

Date: Monday, July 14, 2014  
Time: 3:00 p.m.  
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

---

**PRESENT:****Board**

J. Pickering Deputy Director of Planning, City-Wide & Regional Planning (Chair)  
B. Jackson General Manager of Planning and Development  
P. Judd General Manager of Engineering Services  
S. Johnston Deputy City Manager

**Advisory Panel**

W. Franci Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
K. Busby Representative of the Design Professions  
A. Ray Representative of the General Public  
J. Miletic-Prelovac Representative of the General Public  
P. Sanderson Representative of the General Public (present for Item #1 only)

**Regrets**

S. Chandler Representative of the Development Industry  
J. Ross Representative of the Development Industry  
A. Lalani Representative of the General Public  
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

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

J. Greer Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development  
M. Holm Engineering Services - Projects Branch  
T. Potter Development Planner  
S. Black Development Planner  
D. Autiero Project Facilitator

**235 KINGSWAY - DE417686 - ZONE C-3A**

K. Smith Robert Ciccozzi Architects Inc.  
R. Maruyama Maruyama & Associates Landscape Architects  
R. Vrooman Port Capital Development

**285 EAST 10<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE - DE416894 - ZONE CD-1 PENDING**

R. Acton Acton Ostry Architects  
A. Davies Acton Ostry Architects  
B. Hemstock PWL Partnership  
B. Beatson Rize Alliance

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

---

1. **235 KINGSWAY - DE417686 - ZONE C-3A  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Robert Ciccozzi Architects Inc.

Request: To develop a 7-storey mixed-use building with one (1) level of retail and six (6) levels of residential containing 43 dwelling units over two (2) levels of underground parking, having vehicular access from the lane and also requesting an increase in the Floor Space Ratio using a Heritage Density Transfer from a donor site at 6 Water Street (providing 3,628 sq. ft.).

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Mr. Potter, 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. Potter took questions from the Board and Panel members.

**Applicant's Comments**

Karen Smith, Architect, mentioned that the building presents a 6-storey height along Kingsway with additional height in the form of rooftop access penthouses. In response to the conditions in the Staff Committee Report, they are in agreement and will continue to work with staff. She added that they are planning on increasing the lower level terraces as well as dropping half of the deck to the first level that will allow for an upper and lower level deck that will be linked by a stair case. This will make for a lower wall along the lane with a glass guard and the amenity space will be pushed back into the building. She said that these changes should address all the concerns both in terms of scale and massing and in terms of the adjacency to the indoor and outdoor amenity spaces. As well they will provide continuous weather protection along Kingsway and increase the depth of the balconies along Kingsway.

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

**Comments from other Speakers**

Comments in opposition included:

- Concern with the massing and overshadowing on the hotel's courtyard;
- The wall against the adjacent property is massive;
- Design changes to the proposal's north elevation to allow for light into the hotel's courtyard space;
- Concern regarding the floor space ratio;
- Concern for the 51 parking spaces and the increased volume of traffic;
- Extra FSR should be earned through the addition to public benefits to the community;
- The project is not transit friendly because it is adding more vehicles;
- The elevator shaft seems too high;
- Would like to see permit parking for the street restricted as there are already too many cars parking on the streets;
- Would like to see new condo owners buy their parking spaces rather than a parking space assigned to a unit.

**Panel Opinion**

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

- The recommendations in the Staff Committee Report are supportable;
- The design articulation is merited and should also be read in conjunction with some of the enhancement that should be part of the material palette;
- The applicant should consider upgrading the material to hardi-panel;
- Recommendation for some sort of landscaping on the lane such as a living wall;
- Recommendation for reducing the elevator over-run;
- Based on the future heights in the area, the building is the appropriate height;
- It is unfortunate for the neighbours to the north that their courtyard will be in shadow;
- Recommendation for Engineering to conduct a traffic study;
- Good job with the weather protection along Kingsway;
- Support for the way the indoor and outdoor amenity spaces have been handled; and
- The Advisory Panel recommended support for the application.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. Jackson moved to approve the development application and added two amendments to the conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Johnson and Mr. Judd supported the amendments and had no further comments.

**Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE417686, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated June 4, 2014, with the following amendments:

Add a new Condition 1.4 to read as follows:

*examination of other elevator alternatives to reduce the over-run height;*

Add a new Condition 1.5 to read as follows:

*examination of the provision of additional landscaping or living wall at grade along the lane.*

**2. 285 EAST 10<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE - DE416894 - ZONE CD-1 PENDING  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Acton Ostry Architects

Request: To construct a 21-storey development comprised of 7,295 square meters of commercial/retail use, and 20,336 square meters of market residential use (258 dwelling units) at a proposed floor space ratio of 5.55.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Mr. Black, 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. Black took questions from the Board and Panel members.

**Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Acton, Architect, gave a brief presentation on the application.

Mr. Beatson said they had no concerns regarding the conditions in the Staff Committee Report, however they did have some concerns regarding reducing the amount of vehicle parking in the project.

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

**Comments from other Speakers**

Comments in support included:

- Adds to more vibrancy to the community;
- Good business opportunity;
- Ideal area for young people to location;
- Offers the best value for home ownership in Vancouver;
- Building is an example of modern architecture;
- Will attract smaller and medium size businesses;
- Fits with the community's needs;
- Creates a diverse and vibrant community to the neighbourhood;
- Addresses the needs of the growing community;
- Bringing back one of the city's key locations;
- Restores community connectivity with doors on the street and recognizes the fine grain and diversity of the community;
- The project is better than what was approved at Rezoning;
- Application adheres to the Council's direction as presented at Rezoning;
- The food co-op would have been welcomed but perhaps a large scale food store would be more appropriate;
- Recent precede for reduced parking on transit and this is one site that could significantly reduce the parking and still find buyers for the units;
- Has turned into a handsome building that will change the context of the neighbourhood;
- Important to keep the context of the area but important to provide a variety of options to add more people to the neighbourhood that will add diversity to the community.

Members of the community expressed concerns regarding the following:

- Mt Pleasant is a heritage neighbourhood and has a certain feel to the community;
- A large concrete tower is out of place in this neighbourhood as most buildings are low rise structures;
- Already have the Lee Building as a focal point in Mount Pleasant;
- Can't access Watson Street with large trucks;
- Not a responsible project as it can't fit the site;
- Too much density and too many parking spaces;
- Shadow impacts on all the streets are shown incorrectly by the applicant;
- The overall height of the building is higher than what was approved by Council at Rezoning;
- Brewery Creek flows underneath the proposal and is about one or two storeys below ground whereas The Rize is going to be four storeys below ground;
- The subsidised food co-op has been removed from the proposal;
- Transportation has not been addressed correctly especially along Watson Street;
- The pedestrian realm has not been addressed on Watson Street;
- Not the same application that was approved by Council at Rezoning;
- The amount and type of commercial space has been changed and not approved by Council;
- It is not an iconic or landmark building does not represent the community;
- Mount Pleasant is losing a lot of its character;
- Marketing studies have shown the developer that having more parking will help them sell their units.

#### Panel Opinion

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

- The application was supported by the Urban Design Panel;
- The conditions are appropriate although further development of the brick façade on the Broadway frontage could be improved as to its reference to the Lee Block;
- The public art needs to engage with the community and have an ongoing relationship;
- The parking requirements that were put forth by staff to reduce should be considered;
- Commended the applicant for including shared cars and would like to see that increased;
- The application is a unique and appropriate response to the site;
- The building will be a good fit for the neighbourhood;
- The Advisory Panel recommended approval of the application.

#### Board Discussion

Mr. Jackson said he appreciated the passion of the people who live in Mount Pleasant because they were so actively engaged in the process. He said he understood the frustration that some people might have when projects go before Council or the Board and are not what they envisioned as far as the building height, density or uses. Mr. Jackson said that the Board's role is to look at the form and character of an application and to look at the specific design conditions that were imposed by Council at the time of rezoning. He noted that the specific concerns that were raised by the Urban Design Panel and staff had been addressed in the conditions. Mr. Jackson added that he believed the project will be an iconic building in terms of its design and contribution to the community. He said he was in support of the development and recommended approval with the conditions set out in the Staff Committee Report and recommended an amendment to Condition 1.6.

Mr. Judd noted the type of trucks that will be used for delivery to the building and felt that they would function effectively in the location proposed. However, he thought it would be prudent to add a new Condition A.2.12 regarding truck turning. Mr. Judd added that he thought it was a beautiful building and will be a tremendous addition to this particular location. In years to come when there is an extension to the Millennium line and subway station, the

building will be seen as an entirely appropriate for the location and not to be replicated throughout Mount Pleasant. He added that he was pleased to support the project.

Mr. Johnston said he thought it was a good project and that the developer and the design team had attempted to address the concerns raised by the community and have met the commitments set forth by Council. He added that he thought there was too much vehicle parking and would like to see the bicycle parking increased. He added that he thought the project would add to the community and will provide much needed housing. Mr. Johnston thanked the members of the community for taking their time to share their thoughts with the Board.

#### 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. DE416894, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated June 4, 2014, with the following amendments:

Replace Condition 1.6 with the following:

*Reduce the proposed parking by at least 10% and to consider converting some or all of that space into bicycle parking or add more shared vehicle parking spaces;*

Add a new Condition A.2.12 to read as follows:

*Provision of confirmation of design truck turning movements for planned access roads.*

*Note to Applicant: The analysis of truck turning movements should be performed in conjunction with the Loading Management Plan required through the rezoning conditions.*

#### 3. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

#### 4. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:47 PM

---

L. Harvey  
Assistant to the Board

---

J. Pickering  
Chair