

Date: Monday, Oct 28, 2019
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

A. Law Director, Development Services, (Chair)
T. O'Donnell Deputy Director of Current Planning
P. Mochrie Deputy City Manager
K. Mulji Director, Engineering Projects & Development Services

Advisory Panel

J. Huffman Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
M. Cree Smith Representative of the Design Professions
K. May Representative of the General Public

Regrets

J. Leduc Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission
C. Rogers Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission
S. Allen Representative of the General Public
R. Rohani Representative of the General Public
C. Karu Representative of the Development Industry
R. Chaster Representative of the General Public
P. Sihota Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

J. Greer Assistant Director, Development Review Branch
P. Chan Development Planner, Urban Design & Development

1636 Clark Drive - DP-2019-00287-CD-1**Delegation**

U. Geissler, Architect, HDR
Jim Alders, Architect, HDR
Ken Larsson, Landscape Architect, Connect
James Forsyth, Owner/Developer, BC Housing

Recording Secretary: K. Cermeno

1. MINUTES

Sept 30, 2019 and Oct 15, 2019 meeting minutes were approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. **1636 Clark Drive - DP-2019-00287
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: HDR Architecture Associates Inc.

Request: To develop this site with a 10-storey mixed-use building containing 97 dwelling units (social housing), social enterprise space and a withdrawal management centre, including up to 20 short term transitional beds. This application is being processed through the Social Housing or Rental Tenure (SHORT) program.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mr. Patrick F. Chan, 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. Chan took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Applicant's Comments

The applicant noted a question in regards to the FSR. The applicant asked if there could be more inclusion for amenity space where there is a community room and a sacred space, and this would be added to the amenity to relax the pressure on the FSR.

The applicant noted they wanted to reinforce the theme of gathering, shelter and welcoming, a message that was heard through the first nations stake holder. The goal is to reduce redundant walkways and perceived barriers.

The applicant noted during the last 4 months they've had many meetings with First Nations group, the urban indigenous group and host group. The meetings were valuable to understand their concerns and cultural values.

The applicant noted they look forward to continue working with UDP, the City, and First Nation's group.

Applicant took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Comments from other Speakers

Speaker one, Mr. Donato Calogero, lives directly across the lane. Mr. Calogero noted he is rebuilding a fence in the back lane, a neighbourly and short fence. Mr. Calogero noted the building being proposed includes white aluminum panels creating a 4/5 story movie screen effect, these are very unneighbourly; they reflect off a lot of sun and generates a lot of heat.

Mr. Calogero suggested a textured lighter material should be used.

Mr. Calogero noted the location of the entries in the alleyway, one clinic and one residential tower. This has a 24 hour facility, concerned with a lot of people and a lot of traffic with a 24/7 service in a narrow dimly lit back alley.

Mr. Calogero suggests the entryways be relocated closer to the main street Mclean and Clark.

Mr. Calogero noted presently there is a park where two houses were torn down. Due to the lack of green space this park has been adopted by the community and children. Local business had built a picnic table; this is also an informal dog park and has nice views.

Mr. Calogero noted his concern that the project has no obligation to return a community amenity therefore removing an amenity that has been long standing enjoyed by the community.

Mr. Calogero noted the proposed public plaza on McClean drive is really small and suggested bridges be built the neighbour with green space.

Speaker two, Mr. Nick Pogor, Executive Director of the Commercial Drive Business Society (CDBS) noted three major concerns, expressed by the Grandview Woodland Area Council and many residents in the surrounding areas, the 24 hour sobering center, insufficient parking spaces and the negative impact of increased local traffic to the neighbourhoods.

Mr. Pogor noted the sobering center hosts individuals that are held against their will directly beneath and nearby residential family homes. Additionally, the sobering center is not mentioned in the report.

Mr. Pogor noted there is no other detox or sobering centres planned for Vancouver therefore this will be the only one and if approved intoxicated individuals who are involuntarily clients when released will be released near the busy and dangerous intersection of 1st and Clark. Additionally there is the risk that these individuals will make the surrounding neighbourhoods and business entrances their homes.

Mr. Pogor noted there are 81 planned parking spaces when 177 were recommended by their own Parking study Report. The "Shared parking scenario" used in the Parking and Traffic Impact Assessment acknowledges that "the proposed supply of 81 spaces is insufficient to meet the peak demand."

Mr. Pogor noted it is very hard to believe that increased local traffic to and from this large-scale facility will not negatively impact the neighbourhood, particularly those living on Graveley, Grant, McLean and all who use the adjacent alleys.

Speaker three, Mr. Dan Zubkoff, is a resident of the area for 30 years. Mr. Zubkoff noted some people have moved out already due to concerns of this development. Mr. Zubkoff noted there is a lack of concern for the residents in the local area.

Mr. Zubkoff noted he was informed that 500 notification cards were mailed out however he never received one nor individuals on 1st. From his knowledge of asking around about 40 individuals next to the site did not receive the cards.

Mr. Zubkoff noted his concern for the lack of social impact assessment, the one for one replacement policy never being accounted for and that the sobering center was never mentioned.

Speaker Four, Richard Tickner, noted he is a resident of the block. Mr. Ticker began by noting he is grateful to have the City of Vancouver as his landlord for the City has always taken care of the tenants in the building.

Mr. Tickner noted the intersection is extremely hazardous; intentionally putting this amount of people in a dangerous intersection is counter to the goal.

Mr. Tickner noted it appears not enough assessment has been made therefore the intersection of 1st and Clark is very irresponsible.

Mr. Tickner noted not everyone received the notification cards; the percentage of feedback is not sufficed prior to making the decision.

Mr. Tickner expressed as a result people will die.

Speaker 5, Sean Conner, noted Clark and 1st, McClean and 1st and Woodland and 1st are all very hazardous.

Mr. Conner noted there should be a back up to the loss of the park and no added community amenity. The center is not a community amenity it only services the people using it. Mr. Conner noted a social Impact assessment is very much needed, some kind of projection should have been made on how it will affect the neighbourhood.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Huffman noted UDP has seen this project a couple of times, and at the DP stage voted to have it returned.

Mr. Huffman noted the project is asking for a significant density upgrade, the site is a difficult site in that there is quite a slope and there are two roads you can't access it from, making it a difficult site to put a complex program, there are about 4/5 major entries into the building.

Mr. Huffman noted most of the comments at UDP were cosmetic and regarding the grade level.

Mr. Huffman noted comments included increasing the amount of soft landscape, the various pedestrian entry points all seem to be similar but strong different uses, develop wayfinding and making entrances more distinguish.

Mr. Huffman noted the comment in regards to the reflection from the facades, made by speaker one was a valid comment and suggested this be reviewed.

Mr. Huffman noted along Clark Dr. there was a first Nations motif in some of the cladding at grade, UDP felt it was simply applied; now it is all gone when it should have been a stronger developed piece.

Mr. Huffman noted the lane will be difficult, there is a drop off at the eastern end of the lane that is not really shown and that is one of the most difficult spots.

Ms. Cree-Smith noted this was a commendable project, in terms of the design.

Ms. Cree-Smith noted many of the concerns from UDP were met, however still challenging.

Ms. Cree-Smith noted regarding the entryways with the indigenous art, hopes an authentic indigenous artist(s) is being commissioned.

Ms. Cree-Smith noted her support for the project.

Ms. May thanked the members of the public for their comments.

Ms. May noted her shared concerns of the traffic safety and park space.

Ms. May noted she echoed speaker one in regards to the material that is very reflective of the sunlight.

Ms. May suggested making a friendlier green space where the park is.

Ms. May noted her support for the project.

Board Discussion

Mr. Mochrie asked staff to comment regarding neighbourhood notification.

Staff noted 500 notification postcards were mailed out and 3 site signs were installed.
Staff noted their protocol is not to force the public to comment however they are highly encouraged.
Staff noted the site sign leads to the website that allows for further information.

Ms. Mulji asked staff to comment regarding the parking study and traffic analysis, particularly in regards to the intersection at Clark and 1st.

Staff noted the completed traffic study showed volume generated on the site is low to moderate, and will not be an added significant impact to the intersection.

Staff noted the parking study revisited the parking bylaw requirement, which lowered the number of spaces required on the site.

Ms. Mulji noted in regards to the design it is positive, lane treatment and the screening of the loading bays is done well.

Ms. Mulji suggested that staff take into consideration some of the comments heard today, and consider further greening.

In regards to the parking and traffic, Ms. Mulji put forward a consideration item to specifically review the intersection at Clark and 1st as part of the parking and traffic study requirements.

Ms. Mulji noted with the added consideration she supports the project.

Mr. Mochrie noted this is a significant project for the neighbourhood and city but a much needed one.

Mr. Mochrie acknowledged it is a big change for the neighbourhood.

Mr. Mochrie noted the board members do not have the legal ability to change Council's decision.

Mr. Mochrie noted the panel is present to comment on the design of the building and how it fits in the neighbourhood.

Mr. Mochrie noted he resonates with the comments brought forward by UDP.

Mr. Mochrie suggests to include in 1.3, page 4 of the report, sub ii, a point that relates to the use of the cladding to the upper stories.

Mr. Mochrie noted this is an important project for the City and noted he is aware of the homelessness issues brought up by speaker two, and believes this project is a solution to this crisis.

Mr. Mochrie noted his support for the project.

Ms. O'Donnell thanked the members of the public for their comments.

Ms. O'Donnell noted her support for the project with the added amendment from Mr. Mochrie and consideration from Ms. Mulji.

Motion

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

THAT the Board **APPROVE** Development Application No. DP-2019-00287 - CD-1, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated October 2, 2019, with the following amendments and consideration:

Add at the end of Note to Applicant, section 1.4:

Further consideration to reducing private outdoor open space or balconies for family units may be considered with particular regard to liveability including provision of onsite semi-private accessible open space and dwelling unit design.

Add to section 1.3:

Consideration to provide a non-reflective material as an alternate to the white panels in the upper stories.

Consideration:

To specifically review the intersection at Clark and 1st as part of the parking and traffic study requirements.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:19 pm.