

Date: Monday, March 25, 2012  
 Time: 3:00 p.m.  
 Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

**PRESENT:****Board**

V. Potter Director of Development Services (Chair)  
 B. Jackson General Manager of Planning and Development  
 P. Judd General Manager of Engineering Services  
 J. Dobrovlny Director of Transportation

**Advisory Panel**

N. Shearing Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
 F. Rafii Representative of the Design Professions  
 J. Miletic-Prelovac Representative of the General Public  
 D. Wlodarczak Representative of the General Public (excused Item #3)

**Regrets**

S. Chandler Representative of the Development Industry  
 J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry  
 K. Chen Representative of the General Public  
 K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

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

A. Law Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development  
 R. The Engineering Services - Projects Branch  
 A. Law Manger, Processing Centre - Development Service  
 C. Lau Project Facilitator  
 D. Autiero Project Facilitator  
 J. Bosnjak Project Coordinator  
 S. Hein Development Planner  
 P. St. Michel Development Planner  
 A. Bond Assistant Director of Housing Policy  
 T. Wanklin Planner, DTES Group

**557 CORDOVA STREET - DE416178 - ZONE DEOD**

G. Williamson Gair Williamson Architect Inc.  
 D. Boffo Boffo Homes (Cordova Street) Inc.  
 G. Wiebe Community Building Group

**155 EAST 37<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE - DE416511 - ZONE RM-3A**

G. Williamson Gair Williamson Architect Inc.  
 J. Cheng James Cheng Architects  
 J. Fry Hapa Collaborative  
 J. Kim Tiah Holborn Properties

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

**1. MINUTES**

It was moved by Mr. Jackson seconded by Mr. Dobrovlny and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on January 28, 2013 and February 25, 2013 with the following amendments to the minutes of February 25, 2013:

**Under Questions/Discussion (Page 2 and 3)**

- 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet - Keep 1<sup>st</sup> sentence and replace the rest with *"The water main was relocated in 2009 at Translink's cost. The City supported Translink's request to leave the two sewer mains in place only if an agreement was formalized on terms acceptable to the City including payment for any additional costs incurred due to their station being built over."*
- 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet - replace with *"The passageway on the west side has a reciprocal access agreement between the VanCity and Station Place properties to allow access to portions of each other's property including a plaza area and common property that gains access through to Terminal Avenue."*
- 6<sup>th</sup> bullet - replace with *"The passageway has multiple ownerships and rights granting access to adjacent developments."*
- 7<sup>th</sup> bullet - replace with *"The access to the station and Terminal Avenue from the passageway has been proposed to be closed due to the station modifications"*
- Last bullet - replace with *"There are various jurisdictions within the city that give advice regarding the development. The retail space on private lands would be referred to the Director of Planning while the street treatments, sidewalks, and retail space on city streets are referred to the General Manager of Engineering Services. As well City Council and the Board of Parks and Recreation would be involved."*

**Under Questions/Discussions (Page 6 and 7)**

- 5<sup>th</sup> bullet - replace with *"Condition 1.5 is under the jurisdiction of the General Manager of Engineering Services. In terms of any proposal on City streets, the existing Street Use Agreement between Translink and the City outlines the rights and type of transit uses permitted on city streets. Within that agreement there are designated streets identified where Translink has the support of the General Manager of Engineering Services to build transit facilities on. Any improvements are subject to the review of the General Manager of Engineering Services and the terms of the agreement which does not currently include uses such as retail."*

**Under Board Discussion (Page 8)**

- Mr. Judd's comments - Replace 2007 with 2009

**Under Motion (Page 9)**

- Amendment to 1.2 – delete "related to loitering and vandalism...north of the station"

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

3. 557 CORDOVA STREET - DE416178 - ZONE DEOD  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Gair Williamson, Gair Williamson Architects

Request: To develop the site with a 4-storey multiple dwelling building containing 29 residential units (24 market units on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> floors and five social housing units on the ground floor) with parking at grade having vehicular access from the lane.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Scot Hein, Development Planner, introduced the application noting that in the Technical Table on page 4 of the Staff Committee Report the number of required parking spaces should read 28. The applicant is seeking a relaxation of 9 parking stalls. Mr. Hein described the context for the surrounding area and explained that they are looking for projects that respect the character of the area. The application is for a vacant piece of land and not displacing housing. He then described the background for the application. It is a project being considered under prevailing zoning and approvable and generally complies with the relaxation being sought. There is an ongoing local area planning process (LAPP) which will conclude in November 2013.

Mr. Hein mentioned that there has been some discussion about the 20% non-market housing obligation for five units at poverty rates. That is based on work done by the Housing staff and the five units make the project compliant and the parking relaxation is tied to that consideration.

Mr. Hein reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated February 27, 2013. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

**Questions/Discussion**

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by Mr. Hein:

- The separation, setback and entries could be improved by raising the building however there is not much room to raise the building over all, but it might be possible to raise only the ground plane in combination with the setback.
- In advance of the local area planning process (LAPP), staff set up interim management guidelines to deal with new applications. Council has stated that certain applications can be considered under the interim zoning policy that meet the zoning.
- The application meets the 20% social housing provision under the zoning and those five units will be at the shelter component for welfare which is \$375 a month.
- There is no displacement of existing tenants or owners as the site is currently vacant.
- Currently there is one rezoning application and another application for senior housing that is expected to come before the Development Permit Board before the end of the year for the DTES area.
- The Urban Design Panel gave strong support for the application especially for the courtyard topology.

**Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Williamson said they accept the conditions in the Staff Committee Report including Appendix A and C. He noted that there has been some revision of the plans since their review at the Urban Design Panel.

Mr. Boffo further described the proposal. He noted that there is a verge in front of the property that he believes was there for a possible widening of the street. He said they would like to manage the verge as green space and will explore that with Engineering staff. Mr. Boffo indicated that it might be possible to raise the ground floor slightly but was difficult because of the height difference from the lane. The building will not contain an elevator since the units won't be able to handle large pieces of furniture and as well it keeps the building costs down.

Mr. Boffo went through the conditions in the Staff Committee Report. He stated that with respect to Condition 1.4, the units on the south façade will have sunshades. In replying to a question regarding acoustical improvements to the building, Mr. Boffo noted that they are using laminated glass that will help reduce noise inside the units. Regarding Condition 1.5, Mr. Boffo mentioned that all the units have full glazing but there isn't any natural light in the parkade and there is a corridor behind the parkade for access to the garbage area. He stated that transparency could be achieved with the addition of glass block as a way to address the condition.

Regarding Condition 1.6, Mr. Boffo indicated the courtyard doesn't get enough natural light to allow for urban agriculture. As well, they can address Condition 1.9 as they plan an art wall on the lane and they will be detailing the sidewalls through texture and detail. Mr. Boffo added that regarding the FSR as mentioned in Appendix A, Condition A.1.1., they don't believe they are over the maximum FSR by the amount indicated in the Staff Committee Report but will work through that with staff to meet the maximum FSR. He agreed that they could meet the landscaping conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

**Questions/Discussion**

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- If the applicant was to add an elevator they would lose some of the parking spaces. As well it is cost prohibitive at about \$200,000.
- The applicant will discuss reducing the FSR with staff. There are only a few places where they could reduce the FSR. One way would be to reduce the size of the social housing units which they applicant is reluctant to do. Staff are prepared to work with the applicant to find a solution.
- The addition of the elevator was in response to the Urban Design Panel's commentary.
- The building is wood frame with a concrete garage.
- The units have a large storage room where bikes could be stored.

**Comments from other Speakers**

Anthony Muscardin said he was in support of the project. He works and lives in the area. He stated that he was pleased to see the vacant lot would be developed and put to good use. He added that he was glad to see the applicant was providing affordable ownership for the market units for people who want to stay in the neighbourhood as well five social housing units.

Gordon Wiebe, Chair, Community Builders Group, said he was speaking in support of the project. He noted that Community Builders has provided supportive housing in the DTES since 2002. They manage 253 privately funded units of supportive housing and four SROs. Mr. Wiebe added that they have chosen to partner with Boffo family of companies because of their

community involvement with the Kettle Friendship Society, the Boffo Foundation and their past community work. Mr. Wiebe mentioned that they get between three to five requests a day for housing and only have four to six vacancies per month. Regarding the development, Mr. Wiebe stated that they will be renting the five spaces at \$375 per month which requires community support given the low rental rates. Mr. Wiebe said that it was important to figure out how people of different incomes can live in the same neighbourhood. Social housing is important but so is innovative, private housing. Diversity and density can solve many of the low income housing shortages in Vancouver and this type of project can help the City's goal to end street homelessness by 2015.

Homeless Dave said he felt the Board always approves condominium buildings in the DTES and felt the Board was not listening to their concerns.

Ivan Drury said he was disappointed that the Board didn't take seriously the notion that displacement didn't happen just by moving one person out of a building and moving a new richer one in but by the effects of developments that the Board approves. He said he realises that it is an empty lot but thought the question was is doing nothing better than doing something. Are five units better than sitting and doing nothing? He said it is not doing nothing to turn down the project; it is to protect the neighbourhood against speculation. Mr. Drury said that the City's figures regarding affordable housing shows that the numbers have stabilized and even improved since 2005, but the truth is that they have declined. He added that the City doesn't count the rental amounts only that the rooms still exist. Mr. Drury stated that they have found that there has been a loss of 404 rooms around Woodward's building to rent increases. His concern was that they might lose more rooms in the Oppenheimer district. He asked the Board to refuse the application.

Louise Baldwin was concerned that the building wouldn't be all social housing. As well she was concerned that working girls would be pushed out of the area.

Ken Win lives and works in the DTES and was in support for the application. The building he lives in has both market and social housing units. He thought that if nothing is done the area won't be improved. He added that with this project there is at least exploration in how the situation could be improved. He said he thought more people moving into the area could be an important aspect to how the DTES is developed. He added that he was in support of the project.

Ingrid Steenhuisen asked the Board to take a look at the number of missions and drop-in centres that are in the DTES and revitalizing neighbourhoods instead of gentrification of neighbourhoods. The difference is that with gentrification, the most vulnerable are the ones that are forced out and in many instances they are the ones that helped create the character within the community. She added that she was glad to hear that CPTED issues would be mitigated in the building. Ms. Steenhuisen encouraged the applicant to take a look at a vertical garden if other types of gardens weren't viable.

Tammy Starlight was speaking against the project. She felt that three units at the welfare rate was a pittance. She felt that people in the community wouldn't be able to afford to live in the area. As well she was concerned that further gentrification would take place in the neighbourhood.

#### **Panel Opinion**

Mr. Shearing said he supported the application and thought it was well designed. He added that the units had an interesting layout and thought the advice given by the Urban Design Panel had

been met in the prior-to conditions in the Staff Committee Report. He said the use of the verge did not come up at the Panel meeting. He added that adding an elevator did not get unanimous support from the Panel as most of the Panel did not see it as a critical need.

Ms. Miletic-Prelovac said she was in support of the application with the conditions in the Staff Committee Report. She asked that the applicant pay special attention to the lane.

Mr. Rafii said he thought the units off the courtyard should have some weather protection such as a glass awning. He added that he thought it was a nice design and commended everyone for using private funds for social housing. He said he thought it was the best thing that could happen in the DTES since there is little government money for development.

Ms. Busby recommended support for the application. She added that she liked the two storey family units and the at grade access to the bicycle parking which will make it easier to encourage people to use their bikes.

#### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Jackson noted that the downtown eastside is a unique place and requires a unique approach to the considerable issues that set it apart from the rest of the city with respect to housing, community services and all aspects of living there. He said that he was hoping Housing staff heard the concerns with respect to gentrification versus revitalization and will take that into consideration with the new housing policies.

Mr. Jackson noted that the concerns and comments were not about the design of the building. In fact the application got unanimous support from the Urban Design Panel. He also noted that the applicant has found a way to develop a relatively small scale mid-block building for this part of the downtown.

Mr. Jackson acknowledged the concerns of those who spoke against the project but mentioned that the Board doesn't create policies but only operates within the existing policies that Council has set. Those policies include height, density and uses and Council also determined which applications they felt should be allowed to proceed before the LAP process was completed.

Mr. Jackson said he was heartened by the fact that there was not a deluge of applications that would be coming to the Board prior to the LAPP coming forward with housing policies for the area. In fact, he noted that this application may be one of the last if not the last application of this type that will be coming before the Board before the new policies are in place. He added that he recognized that this was a well thought out development and supported staff's recommendations. Mr. Jackson moved for approval of the recommendations in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Dobrovolny seconded the motion and said he appreciated the number of speakers who came to address the Board. He said it showed how much people care about the neighbourhood. He noted that the speaker's approach would help the community and was a way to move the community forward and make it stronger. He said he took heart with not only people who live there but people who are doing business or investing there as they all have visions for how the community could move forward. The difficulty is that there are two different points of view. Mr. Dobrovolny said he agreed that doing nothing is not the best approach. The fact that there would be five housing units at the welfare rate is a step forward and through the LAP process staff and the community will continue building on that and make the process and projects that

come forward even stronger and contribute more to the DTES. He added that he supported the recommendations in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Judd said he supported the project within the policy framework. He added that it is a supportable development. Mr. Judd said he looked forward to the local are planning providing broader context. Mr. Judd noted that fundamentally this is five social housing units that can be built sooner rather than later on a piece of property that currently vacant.

**Motion**

It was moved by Mr. Jackson and seconded by Mr. Dobrovlny and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE416178, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated February 27, 2013.

3. 155 EAST 37<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE - DE416511 - ZONE RM-3A  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Gair Williamson, Gair Williamson Architects

Request: To develop the site with a 5-storey multiple dwelling, containing 53 social housing units for seniors and families with eleven surface parking spaces having vehicular access from Grouse Walk off of East 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Pat St. Michel, Senior Planner, introduced the application for a 5-storey fifty-three unit senior's social housing project. This is the first project to proceed on the Little Mountain Housing site.

The proposed building site is located in the southeast quadrant of the 15 acre site along the East 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue frontage. In the future, the site will be subdivided, but at this time, it is still one large parcel. The larger site is bordered by Ontario Street and Queen Elizabeth Park to the west, Main Street to the east, East 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue to the north and East 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the south. Both Ontario Street and East 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue are important cross-city bikeways.

Ms. St. Michel gave a history of the site noting that the site was home to Vancouver's first public housing project built in 1956. The former housing that occupied the site was demolished in 2009, except for a four unit rowhouse building that is still occupied in the southeast quadrant of the site. Numerous significant trees remain on site, many of which will be retained in the future redevelopment.

The proposed building has been designed in accordance with the policy statement to guide redevelopment of the Little Mountain Housing site which was approved by Council in June last year. The policy statement was the result of a planning program that commenced in late 2009 and which extensively engaged the community through a series of open houses and numerous meetings with a community advisory group.

Ms. St. Michel said they anticipate receiving a rezoning application from James Cheng Architects and Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg Landscape Architects on behalf of Holborn Properties in the near future. However in the interests of accelerating the delivery of social housing units on the site, this proposal is being considered in advance of the rezoning. Also in the interests of facilitating this important public project, Ms. St. Michel noted that staff have waived the usual Urban Design Panel and Development Permit Board requirements of a detailed model. For reference, a smaller massing model was on display that illustrated the general form and placement of the proposal in the future context of Little Mountain.

The proposal is being considered under the existing RM-3A zoning which allows multiple dwellings up to a density of approximately 1.45 FSR and a height of 35 feet. While the density is not an issue because the site is currently one large parcel, the proposed height requires a relaxation from the Board. Section 3.2.4 of the ZDB enables the board to grant a relaxation due to unnecessary hardship, having regard to the intent of the By-Law and applicable policies and guidelines adopted by Council. Staff are recommending that the Board support the height relaxation to 57.79 feet based on the fit of the proposal with approved Council policy for the future of the site. Planning and consultation for the redevelopment of Little Mountain has been extensive to create Policy Statement that addresses the complexities of the site and its importance socially, historically and physically within the city.

Ms. St. Michel mentioned that most former residents were relocated from the Little Mountain Housing site in 2009 and many have expressed a strong desire to return. Staff believe that delaying the provision of social housing on the site until rezoning is complete, and thereby extending the duration of time before any former residents may return to live on the site is an unnecessary hardship. By advancing the construction of this first housing project with a height relaxation under the existing zoning, the residents that currently live in the remaining rowhouse will be able to move directly to their new homes, without ever having to move away.

The Little Mountain policy supports an overall density of 2.3 to 2.5 FSR over the site with building heights generally four to ten storeys, up to 12-storeys in two key locations and transitioning to three or four storeys at the edges of the site shared with single family. The site is organized around a central mews/street connecting East 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue to Main Street. Fundamental to the site planning is the expression of the memory of the former development through the retention of existing trees and reflection of its angled geometry.

This project is located in the southeast quadrant of the site, near Main Street and off East 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue. This southeast quadrant will be the community heart. The focus of the area is a community plaza organized around several existing retained trees. A neighbourhood house, childcare, and local retail focused on the square and on Main Street will be important to the public life of the square.

Ms. St. Michel commended the architects for being very responsive to evolving thinking around the placement of this project in its context at a late point in a brief design process. The building footprints envisioned in the policy statement called for a smaller four to five storey building at the site's edge, sharing an east-west courtyard with a taller four to seven storey building at its northern edge. However, late in the design process, it was recognized that reorienting the buildings would create more livable relationships between them, improve access to sunlight, and enhance permeability to the site from the neighbourhood to the south. This also gives the seniors housing both a presence on the new square and in the existing neighbourhood.

The building is designed with temporary surface level parking accessed from East 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and a temporary structure for bike storage and garbage and recycling. In the future, the building will be connected underground to a neighbouring social housing project to the east, and the temporary access from East 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue will be closed up.

The rezoning for the Little Mountain Housing site will meet or exceed the City's criteria for sustainable large development planning including feasibility of low carbon energy supply, rainwater management and other elements. This building will achieve LEED™ Gold certification.

The proposed building was supported unanimously by the Urban Design Panel and the architect was complemented on the design and the improvements to its placement in the future context of the area. Panel comments on several aspects of the outdoor spaces for residents are reflected in the prior-to conditions.

Notification was sent to neighbouring property owners, and former residents. A presentation was made to the Community Advisory group for the Little Mountain site. The most common concern was regarding the amount of parking and the access from East 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue. However, the parking proposed is in accordance with standard city requirements for parking for social housing, and at this time staff do not think an increase above this is required. With respect to the access from East 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue, this temporary configuration enables clear and safe

separation of resident and construction activity, and an engineering condition regarding closure of this temporary access brings greater certainty to the timing of this.

Ms. St. Michel reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated March 13, 2013. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

#### Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by Ms. St. Michel:

- Staff do not require an actual number for height recommended by the Board.
- The units are all three bedrooms.
- The building can go up to 7-storeys adjacent to the square but not adjacent to the south streetscape.
- The building is responding to BC Housing and their programming.

#### Applicant's Comments

Mr. Cheng, Architect, explained the master plan concept for the site noting that the site used to accommodate 224 social housing units. The road network and on grade parking is still available and is the reason the first phase does not have underground parking. The original plan envisioned a single loaded corridor building along East 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue to address the residential neighbourhood across the street. Since then Council has given instructions that they would like to see the social housing be implemented as soon as possible. As a result this first building became a double loaded building. It didn't work very well because the units on the north side had no sun so by rotating the building all the units get some sun throughout the day. Mr. Cheng noted that they are doing an inventory of all the trees on the site and the arborists labelled them either viable or nonviable. All the trees being retained are viable and were the specimen signature trees that gave the site character. Mr. Cheng mentioned that the future road will be raised about four feet higher than the current road to eliminate physical challenges and make it level with East 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He added that this will be part of the rezoning and is not part of this application. Mr. Cheng said they looked at raising the building to accommodate more units, but they decided on the current height so as not to shadow the plaza.

Mr. Williamson, Architect, mentioned that they were brought in to develop the urban massing of the building. There are 53 units with forty-one units that are adaptable for wheel chairs and the rest are regular units. There are one and two bedroom units in the building. Mr. Williamson noted that the materials were selected to match the natural setting. There is direct access from East 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Mr. Fry, Landscape Architect, noted that there was a desire to move the building two feet to the south to accommodate future roadway alignment and was predicated by the existing trees to the north. There is about twelve feet of flex space between the property line and the building face. He said they are confident that without shifting the building they can accommodate the two feet as well as the additional six feet that Engineering is requiring for accommodating the future street right-of-way. Mr. Fry mentioned that there is a sloped walkway from the west side so it is not a prominent pathway off East 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue and also provides universal access from the fire exit door. He also mentioned that they have made it possible for universal access to all ground floor patios. As well they changed the amenity space at the north edge of the building to be oriented more to the village square. On the fifth level roof deck they are planning urban agriculture and landscape amenities such as furnishings.

Mr. Tiah, Holborn Properties, said they have met with the First Nations group from Musqueam with regards to jobs and businesses on the site. They will also be including them in adding aboriginal art. Mr. Tiah said they would coordinate with the authorities should any First Nations artifacts be discovered on the site.

#### Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- When the property next door is developed there will be underground parking for both buildings.
- Construction of this building will take about fifteen months and the next to be built is the property to the east.
- Condition 1.1 in the Note to Applicant requests the building move two feet to the south in order to get off the root base of one tree and to get a road with sufficient width. The purpose of the note is to find solutions.

#### Comments from other Speakers

Ingrid Steenhuisen said it was important to allow for mobility and access for seniors in the building but was concerned as both elevators are at the north end of the building. She said it would be beneficial to have an elevator at both ends of the building. She said she would also like to see the balconies be more liveable.

Ned Jacobs is a member of the community advisory group, Riley Park City Plan Community Visions, and was in support of the application. He added that it has been a hardship for the residents of Little Mountain as they were promised that they would be back in new homes in 2010. He noted that they still don't know when the rezoning will be completed. Mr. Jacobs said he thought the applicant had done a good job of staggering the setbacks on East 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue and the level of amenity spaces was very high. He added that he also thought there should be elevators at either end of the building and to make the balconies more useable.

Sheila Leggett said that because of her financial situation her dream is to be able to move into this building.

#### Panel Opinion

Mr. Shearing said the Panel gave the project their support with a few issues to be considered. He read the key aspects needing improvement noting that the prior-to conditions in the Staff Committee Report had addressed those concerns. Mr. Shearing felt there was some confusion on how the building was sited as it has two front doors: the one at East 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue and the other in the future interior street. He said that for some time the East 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue will be the critical street especially during construction. Mr. Shearing suggested that the Board consider it as a second access. As well Mr. Shearing thought the acoustics could be improved so that noise could be mitigated during the construction period.

Ms. Miletic-Prelovac thought there was a high level of consideration to the design process and was pleased that that the master plan would allow the buildings to get more sun and that there was an opportunity for a different treatment of the public realm with the addition of green space. Ms. Miletic-Prelovac supported the application.

Mr. Rafii said he supported the project and thought it was well put together. He said he also supported the notion of improving the acoustic to reduce construction noise for the residents.

Mr. Wlodarczak said he wished other supportive housing was this well done. He noted that his father grew up on the site and it was great to see it come back in a better way. He added that he was in support of the application.

Ms. Busby recommended approval for the application.

#### Board Discussion

Mr. Jackson said he thought it was a nicely designed affordable housing project. He said he thought it was well thought out and commended the applicant team, staff and the master plan process. He urged the applicant to move on with the balance of the site so the building could be put in the proper context and to alliviate some of the concerns with respect to the aucostics. Mr. Jackson advised staff to look into the issue of acoustics that will be needed during the construction stage. The other issue is the placement of the elevators. He said he thought the comments were useful and advised staff and the applicant to take that into consideration in the final design as to the placement of the elevators. Mr. Jackson moved for approval of the recommendations in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Judd seconded the motion for approval and offered an amendment to condition 1.1. He said he thought the remainder of the condition gave direction and flexibility to consider the design of the road preserving the tree as it stands. Mr. Jackson accepted the amendment.

Mr. Dobrovolny said he liked one of the quotes that was heard from one of the speakers; let's get on with it. He was in support of the Motion.

#### Motion

It was moved by Mr. Jackson and seconded by Mr. Judd, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE416511, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated March 13, 2012, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.1 in the Note to Applicant by deleting the following sentence:  
*The northern edge of the building needs to provide 2 ft. more clearance which may be achieved by relocation of the entire building 2 ft. to the south.*

#### 4. OTHER BUSINESS

#### 5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:41 PM.

---

L. Harvey  
Assistant to the Board

---

V. Potter  
Chair