

Date: Monday, May 28, 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. Dobrovolny General Manager of Engineering  
G. Kelley General Manager of Planning, Urban Design & Sustainability item #1  
A. Molaro Assistant Director Urban Design item #2

**Advisory Panel**

J. Huffman Representative of the Design Professionals (Urban Design Panel)  
M. Norfolk Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission  
R. Rohani Representative of the General Public  
B. Jarvis Representative of the Development Industry  
S. Allen Representative of the General Public

**Regrets**

R. Chaster Representative of the General Public  
D. Pretto Representative of the General Public  
R. Wittstock Representative of the Design Professions

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

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

**Pearson Dogwood C (Community Health) - 698 W 57th Parcel C - DP-2017-01335 - CD-1  
Delegation**

M. Bruckner, Architect, IBI  
T. Wai, Architect, IBI  
Mike Enns, Landscape Architect, Enns Gauthier  
Jason Racke, Leed Consultant, Recollective  
Jamie Vaughn, Owner Developer, Onni

**2301 Granville St - DP-2017-01278 - C3-A**

Delegation  
M. Bruckner, Architect, IBI

---

T. Wai, Architect, IBI  
Stephen Vincent, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk  
Barry Savage, Owner Developer, Aoyuan Canada

Recording Secretary: K.Cermeno

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Dobrovolny seconded by Mr. Mochrie and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on April 30, 2018.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. Pearson Dogwood C (Community Health) - 698 W 57th Parcel C - DP-2017-01335 - CD-1  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: ONNI/IBI

Request: To develop the site with a 27 storey mixed-use building with a Community Health Centre on Levels 1 - 4, a therapeutic pool on Level 1, and retail on Level 1, child daycare on Level 2, 6 Pearson Supportive Housing units on Level 5, and 171 dwelling units on levels 5 - 27 all over 4 levels of underground parking accessed from a new internal street. This is Parcel C of Phase 1 of the Pearson Dogwood redevelopment.

**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 have no issues with the conditions provided by staff. Feel 57<sup>th</sup> is a point where further investigation architecturally is required to break up the massing.

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:

Mr. Huffman noted the UDP found this to be a complex project. UDP generally supported the project.

Mf. Huffman noted the first 5-6 meters of the building's ground plain, needs development, however confident the applicant team can work with planning to rectify this. Wonderful project overall.

Ms. Allen noted this project represents great opportunity for integrating housing with the supported units being market units.

Ms. Allen noted as this project moves forward into operations, hopes the social sustainability can be maintained in order for the tenants to feel part of the development's future.

Mr. Jarvis noted this is a complex project with a lot of interesting architecture.

Mr. Jarvis noted it was great to see a great collaboration between the applicant, engineering and planning.

Mr. Jarvis noted in regards to section 1.6 of the conditions, related to accessible units and flat transitions from the interior and exterior space, moving forward with this policy in general one would want to make sure there is enough building height to accommodate all of this.

Mr. Norfolk noted his past concern for potential heritage results for parcel A, and the absence of the overall review of heritage possibility on the overall block that was promised years ago.

Mr. Norfolk noted the review has yet to be completed; however looking at this particular parcel nothing there that provides course of concern for parcel A.

Mr. Rohani noted this was an incredible mix used project with a great feel of the public realm and great architecture.

Ms. Law noted the memorandum provided by staff:

*Arrangements to be made to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and the Director of Legal Services for a surface Statutory Right of Way over the easterly 5m of Parcel F to allow for a temporary pedestrian access path. The Statutory Right of Way can be discharged following completion of High Street Commons on Parcel F;*

*Note to Applicant: The Path is to be stairs-free and surfaced with a smooth, slip resistant material to facilitate access for people using wheelchairs and other mobility aids.*

Mr. Dobrovolny moved to recommendations from this amendment.

Mr. Mochrie seconded.

#### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Dobrovolny noted this was a great project that achieves many things.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted, directed at staff, this site is intended to provide a lot of service and functions and was surprised at the small number of supportive units included in the initial phase and looks forward to the future phases and what will be delivered on site and the community health facility.

Mr. Kelley noted he echoed Mr. Dobrovolny's point on supportive housing and is also excited to see future opportunities.

Mr. Kelley noted this project falls very closely to the rezoning approval.

Mr. Kelley noted his concerns are with the ground plain and the entrances to the building and the activation of the plaza. However these points are reflected in the conditions and believe will be solved during the refinement process.

Mr. Kelley noted his support.

Mr. Mochrie noted his support.

### 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-2017-01335, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated May 2, 2018, with the following amendment,

A.2.10 be replaced:

*"Arrangements to be made to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and the Director of Legal Services for a surface Statutory Right of Way over the easterly 5m of Parcel F to allow for a temporary pedestrian access path. The Statutory Right of Way can be discharged following completion of High Street Commons on Parcel F;*

*Note to Applicant: The Path is to be stairs-free and surfaced with a smooth, slip resistant material to facilitate access for people using wheelchairs and other mobility aids."*

### 3. 2301 Granville St - 2017-01278 - C3-A (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: IBI

Request: To develop on this site an eight8--storey mixed-use building with retail at grade along Granville Street and West 7th Avenue and with a continuous ground floor commercial retail units on the main floor, with residential entry and lobby having access to West 7th Avenue, and including at the ground floor, 41 dwelling units above on levels 2 through 8, and 2 levels of underground parking accessed from the rear lane. An increase in the Floor Space Ratio (FSR) from 3.0 to 3.3 is sought through a 10% Heritage Density Transfer (5,394 sq. ft.) from donor sites at 40 Powell Street and 12 Water Street

### Development Planner's Opening Comments

J. Olinek, 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. Olinek took questions from the Board and Panel members.

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

We have reviewed the conditions and some of the design conditions we have met with stuff, in particular the open space on the corner of Granville and West 7<sup>th</sup> and understand the intent of the condition to make it more open and have a greater sense of continuity.

We agree with the idea of placing the amenity on the roof. This will allow us to re arrange the ground floor where the residential entry is and open up the retail frontage going around the corner. This will also allow for an interesting entrance lobby which may also help in activating the lane.

There was a condition about a bike elevator; we can reach the height limit to avoid an elevator.

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

#### **Comments from other Speakers**

Ms. Cheryl Townsend, executive director of the South Granville Business Association, noted there are two issues that are of great concern. Even though parking is living within the minimal standard set in the bylaw, this property is the first to be redeveloped in the North of Broadway, therefore, it is setting a precedent, and the project is already getting extra density which will pave the way for future developments down the corridor.

How will the lane that is a car and half wide be dealt with. Despite half the block is already empty from vacated businesses, at any given time during the day everyone dumps out on 7<sup>th</sup> avenue. This will get extremely congested at any time and consider this dangerous for cyclists and those down at terraces living at residences for the elderly. Many use this alley on an everyday basis and this alley is used for loading and unloading. I foresee serious challenges that will not be fixable.

There is also a concern that because of the slope that whole pedestrian pathway on Granville north of Broadway is always a struggle for the retail, so whatever is done can't hurt the business more. Retail space has to have serious attention so that it's viable, particularly if it is stratified as it could just become holding property.

Mr. Jarvis noted a point of clarification that within a zoning of C3-A, a 3FSR plus the heritage transfer that can get you up to 3.3 is allowable across the board.

Mr. Jim Ferguson, asphalt and paving contractor for 35 years, noted issues living in the neighbourhood and using the alley that key bones to the alley back of this project. The traffic at the light is often difficult, reason being if you have a number of cars waiting at the intersection and there are no cars turning right or left you have a chaotic scene, there is also a bike lane and a senior's center nearby that adds to the chaos. This intersection will not work well together with a green space and a bike lane. If you are being sensitive to the traffic and neighbourhood the building should be capped at 6 feet. Please analyze situation at times of day with most traffic.

Mr. Dobrovolny asked staff to clarify there is not an encroachment into the lane and if approved the final project would be a standard width of 23 ft lane.

Mr. Olinek confirmed there is no encroachment.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted Ms. Townsend's comment about the need for retail space to be successful, and asked staff if this is a priority in terms of space design.

Mr. Olinek confirmed this and noted in standard condition A1.15 is to provide well-functioning and successful retail space.

Mr. Mochrie asked staff if there are expected changes to the intersection at Granville and 7<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted changes are being looked at that would extend to 5<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup>, presently the design conversations are ongoing but certainly the intersection at Granville and 7<sup>th</sup> is being looked at.

Ms. Molaro asked staff when the date for the guidelines for this zoning was adopted.

Mr. Olinek noted the most recent amendments were adopted in 1998.

#### **Panel Opinion**

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

Mr. Huffman noted UDP supported the height, bulk, and general massing; however there were concerns of the architectural expression and character.

Mr. Huffman noted UDP voted for a resubmission. The project needs further design development.

Mr. Huffman noted the recommendation stated in the UDP minutes.

Ms. Allen noted it was important to be clear on how the parklet and public realm will function for if it is exclusive to the retail space may not be as welcoming.

Mr. Jarvis noted the massing along the lane has opportunity for improvement.

Mr. Jarvis noted the applicant dealt with view cones in an interesting way.

Mr. Jarvis noted speaker one's assessment of the retail north of Broadway is quite accurate and work can be done here for improvement.

Mr. Jarvis noted one of the factors diminishing the retail on 7<sup>th</sup> is the bike share as it takes up a lot of the public realm for pedestrians.

Mr. Jarvis echoed that it is important to point out that zoning has been adopted and in place for a long time.

Mr. Jarvis noted traffic is a concern however confident in engineering's vigorous approach in regards to these issues.

Mr. Norfolk commended how staff presented the importance of context that this building has to fit in between and this building fits well in between.

Mr. Norfolk noted 2331 Granville, immediately to the south of 2301, would be found to be a Heritage resource.

Mr. Norfolk noted in regards to the 10 percent, this has been an important tool however it is his understanding this will not be renewed.

Mr. Rohani noted his appreciation that over 60 percent of the units will be more than one bedroom.

Mr. Rohani agreed retail needs more work, presently finds it uninviting especially on the south end. The public bike share does take away from an inviting retail space.

Mr. Rohani noted in regards to the traffic has driven in this area and is a chaotic scene, and if possible to consider what the back alley will be and if can be used as an alternate to escape the traffic.

Mr. Rohani noted he liked how the applicant handled the view cones, and the three tier structure.

Mr. Dobrovolny asked staff of their perspective about the gateway of this site and how this contrast with the view cones and height restriction.

Mr. Olinek noted this site not conceived as a gateway site although it can operate in that function.

Mr. Olinek noted the views and massing is geared towards coming into downtown and preserving the view of downtown and past the building.

Mr. Olinek noted coming out of downtown this site is more of a passive building not a gateway.

Ms. Molaro moved to recommendation Mr. Dobrovolny seconded.

### Board Discussion

Ms. Molaro noted according to how the urban design guidelines are structured it is actually the negative spaces that create the gateway not the building. It is the setback and the experience of going down the street that is the gateway aspect and the building is there to frame that.

Ms. Molaro noted she is confident in the number of design development conditions related to the UDP comments and that the concerns of the panel will be resolved through the conditions.

Mr. Mochrie noted his support.

Mr. Mochrie noted there are issues and opportunity for development.

Mr. Mochrie noted his support for relocating the amenity space to the roof level.

Mr. Mochrie noted he is confident the conditions address issues raised and recommendation from the UDP.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted his support.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted the concerns about congestion and traffic both at the alley and 7<sup>th</sup> are ones that are real issues and staff will stay focused looking at how the lane and intersection will be managed especially with the increase in cyclists, transit trips, and walking. Staff will also look at how the street will be managed for cars and buses and staff will stay active in both the Granville and 7<sup>th</sup> project.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted these issues are not reasons to approve or not approve.

**Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DP-2017-01278, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated May 2, 2018:

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:30pm.