

Date: Monday, September 21, 2015
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
T. Hartman Acting General Manager of Community Services
J. Dobrovolny Acting General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

J. Marshall Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
H. Ahmadian Representative of the Development Industry
S. Chandler Representative of the Development Industry
J. Denis-Jacob Representative of the General Public
S. Atkinson Representative of the General Public

Regrets

J. Ross Representative of the General Public
R. Chaster Representative of the General Public
P. Sanderson Representative of the Design Professions
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

M. Au Manager, Development Review Branch
M. Holm Engineering Services, Projects Branch
A. Maness Landscape Development Specialist
A. Molaro Assistant Director, Urban Design
P. St. Michel Development Planner
T. Tenney Project Facilitator

3699 MARINE WAY - DE418252 - ZONE CD-1

Beau Jarvis Wesgroup
Ray Letkeman Ray Letkeman Architects
Greg Voute Ray Letkeman Architects
Alain Lamontage Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects

Recording Secretary: L. McLeod

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 September 8, 2015.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 3699 MARINE WAY - DE418252 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Park Lane River District Development

Request: To develop this site with two, six-storey multiple dwelling residential buildings containing a total of 273 dwelling units and one, two-storey amenity building over two levels of common underground parking.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ms. St. Michel, 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.

Ms. St. Michel took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Applicant's Comments

The applicant team declined to give a presentation, but 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:

- The prior-to conditions appear to reflect the ideas of the Urban Design Panel sufficiently;
- There was concern that this building is not connected enough to Boundary Road and Marine Way - bolder and more solid connections are needed;
- Simplify and clarify the entryway for Building 'B';
- The unit mix of one to three bedroom units is good;
- More wood would improve the expression of the façade;
- The amenity space should be better connected to the buildings;
- This project is an attractive and much needed addition to the community.

Board Discussion

Mr. Dobrovolny noted that he would continue to discuss a separate bike path with the applicants, but was happy to support the project overall.

Mr. Jackson stated that the Rental 100 process seems to be too complex and is driving developers away from such projects. Thus the process should be made easier in order to encourage Rental 100 applications as rental units are needed in Vancouver.

The site is tough as it sits at the bottom of Boundary and will be seen as an urban gateway to Vancouver. There is a need for more permeable landscaping, along with well-lit and well-marked edges. Overall the application is supportable.

Ms. Hartman acknowledged the difficulty of the site, but given the recommendations from the staff the project appears supportable.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE418252, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated August 26, 2015, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition A.2.6 to read as follows:

Note to Applicant: The minimum required width would be 3.5 m (1.35 m boulevard/ 1.8 m sidewalk/ 0.35 m back boulevard). Further consideration should be given to an additional 1.5 m to accommodate a separate bike path.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:40 PM.