

Date: Monday, February 9, 2016
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

G. Fujii Director, Development Services, (Chair)
P. Mochrie Acting Deputy City Manager
J. Dobrovolny General Manager of Engineering
J. Pickering Acting General Manager of Planning and Development

Advisory Panel

R. Hughes Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
S. Chandler Representative of the Development Industry
H. Ahmadian Representative of the Development Industry
J. Denis-Jacob Representative of the General Public
N. Lai Representative of the General Public

Regrets

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

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

L. King Project Facilitator
S. Black Development Planner
D. Naundorf Housing Policy and Projects
B. McCaw Housing Policy and Projects
Y. Hii Social Policy and Projects Division
M. Roddis Park Board, Planning and Research
C. Joseph Engineering, Projects and Development Services
J. Greer Assistant Director, Development Review Branch

1111 RICHARDS STREET - DE419710 - ZONE CD-1

Stu Lyon GBL Architects
Joey Stevens GBL Architects
Max Kerr Brenhill

Recording Secretary: L. McLeod

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Ms. Pickering, seconded by Mr. Dobrovlny, and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on January 25th, 2016.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 1111 RICHARDS STREET - DE419710 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: GBL Architects

Request: To develop this site with a 35-storey mixed-use building containing retail store and restaurant uses on the ground floor, commercial child day care facility on the ground and second storeys, 110 secured market rental dwelling units and 278 market dwelling units over seven levels of underground parking accessed from Helmcken Street.

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

The applicant team noted that they were eager to move forward with the project. There have been a lot of iterations of the building and they are quite excited about what this building entails. However, there were a number of conditions which the applicants wanted to be considered for amendment.

A request was made to amend condition A.1.35 to read:

A.1.35 consider design development to level 10 common amenity area so that it enjoys better visual connection to the park;

Note to Applicant: Intent is to allow more occupants to benefit from close access to nature and direct sun. This can be accomplished by relocating the common amenity area directly adjacent to the park at the south west corner of the building. The area and proportion of space dedicated to the common area and private patios should be maintained. The shape of the upper floors of the building may be adjusted, in balance with other urban design requirements.

A request was made to amend condition A.1.36 to read:

A.1.36 consider design development to reduce the water feature at the entrance area adjacent to Richards Street to allow space for an additional street tree planted at grade on private property;

Note to Applicant: The water feature may also be revised to include planting closer to the street and water feature setback closer to the building. Ensure distance to property lines from tree trunk is considered per the Downtown South guidelines and the depth of growing medium is sufficient for a suitable tree species tree and layered planting. The additional street tree is to be complimented with area specific tree grates/motifs.

A request was made to amend condition B.2.2 to read:

- B.2.2 Amenity areas consisting of 825.0 sq. ft. on Level 10, and 1,584.0 sq. ft. on Level 34, excluded from the computation of the floor space ratio, shall not be put to any other use, except as described in the approved application for the exclusion. Access and availability of the use of amenity facilities located in this project shall be made to all residents, occupants and/or tenants of the building;
AND
Further, the amenity spaces and facilities approved as part of this Development Permit shall be provided and thereafter be permanently maintained for use by residents/users/tenants of this building complex.

For condition A.1.51 it was also noted that work will continue on providing more open space. However, some of the student numbers may need to be reduced in order to achieve targets.

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

Comments from other Speakers

Speakers noted that the building is a good height with a good mix of uses. It will deliver 110 suites and fit in well with the downtown core. The project is exceptional, and will create exceptional living spaces within the area.

Other speakers urged rejection as the project has not had enough scrutiny, and the design is out of scale with the neighbourhood. The project does not appear to conform to existing zoning, and the applicant is asking for more FSR than is allowed on this site by a significant margin. This massive increase in density is based on the social housing being provided, and as such it will set a bad precedent for other social housing projects.

Speakers also noted that, while this building looks better, it is in the wrong location. The property should not have a high-rise as the lot is too small, and the proposed building contravenes the right to access light and air for surrounding buildings. The shadow analysis also does not take into account the impacts on all neighbouring properties. Overall the project seems too big for the area and was not supported by the community. Approving the project would violate the spirit of listening to neighbourhoods and of government.

Further speakers thought that the social housing which comes with this project will provide equality, affordability and cleanliness to its residents. The project itself will supply rental housing and market housing to the downtown core, and the inclusion of the pre-school is a much needed service in the neighbourhood.

The tower being considered is important in constructing the new Jubilee House. The old Jubilee House is failing and badly needs to be replaced, and this new building allows people to remain in the neighbourhood. The proposed building is of sufficient size to allow for the social housing to be constructed, and is a wise trade-off of height and density for social good. Due to this, speakers strongly urged support for the project.

Panel Opinion

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

- The design is very attractive and the shadow and view impacts on the surrounding areas will be minimal;
- Attention to landscaping is critical to the urban scape at grade. It is very important to have the right setbacks to ensure proper soil density;
- It is important to show the significance of the entrance and public art may help with this;
- The rental amenity should be closer to the park for sun exposure;
- The dark materials currently help to distinguish between the different parts of the building and including some lighter materials might dilute this. The strong material palette should be preserved to create separation between the north and south towers;
- The building seems to be an appropriate density, scale and height for the site and creates much-needed affordable housing;
- It is clear that this building is in compliance with the By-Laws, and the design seems much improved from the rezoning;
- The form, diversity and context of the elements are excellent and clear. This building will add a positive interface with the park;

Board Discussion

Mr. Dobrovolny noted that he was pleased with the work done by City staff and the applicant on the development. The building design is spectacular and it is in a good location. Commentary by residents and speakers was heard and some of the issues were agreed with. He also wanted members of the public to note that the Panel is listening, and that they appreciated all the speakers who came out.

Mr. Mochrie also thanked the speakers and City staff for their work. He also noted that there are a variety of opinions so not everyone will agree, and that there is still room for work around the childcare component.

Ms. Pickering thought that was a good looking building purely from a design prospective, and that the much-needed social housing it provides is great. It is a good development which will bring a lot to the neighbourhood, but if a daycare is being provided then it must comply with the City's Childcare Design Guidelines and performs to childcare licensing regulations as required by the Vancouver Coastal Health Community Care and Facility Licensing (CCFL).

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE419710, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated January 14, 2016, with the following amendments:

AMEND condition A.1.35 to read as follows:

“consider design development to level 10 common amenity area so that it enjoys better visual connection to the park;

Note to Applicant: Intent is to allow more occupants to benefit from close access to nature and direct sun. This can be accomplished by relocating the common amenity area directly adjacent to the park at the south west corner of the building. The area and proportion of space dedicated to the common area and private patios should be maintained. The shape of the upper floors of the building may be adjusted, in balance with other urban design requirements.”

AMEND condition A.1.36 to read as follows:

“consider design development to reduce the water feature at the entrance area adjacent to Richards Street to allow space for an additional street tree planted at grade on private property;

Note to Applicant: The water feature may also be revised to include planting closer to the street and water feature setback closer to the building. Ensure distance to property lines from tree trunk is considered per the Downtown South guidelines and the depth of growing medium is sufficient for a suitable tree species tree and layered planting. The additional street tree is to be complimented with area specific tree grates/motifs.”

AMEND condition B.2.2 to read as follows:

“Amenity areas consisting of 825.0 sq. ft. on Level 10, and 1,584.0 sq. ft. on Level 34, excluded from the computation of the floor space ratio, shall not be put to any other use, except as described in the approved application for the exclusion. Access and availability of the use of amenity facilities located in this project shall be made to all residents, occupants and/or tenants of the building;

AND

Further, the amenity spaces and facilities approved as part of this Development Permit shall be provided and thereafter be permanently maintained for use by residents/users/tenants of this building complex.”

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:53 PM.