

Date: Monday, October 20, 2014  
Time: 3:00 p.m.  
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

**PRESENT:**

**Board**

J. Pickering Deputy Director of Planning, (Chair)  
B. Jackson General Manager of Planning and Development  
J. Dobrovlny Director of Transportation  
S. Johnston Deputy City Manager

**Advisory Panel**

R. Bragg Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
K. Busby Representative of the Design Professions  
S. Chandler Representative of the Development Industry  
J. Ross Representative of the Development Industry  
A. Ray Representative of the General Public  
P. Sanderson Representative of the General Public  
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

**Regrets**

J. Miletic-Prelovac Representative of the General Public

**ALSO PRESENT:**

**City Staff:**

J. Greer Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development  
M. Holm Engineering Services - Projects Branch  
C. King Development Planner  
W. LeBreton Project Facilitator  
A. Molaro Assistant Director, Urban Design  
J. Grottenberg Planner, Vancouver - Downtown

**1546 NELSON STREET - DE418104 - ZONE RM-4**

D. Bojadziev Ankenman Marchand Architects  
T. Ankenman Ankenman Marchand Architects  
N. Sangian Carrera Management Corporation

**1071 CARDERO STREET - DE418103 - ZONE RM-5A**

A. Banafsheh Ankenman Marchand Architects  
T. Ankenman Ankenman Marchand Architects  
N. Sangian Carrera Management Corporation

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 October 6, 2014.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

**3. 1546 NELSON STREET - DE418104 - ZONE RM-5  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Ankenman Marchand Architects

Request: To construct of a new 3 storey multiple infill dwelling containing 4 dwelling units (rental) at the rear of the site as follows: level 1 - one 2 bedroom rental unit, level 2 - one 1 bedroom room rental unit and level 2 & 3 - two 2 bedroom rental units.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Mr. King, 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. King took questions from the Board and Advisory Panel members.

**Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Ankenman, Architect, mentioned that under Guidelines the infill is able to be strata titled however the client decided not to do that but instead to have it be a rental building. He mentioned that the application was initially to come in under an HRA but were asked by Staff to not propose the development as an HRA. They did a Statement of Significance for the project and was characterized as a "B" building. He noted that they had looked at moving the house forward on the site and making the infill building bigger. The client didn't want to do that as it would mean displacing the current residents. Mr. Ankenman said that the way they see the design developing is that the existing tenants can use the front yard as their own private outdoor space and the courtyard could be shared by the ground floor of the existing home plus the ground floor of the infill building. He asked that the Board direct them to put in a small roof garden for each of those units. As well, he said they want the Board to look at the loss of rental that would happen if the house was moved forward on the site. He added that the windows on the side elevation will not be clear glass but more of a decoration. Regarding the parking, Mr. Ankenman mentioned that the client owns three properties within a one block radius of the site and his parking lots sit empty. He has tried to the rent out the spaces but has not been able to do so. He added that they are concerned that a 60 year lease might hinder the client from getting financing for the project. As well adding parking could increase the amount of rent being asked for the units.

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

**Comments from other Speakers**

Members of the community expressed concerns regarding the following:

- Concerns regarding daylight and sunlight into neighbouring properties as the new building will cause shadowing most of the day;

- The scale and massing of the building makes for a building that will tower over neighbouring houses;
- The new building shows little respect to the character of the surrounding context in its architectural design;
- Lack of privacy to adjoining properties;
- Perhaps a green wall would help to soften the overlook from the neighbours or other means of improving the blank wall;
- Concern that the plum tree's roots will likely be compromised by the new construction;
- Would rather see a 2-storey building or other ways to mitigate the building's height;
- Recommend access to refuse area be switched to east location rather than up against the neighbouring house;
- Many concerns around the lack of parking on the site as parking is a huge issue and there is a lot of competition for parking spaces already on the street;
- The application should be more in concert with the planning guidelines for laneway housing;
- Would like to see some heritage aspects in the architectural expression;
- Would like to see the house moved forward on the lot to help reduce shadowing on neighbouring homes;
- There seems to be a lot of over-charging for parking by owners of properties in the West End and since the City's permit is only \$78 for a year, it makes for little parking on the street. As well Nelson Street doesn't have any parking on the street because of the fire station;
- Consider CPTED issues for doors opening onto the lane.

#### Panel Opinion

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

- The application will set a precedent for laneway housing in the West End;
- This type of housing will bring growth and density into the community;
- The intent of the laneway housing policy is looking for compatibility within neighbourhoods and this application has some issues with respect to compatibility;
- Need to look at each application individually with respect to different conditions;
- The materiality of the building needs to be strengthened;
- The articulation and quality of materials is not compatible and is something the Urban Design Panel wanted to see improved;
- Design development of the blank wall with either a green wall or other design elements;
- Lowering the parapet and using the upper level as an amenity could improve livability;
- Perhaps moving the house could sort out some of the issues;
- The existing deck should be removed and the spaces be considered to have viable amenity for the existing house and the infill;
- There is a possibility for exterior roof top space for the residents, however if that was to occur the parapet height should be dropped down;
- Staff's requirement for parking should be met and the parking study for the West End should be completed;
- The Advisory Panel agreed that the application should be deferred to a later date.

#### Board Discussion

Mr. Jackson made a motion to defer the application to the next Development Permit Board Meeting of November 17, 2014 to allow the applicant and staff to address some of the issues brought up by the Urban Design Panel as well as the recommendations from the residents. He also mentioned that the parking issue needs to be addressed.

Mr. Dobrovolny agreed that there was work to be done on the application and given the concerns of the neighbours said he wanted to make sure the issues were addressed properly.

Mr. Johnson agreed to defer the application. He also thanked the speakers for addressing their concerns as well as offering solutions.

**Motion**

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

THAT the Board DEFER the application to the next Development Permit Board meeting of November 17, 2014.

**4. 1071 CARDERO STREET - DE418103 - ZONE RM-5A  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Ankenman Marchand Architects

Request: Interior alterations to the existing multiple dwelling (1601 Comox St) on the basement level laundry and bike storage rooms and construct a new 4-storey multiple infill dwelling containing 11 dwelling units consisting of: level 1 - two 2 bedroom rental units, level 2 - two 1 bedroom & one 2 bedroom rental units, level 3 - two 1 bedroom & one 2 bedroom rental units, level 4 - two 1 bedroom & one 2 bedroom rental units, with 2 standard car and 1 car share space at the rear having vehicular access from the lane, on this existing site.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Mr. King, 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. King took questions from the Board and Advisory Panel members.

**Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Ankenman, Architect, mentioned that they have two concerns in the Staff Committee Report conditions. One is moving the core of the infill from where it is now to a little closer to Comox Street. He said that it is not a viable location for units and so made sense to have the entry in that location. As well the courtyard is not intended for private outdoor space and so they decided to add a roof garden. Mr. Ankenman said that they looked at locations for the pad mounted transformer and thought it might be better located in the courtyard and asked the Board to approve that location.

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

**Comments from other Speakers**

Members of the community expressed concerns regarding the following:

- Too much development to be taking place in such a small area of the city;
- The project is too tall at 3-storeys;
- Should be a small cottage infill that provides some rental income and beautification of the lane;
- Still doesn't address the fundamental issue of parking and in fact takes away 13 parking spaces.

**Panel Opinion**

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

- Relocating the core would create a more normalized condition at the entry to the new building as it needs to have a clearer entry sequence;
- Pulling the entry forward would create better layouts in the building;
- May be worth looking at moving the PMT into the courtyard rather than having it on the lane and then mitigating any impact with landscaping;
- Needs some design development as well as better materiality choices;
- A nicely proportioned building that falls down at the grade level;
- Additional parking is needed;

- The building is compatible with the heritage context in the area from the second floor up;
- Some concerns regarding the livability of the units.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. Jackson made a motion to defer the application to the next Development Permit Board Meeting of November 17, 2014 to allow the applicant and staff to address some of the issues. He added that it is not so much about the design other than the lower levels needing some design development. He said he wanted the issues of parking and the core to be worked out with the applicant and staff so that they find a solution that works for the project.

Mr. Johnston agreed that the parking issue needed to be addressed and added that the application was a great example of what is more typical in laneway housing.

Mr. Dobrovolny said he was in support of the motion.

**Motion**

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

THAT the Board DEFER the application to the next Development Permit Board meeting of November 17, 2014.

**5. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**6. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:10 PM