

Date: Monday, November 17, 2014  
 Time: 3:00 p.m.  
 Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

---

**PRESENT:****Board**

K. McNaney Assistant Director, Vancouver - Downtown (Chair)  
 B. Jackson General Manager of Planning and Development  
 S. Johnston Deputy City Manager (arrived at 3:30 PM)  
 J. Dobrovlny Director of Transportation

**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. Lalani Representative of the General Public  
 A. Ray Representative of the General Public  
 P. Sanderson Representative of the General Public  
 K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission (left after 4<sup>th</sup> Item)

**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  
 A. Moorey Development Planner  
 A. Molaro Development Planner  
 W. LeBreton Project Facilitator  
 J. Borsa Project Facilitator  
 J. Grottenberg Planner, Vancouver - Downtown  
 D. Hurford Housing Planner  
 D. Leung Cultural Planner

**1546 NELSON STREET - DE418104 - ZONE RM-5**

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

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

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

**311 EAST 6<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE - DE417971 - ZONE IC-3**

P. Lang IBI/HB Group  
 J. Mok IBI/HB Group  
 C. Owen IBI/HB Group  
 T. Pappajohn Jameson East 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue LP  
 A. DeGenova Vancouver Resource Society

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

---

**1. MINUTES**

It was moved by Mr. Jackson, seconded by Mr. Dobrovolny, and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on October 20, 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 they had no concerns meeting the conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

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:

- Concern for the amount of shading on the neighbours private open spaces;
- Wanted the project put on hold for more neighbourhood consultation;
- The building is out of context with the rest of the neighbouring buildings;
- The parking issue has not been adequately resolved; car share not acceptable;
- The residents should be exempt from buying into the City's parking permit program;
- Wanted to see the building reduced to 2-storeys or slope the roof to reduce shadowing;
- Need to find a way to save the plum tree;
- The developer held an open house and the outcome has not been made public;
- Appreciation for adding the green wall, but concern for how it will be maintained;

Members of the community expressed their support for the application:

- The development will animate the laneway and will provide more rental housing.

**Panel Opinion**

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

- A precedent setting application as it is the first of the laneway housing in the West End;
- The application is compliant with the guidelines;

- The form of development is appropriate for the area as it is the same scale as adjacent developments;
- The revisions as recommended by staff are beneficial and help the development in terms of livability and improving the shared community space;
- The green screen will address some of the neighbour's concerns but requires some design development regarding viability;
- The balconies on the second and third floors are questionable regarding functionality;
- Suggest the balconies not be removed but find a way to have some outdoor space for the family units;
- Perhaps the plum tree could be replaced with a similar tree within the project;
- The proposed parking solution seems logical for the area;
- Commended the applicant for protecting a heritage resource without using any incentives;
- The Advisory Panel recommended approval for the application.

### Board Discussion

Mr. Johnston said that he would leave staff to take the feedback from the Advisory Panel under consideration. He thought that the residents had some important comments and agreed that there had been some positive changes such as the green wall and community space. The application has been a learning opportunity to see how laneway housing would work in the area. Like most areas in the city, neighbours are impacted even though staff and the applicant have tried to mitigate those impacts. The project adds much needed rental housing and preserves the heritage house. He agreed that there needs to be a parking study done as soon as possible. Mr. Johnston thanked the residents for their constructive comments and moved for approval of the application.

Mr. Jackson thanked the speakers coming out to the meeting. He explained that the application might not be as right as they would like it to be but felt that the changes made for a better project and would encourage the applicant to find a way to keep the plum tree. Mr. Jackson noted that the Board was not able to make new policy but to approve projects that are compliant with the bylaws and guidelines. He mentioned that Council had made it clear that these types of projects belong with this type of form and felt that the Board had gone as far as it could. He added that he was in support of the application.

Mr. Dobrovoly thanks the public for their comments and said that he realized they have concerns and might find it frustrating disagreeing with the final result. In term of the parking, he said he heard what the speakers had to say but the project does meet the bylaw. He added that staff will be working at reviewing the parking bylaw and updating it. He noted that the project is slightly less in height than the surrounding buildings and is a smaller scale that what is permitted.

### Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE418104, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated September 24, 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 had no concerns meeting the conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

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:

- Concern for the location of the pad mounted transformer (PMT) and wondered if it was required or if a hydro vault could be used instead.

**Panel Opinion**

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

- The application is appropriate in scale and design for the neighbourhood;
- Appreciation for the applicant's willingness to clean up the architectural resolution regarding the PMT;
- Recommended changing the materials from Hardy panel to a stone product;
- Some concern regarding the small size of some of the second bedrooms as they can only accommodate a single bed;
- The second entry condition on the ground floor units seems a little unresolved and needs some design development;
- Commended the applicant for the improvements to the courtyard;
- Recommended having a common outdoor amenity space on the roof with some covered space;
- The Advisory Panel recommended approval for the application.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. Jackson commended the applicant and developer for this unique proposal. He mentioned that hydro vaults can be an issue. Hydro does not move them underground lightly as it adds to their maintenance costs. Mr. Jackson added that he thought it was a great project and

appreciated all the work from the applicant and staff. He said he would not amend the condition for the roof top amenity as he thought it was important for the residents to have outdoor space to enjoy their property. Mr. Jackson moved approval of the application.

Mr. Johnston agreed that it made sense to have a roof top amenity space for the residents. He suggested the applicant take the comments into consideration regarding the PMT and look at the exact siting of it and how to better articulate the entrances more clearly. He added that it was a good project and supported Mr. Jackson's motion.

Mr. Dobrovolny said he was in support of the motion for approving the application.

**Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE418103, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated September 24, 2014.

5. 311 EAST 6<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE - DE417971 - ZONE IC-3  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Jameson East 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue LP

Request: To develop a six (6) storey mixed-use building with 66 Artist Studio - Class A with Associated Residential Units, 14 of which are low cost rental for artists with disabilities, and 58 Dwelling Units, all over two (2) levels of underground parking having vehicular access from the lane, subject to Council's approval of a Housing Agreement and an increase in density for the provision of low cost rental units for artists with disabilities.

#### Development Planner's Opening Comments

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

#### Applicant's Comments

Mr. Lang, Architect, said they are in support of the development conditions in the Staff Committee Report but there are some details that needed to be worked out.

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:

- Concern with the amount of density on the site and that the height doesn't respond to the zoning;
- Concern that I-3 doesn't allow assisted living units or community care facilities and not sure what use the stand-alone units have in conjunction with the artist studios;
- A housing agreement needs to be made available to the public;
- The public hasn't had a chance to review the project and should be going to Council;

Members of the community expressed their support for the application:

- The project will house clients of Vancouver Resource Society who are physically challenged and are artists by the nature of their work and will have a space to sell their work and help them be more self-reliant;
- Hard for physical challenged people to find space to work and live since they don't need care home type facilities.

#### Panel Opinion

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

- Support for the integrated development and the inclusion of Vancouver Resource Society units;
- Some concern regarding the northwest elevations and the way the parking structure comes out of the ground;
- Like the location of the bike storage on the northwest corner of the site;
- Still need some design development to improve privacy for the ground floor units;

- Roof top amenity is an important aspect of the project but would like to see some covered space;
- The Advisory Panel recommended approval for the application.

#### Board Discussion

Mr. Jackson made an amendment to the conditions in the Staff Committee Report and moved for approval of the application.

Mr. Johnson commended the applicant team and staff for the project.

Mr. Dobrovolny said he was in support of the motion as well as the design, scale and proposed height of the project. He added that he was happy to see the addition of the Vancouver Resource Society units.

#### 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. DE417971, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated November 5, 2014, with the following amendments:

Add a new condition 1.5 to read as follows:

*Design development to the Scotia Street frontage and northwest corner to improve and enhance the overall architecture and amenity of the public realm interface;*

#### 6. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

#### 7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:02 PM