APPROVED MINUTES

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT BOARD
AND ADVISORY PANEL
CITY OF VANCOUVER
JUNE 17, 2013

Date: Monday, June 17, 2013
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT:

Board

V. Potter  Director of Development Services (Chair)
B. Aujla   General Manager of Real Estate Services
B. Jackson General Manager of Planning and Development
J. Dobrovolny Director of Transportation

Advisory Panel

N. Shearing Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
J. Stovell  Representative of the Development Industry
K. Busby   Representative of the General Public
J. Miletic-Prelovac Representative of the General Public
D. Wlodarczak Representative of the General Public

Regrets

F. Rafii    Representative of the Design Professions
S. Chandler Representative of the Development Industry
K. Maust    Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission
K. Chen     Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

City Staff:

J. Greer  Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
R. The    Engineering Services - Projects Branch
P. Cheng  Development Planner
M. Au     Project Facilitator

1121 SEYMOUR STREET - DE416617 - ZONE DD

M. Elliot  Endall Elliot Associates
A. Endall  Endall Elliot Associates
B. Wall    Wall Financial Corp.
J. Voss    Creative Transportation Solutions Ltd

Recording Secretary:  L. Harvey
1. 1121 SEYMOUR STREET - DE416617 - ZONE DD
   (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

   Applicant: Endall Elliot Associates
   Request: To construct a 9-storey multiple dwelling building containing 40
dwelling units, including one detached 3-storey townhouse at grade, all
above two levels of underground parking accessed from the lane west
of Seymour Street using a Heritage Density Transfer from donor site at
53 West Hastings Street on this site thereby permitting a height
increase to 92.5 ft.

Development Planner’s Opening Comments
Mr. Cheng, 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.

The staff team took questions from the Board and Advisory Panel.

Applicant’s Comments
Allan Endall, Architect, noted that their firm is also the architect for the building next door and
they are trying to coordinate the design for both buildings so they work together. He added
that they are comfortable with most of the conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Endall mentioned that they had some concern regarding Condition 1.1 with respect to the
two foot setback. He said it would be difficult to achieve because that is a structural sheer
wall and it has to be vertical from the roof to the footings. To set that back would mean losing
a lot of area and compromising the workability of the units along that frontage. He added that
they acknowledge the intent of that condition and think they can enhance the lane frontage
and deal with CPTED issues. Mr. Endall noted that Condition A.1.5 regarding the floor area for
Studio Units Type J of which there are four, have a floor area of 412 square feet and the
condition is asking for the area to be calculated by subtracting the ensuite storage which would
bring the square footage below the 400 square foot minimum. He said he understood that
there is provision in the regulations of the zoning bylaw that allow the Director of Planning to
give consideration and approve an area less than 400 square feet if appropriate. If they were to
conform to the 400 square feet minimum they would either have to delete the ensuite storage
and provide it in the basement or decrease the size of the open balcony. He added that they
feel that either one of those solutions would negatively affect the liveability of the units. He
said that by allowing them a slight decrease in the size of the J units to about 380 square feet
plus ensuite storage would bring them into compliance. Mr. Endall asked the Board to amend
the condition.

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

Comments from other Speakers
None.

Panel Opinion
Panel members offered a range of comments on the proposal, including:
- Great infill project;
- Supportable smaller unit sizes making them more affordable; and
• Impressed with the design features.

The Panel generally supported the application.

Board Discussion
Mr. Jackson recommended approval based on the amendments to the Staff Committee Report that had been discussed during the meeting. He commended the applicant for a clever infill project and thought it was a good solution to a mid-block project that brought a variety of housing types.

Mr. Dobrovolny thought it was an interesting and unique project and looked forward to seeing it built.

Mr. Aujla said he was in support of the project and thought it was an innovative design. He thought it would be further improved with the applicant’s commitment to improve the lane and address the blank walls.

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE416617 in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated May 22, 2013, with the following amendments:

Delete Note to Applicant in Condition 1.0; and
Delete Condition A.1.5.
Renumber Condition A.1.6 to A.1.24 to A.1.5 to A.1.23

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:36 PM.

L. Harvey  
Assistant to the Board

V. Potter  
Chair