Legate noted she was happy to hear dialogue was chosen at the architect but was alarmed to hear the tall scale building. Ms. Legate attended numerous planning process of the west end and understood the goal was to main the 6 storey option yet the public has seen no 6 storey proposal presented. As far as the public consultation, it was brief with no true analysis provided. Finds the development brutal and over scaled and would like to see smaller scale buildings that are carefully reviewed.

Navi Guraya lives in the area and supports the development. The building created a good visual interest and the height is complimentary with other buildings. The slender form allows for more light to come through. There are larger units to accommodate bigger families. The outdoor space, amenity space, and landscaping is very appealing. 21 units allows for everyone to get to know their neighbourhood.

Rob Grant lives in a zone similar to this proposal. Mr. Grant is certain the current building has not received the appropriate amount of money to move to another area which is a real issue. Agrees the design is exemplary however how does the building follow the principles of the WECP. Speaker went ahead to read out principles 1-9 from the WECP. This building is not what we need in the west end and requests the board and panel to reject this proposal and ask for better solutions to the immense pressures of our neighbourhoods.

John Wood is a resident and owner at 1127 Barclay Street. Mr. Wood request the panel to explain why they felt the 11 storey was worth the merit.

Carmen Sharp spoke on behalf of the site located behind the proposed building across the lane. It appears all the exiting points are at the same location which is also the exit and entrance points of the site Ms. Chow is speaking on behalf of. The concern is what this will mean in terms of traffic. Ms. Sharp noted she agrees with the point brought up by the other speakers against the project. Ms. Sharp noted she would also like to know about the sound confinement and restriction for the amenity areas.

#### **Question arising from the general public:**

Ms. Molaro requested staff to explain what is looked at in terms of the shadow analysis and impact. Explain a walk through the times of day and what is looked at. Also explain the context versus the 6 to 11 storey and what the differences in shadow impact are.

Ms. Linehan noted a shadow analysis was required for this application. The city typically requires shadow studies to be provided at 10am 12 noon and 2 pm.

Ms. Linehan noted the shadow impacts due to the taller tower mostly directed towards Barclay St.

Ms. Linehan noted at 10am shadows extend along the side yards of the adjacent buildings which are already shadowed by existing developments.

At 12pm the shadows extend onto Barclay Street.

As you reach 2 pm the shadows extend across the street but that is offset by the comparison of the 6 storey form which would be a wider shadow which would shadow the side of Barclay St where the development is located.

Around 4 pm the 6 storey building would extend across the street in terms of shadowing as well with an 11 storey but with a narrower profile.

Ms. Linehan noted staff did ask for an additional shadow studies be provided outside the hours of 10am and 2 pm, as neighbours stated there were alternate times that were a concern. Staff asked for an 8am shadow study and a comparison between the two forms (6 storey and 11 storey).

At 8am, the 6 storey form would shadow the lane and the 11 storey form would shadow the neighbour building across the lane. There is a minor amount in September, and there is shadowing in June at 8am, however those shadows move off the site at 8:30am.

Comparing the 6 to 11 storey form, staff have assessed there is reasonable parity between the impacts of the two forms in that taller form has a longer shadow but much narrower.

The 6 storey form shadow does not extend as far but is wider. This would cause a wider shadow on the sidewalk. Staff have concluded that the 11 storey shadow impact is not unreasonable.

Ms. Molaro noted staff mentioned, in regards to the wording in the west end plan of the RM5-B, the RM5-B zoning has been in place and did not change as a result of the WECP. When was the RM-5B established?

Ms. Linehan noted the guidelines were established around the early 1990s.

Ms. Molaro asked if this proposal could have happened before or after the WECP.

Ms. Linehan responded yes.

Ms. Molaro noted the West End plan language included maintain primarily a 6 storey neighbourhood. The intent was to not make changes but it does not prohibit higher buildings as the zoning and guidelines allowed for higher buildings if it met certain criteria in terms of site.

Ms. Linehan noted staff have consulted with the west end planners to get more clarity and the fourth bullet notes maintaining the existing RM regulations including tower separations. The WE planner confirm the WE plan wasn't meant to preclude applications over 60 ft that otherwise meet the regulations and guidelines. The WECP encourages maintaining a 6 storey height however the criteria for more height are not exempted from being allowed. Sites eligible for over 60 ft under the rezoning and guidelines are not limited to the plan. In this case the applicant is meeting the minimum separation and does have enough floor area to go higher.

Ms. Molaro asked staff to restate why this building can be a market development and does the City have any control over occupancy rates.

Ms. Linehan noted the existing building is an equity coop building meaning the residents own their units under a co-op structure similar but not the same as a strata ownership. They are not rental units therefore the rate of change in terms of tenancy relocation is not applicable. If the units were rental units this would be different. Therefore there is no transition plan.

Ms. Pretto asked staff or the applicant to further explain about design development of the west wall.

Ms. Linehan noted there has not been a significant change to the architectural expression of the west wall. The wall is articulated with punch windows, they are framed punch windows. This is part of the building's aesthetic to have a sense of solidity and lighter expression for the adjacent form.

Ms. Linehan noted the west end design guidelines talk about solidity and permanence. Many of the older towers in the west end have this form of expression; the architect is trying to reference this.

Ms. Chaster noted comments made by the public in terms of families not able to afford this type of units or the units sitting empty and asked what the city can do to control post occupancy.

Ms. Linehan noted the empty homes tax would be applicable to these units. Otherwise staff cannot make recommendations in terms of affordability or social housing.

Ms. Linehan noted this is a zoning application and not rezoning.

There was a question about how public feedback plays a role in the decision making.

Mr. Stanford noted staff compiles all the feedback into central themes/issues that were raised. Staff take the main concerns and include them in the conditions that are then in the report which is available to the public.

#### **Panel Opinion**

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

Ms. Brudar noted this was a West End project that respects historical mid-century form. At the design panel the project was exceptionally well received. The principles were strong; the vertical and horizontal elements articulated well they offset each other nicely. The building is well proportioned. Materials used were of high quality. The proportion of the podium to the tower was well articulated. This building will stand the test of time.

Ms. Brudar noted the floor plate were small for the building so the efficiency of the building is not very high however the core exiting system is very innovative which increases the efficiency of the building.

Mr. Brudar noted the project is proposing well beyond what is asked of in terms of sustainability targets. The window to wall ratio is 35 percent which is rare to see.

Ms. Chaster thanked all the members of the public and noted her appreciation for their input.

Ms. Chaster noted that public input was one form of feedback.

Ms. Chaster noted her support for the application.

Ms. Chaster noted all the unit sizes are needed. The City cannot control who moves into the units. There are other policies in place to assure affordability via other mechanisms.

Mr. Wittstock noted the massing was appropriate. It has a welcoming amount of measurability.

Mr. Wittstock noted his support for the comments made by UDP.

Mr. Wittstock agreed with the concerns in regards to the west wall view obstruction and if something could be done to make it more appealing.

Mr. Wittstock noted his concern with amount of parking versus bike stalls, two parking stalls per units is not necessary.

Mr. Wittstock noted it is an elegant building.

Mr. Norfolk noted he took this proposal to the heritage commission in an informal way.

Mr. Norfolk noted he was part of the involvement with the WECP. In a generalized sense the deal that underpins the west end plan of protecting the neighbourhood with gentle densities, particularly along the lanes, in return to agreeing to high dense developments in the corridors and lower densities along Robson.

Mr. Norfolk noted this was recognition of this deal of protecting the neighbourhoods, in return of the other, needed to be recognized.

Mr. Norfolk noted his concern is this idea if you assemble a large amount of lots with sufficient distance that 6 storey goes out the window and this was not the intention.

Mr. Norfolk noted what is outright is outright anything that is condition beyond that has to be earned, not sure what this particular project is offering in terms of conditional exercises and expression.

Mr. Norfolk noted his concern with this particular project, and that the 6 storey limit will evaporate.

Mr. Rohani noted his support for the project.

Mr. Rohani noted he liked getting this architecture in this neighbourhood and what promote diversity in a neighbourhood are the different unit sizes. This building is created to be lived in.

Mr. Rohani noted the landscaping was great and suggested some art in the west end wall.

Ms. Pretto noted her support for the project.

Ms. Pretto noted the three bedroom units helps keep families.

Ms. Pretto suggested not shrinking the size of the units. Families are looking for units that allow for family functioning and remaining downtown.

Ms. Pretto agreed there is no need for two parking spaces per unit and that this type of building allows for diversity.

Ms. Pretto agreed we need beautiful buildings that are interesting to look at.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. Dobrovolny move to recommendation Mr. Mochrie seconded.

Mr. Dobrovolny thanked the members of public for attending, noted it is important for members of the public to share their opinions and understand that the decision is not always the one that wants to be heard.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted his concern with the staff report. It is problematic that in the background it describes but it does omit what is a significant point in terms of the policy. The report describes a component of the plan but not all that is relevant to the project.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted the scale fits in the area, as there are many other buildings within this area that are 10-12 storeys.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted his support for the project.

Ms. Molaro spoke to how this project earned its conditional height and density.

Ms. Molaro noted the criterion based in the zoning is if you meet this frontage you can earn the extra density and height.

Ms. Molaro noted staff looked at guidelines for direction.

Ms. Molaro noted that not all sites meet this frontage requirement will still get to meet the requirements for the extra height.

Ms. Molaro noted additional criteria to how a project can meet extra height include:

- Well resolved built form;
- Landscape treatment;
- Takes in consideration views, privacy, and shadow impacts;
- Open space provided;
- The quality of the architecture.

Ms. Molaro noted her support for the project.

Mr. Mochrie thanked everyone for their participation.

Mr. Mochrie noted his support for the application.

Mr. Mochrie noted this development is not inconsistent and is in fact consistent with the current zoning and West End Plan.

Mr. Mochrie noted the policies talked about primarily maintaining but not exclusively 6 storey limit and clearly stating the existing zoning regulations.

Mr. Mochrie noted in respect to the design advice has been received from the advisory panel, staff and UDP, therefore comfortable with the design of the building.

Mr. Mochrie noted the scale of the building does fit the neighbourhood.

Mr. Mochrie noted from a policy perspective this project does address some policy concerns such as larger family units.

**Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DP-2017-01342, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated April 4, 2018:

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:45pm.