

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