It was moved by Mr. Mochrie, seconded by Mr. Kelley, and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on Jan 22, 2018.
2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 833 W Pender St - DP-2017-00064-DD (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Studio One

Request: To develop this site with a 13-storey, 106 room hotel with two levels of underground parking accessed from the lane via a vehicular elevator operated by valet service. The hotel will have a restaurant/guest lounge on the ground floor. Lobby access from Pender Street and a vehicular drop off area on the lane side with a rooftop garden amenity for hotel guests.

Development Planner’s Opening Comments

Ms. Linehan, Development Planner, presented the proposal as a 13-storey hotel. It is a small infill site at 52’ by 120’ in the Downtown District. It is in a subarea of the Downtown where residential uses are not permitted and office, commercial and service uses (hotel) are permitted. The permitted density is 9.0 FSR. The development permit board may approve an additional 15% floor space to facilitate hotel use, subject to the urban design considerations. The proposal is seeking the 15% increase. The basic height limit in this area is 300’. The proposal is well below that at 154’.

The taller buildings in the context were approved through rezoning. The adjacent site to the east has a 31-storey building, the Exchange, which retained the historical stock exchange and provides commercial office uses. The 36-storey building across the lane to the north, the Jameson, has 12 levels of commercial use. Levels 14 and above have residential use, noting the residential use was approved through rezoning.

The Urban Design Panel reviewed the proposal twice. The building configuration is largely the same as the first review, but the first design proposed facades in window wall with a random pattern of spandrels. UDP recommended resubmission with design development to the facades to consider context and orientation, as well as to improve the quality of the façade design and material treatment noting that the built environment of the downtown should be of a very high quality as per the downtown guidelines.

The revised design proposes a white stone façade with a regular pattern of windows as a reference to historical buildings in the area. This also reduces the extent of glazing to address heat gain. Portions with glazing are upgraded to curtain wall. The treatment of the side wall has also been considered due to its exposure above the podium of the Exchange. The high quality façade materials turn the corner and a notch is provided to bring daylight into the building, and provide visual interest. Setbacks are provided at the rear to reduce impact to residential units at L14 and above, noting the roof deck is setback 55’ from the residential floors across the lane.

In summary, the proposal is modest in its context and has responded well to the regulations and guidelines for downtown, as well as the advice of the urban design panel. Staff recommend approval subject to the conditions outlined in the report.
Ms. Linehan took questions from the Board and Panel members.

**Applicant’s Comments**
The applicants noted they will be able to respond to all the items described in the conditions and appendices.

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

Mr. Kelley asked if the hotel was an extended or long term stay hotel.
The applicant responded “no” it will be a regular functioning hotel.

**Comments from other Speakers**
No speakers.

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

Ms. Avini Besharat noted on behalf of the UDP, members reviewed the project in the first and second submission and found it has improved and will be a modest and well done project.

Mr. Jarvis noted the addition of another hotel with occupancy rights is welcomed.

Mr. Jarvis commented in regards to the parking, was there a relaxation being sought and talks about cash in lieu.

Mr. Jarvis noted he understands there is emerging policy and talks about what that policy will mean however he has seen a number of applicants coming through having to pay and wondering how equitable that is in the grand scheme of things.

Ms. Allen questioned the number of accessible units and its locations.

Ms. Allen noted there will be three accessible units.

Ms. Allen questioned if there was enough width and clearance for wheel chairs coming through the sliding doors.

Mr. Norfolk noted development in historic districts is always an interest and has to be done right.

Mr. Norfolk noted he did not approve of the first submission; however UDP dealt with all areas needing improvement and suggested the appropriate changes.

Mr. Norfolk noted his support of UDP’s comment to delete the glazed corners, and other than that the project was well designed in an important area.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. Dobrovolny moved for recommendations and Mr. Mochrie seconded.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted his support for the project.
Mr. Dobrovolny noted it was a modest project in a transitional area.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted the site was nicely scaled alongside existing buildings. The applicants did a nice job designing the project to fit in with the limitations of the area.

Mr. Mochrie noted his support for the project and liked the second design.

Mr. Mochrie noted his support for the bar/restaurant in future application for it is a great use of the space particularly in the downtown area.

Mr. Mochrie noted Vancouver is in desperate need of hotels.

Mr. Kelley noted it was a well-executed design for a modest scale project and describing it as an infill is appropriate.

Mr. Kelley seconded that Vancouver was in desperate need of hotels in the downtown area.

Mr. Kelley noted his support.

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DP-2017-00064-DD, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated January 24, 2018.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.