

Date: Monday, March 21, 2016
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT:

Board

G. Fujii	Director, Development Services, (Chair)
K. Llewellyn-Thomas	General Manager, Community Services
C. Nelms	Director of Engineering Project & Quality Management
J. Pickering	Acting General Manager of Planning and Development Services

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
N. Lai	Representative of the General Public
J. Ross	Representative of the General Public

Regrets

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

ALSO PRESENT:

City Staff:

J. Greer	Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
N. Szeto	Engineering Projects and Development Services
S. Black	Development Planner
L. King	Project Facilitator
D. Naundorf	Housing Policy and Projects

1754 PENDRELL STREET - DE419775 - ZONE CD-1

Peter Wood	Henriquez Partners Architects
Ly Tang	Henriquez Partners Architects
Joseph Fry	Hapa Collaborative
Farouk Babul	Westbank

Recording Secretary: L. McLeod

1. MINUTES

It was moved by J. Pickering, seconded by K. Llewellyn-Thomas, and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on February 22, 2016.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 1750 PENDRELL STREET - DE419775 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Henriquez Partners Architects

Request: To develop this site with two buildings consisting of a 21-storey multiple dwelling building containing 173 secured market rental units, 26 of which are secured for 30 years with rents at 20 per cent below the average West End area market rents and a one-storey amenity building all over three levels of underground parking with vehicular access from the lane.

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 there are a number of conditions which they would like the board to revise.

For Condition 1.5 the applicant team noted that although the project will certainly meet its sustainability performance requirements, the reference to the Green Building Policy for Rezoning, and the requirement to have the project certified and registered with the CaGBC should be revised, so that Condition 1.5 is aligned with the Conditions of Approval of the Form of Development.

For condition A1.11 the applicants understand that the City's policy is to protect healthy trees wherever possible. However, after weighing many issues it was determined that saving the neighbour's tree would create more hardship and challenges than benefits. Retaining the tree would require that the perimeter foundation wall is notched at a minimum 3.0m distance for a root protection zone. See attached Arborist Report. This will have a substantial impact on the project, including the following:

1. The public bench off the Pendrell Street Sidewalk is now decreased with exhaust intake now located under the Public Art Screen where planting has been designated.
2. The notched perimeter wall will shift the Car Share spaces towards the second security gate causing challenges to parking maneuverability out of these stalls.

3. There will be a reduction of at least 2 parking spaces creating more of a demand on street parking.
4. The area and layout of Phase 3 of the Neighbourhood Energy Room will be decreased and impacted.

Considering that the existing property has no on-site trees, the current application is proposing almost 20 new trees to the site, well beyond the minimum 2:1 ratio. The owner of the neighbouring lot has also requested that the tree be removed, and not replaced, as it provides minimal benefit to their landscape. It will also require regular pruning by them to control its growth as to not impact the foundation wall of 1750 Pendrell Street.

The applicants also asked that condition A1.15(ii) be removed. Since the UDP Meeting, a design of the lane treatment has been developed which is both in alignment with the City's Laneway 2.0 policy, and that would revitalize and activate the lane without requiring a 4 foot wide rear setback. Complying to this setback would needlessly impact the below grade parking levels and bike storage rooms

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

Comments from other Speakers

Members of the community expressed concern that there are a number of unresolved conditions which should be met prior to the issuance of a development permit.

The towers proposed in the neighbourhood will destroy the livability of the neighbourhood by adding new residents and cars, further stretching the transportation and amenity structures of the neighbourhood. While construction in the west-end is fine, this building is too monolithic. As well, the look of this building is too institutional. A nine to ten-storey building with a slimmer form would be more acceptable to the community.

Speakers also noted that the views of the residents in the area are significantly impacted, and will eventually become non-existence. A new study of shadowing and view impact needs to be done. Anything which can be done to protect the views of existing residents should be done.

Two speakers noted that the parking study for this area has not been completed and needs to be before the traffic impacts can truly be known.

Finally, this building doesn't appear to give anything back to the neighbourhood. The original application for this site has been repeatedly re-designed and the social housing initially proposed has disappeared. The current proposal does not increase affordable housing on the site, and 150 luxury rental units do nothing to provide social benefit to the neighbourhood.

Members of the community also provided support for the project and noted that the opposition for additional rental stock in this neighbourhood comes from owners. Owners are very privileged and the impact of their view is a small price to pay for more rental units. More rental stock is sorely needed in this community, and the older buildings need to be replaced.

In addition, the originally proposed social housing was not viable for middle-class renters as they earn too much to qualify. Below-market rentals are a much better option, and the additional three-bedroom units will encourage families and diversity.

The West-End Business Improvement Association supported the project as the increased density is needed in order to drive the economic well-being of the area. Please support the project and the increase of community business.

Modo the Car Coop also supported the proposal as it provides a good arrangement for car sharing, and will decrease the number of privately-owned vehicles in the area.

Panel Opinion

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

- Design development is needed on the east elevation as it looks too relentless;
- The issues with the lane well have been addressed, but it should continue to be further development;
- Opinion was split on whether the tree should be preserved;
- The overall design of the building is clean, and the touch of wood brings some flavour to the building;
- Additional rental units are very welcome in the West-End;
- The architecture is quite appealing and there are a variety of unit sizes which is important;
- This building could draw more details from the neighbourhood into its design;

Board Discussion

Ms. Nelms supported the project with some amendments as it adds a variety of rental units to the area. She supported the retention of the tree, and directed City staff and the applicants to work together on finding a solution to retain it. She also noted that work needs to be done with City staff to make improvements on the walking-experience of the lane, and encourage consideration for use of set-backs.

Ms. Llewellyn-Thomas also supported the development with the proposed amendments as it provides an increase in rental stock and family units in the area.

Ms. Pickering thought that it was important to note that the Panel is meant to enact council decisions, and that the density and form of this project were supported by council. She also noted that City staff and the developer will need to work out the landscape strip off the lane between them. Ms. Pickering supported the Urban Design Panel comments around the 'relentless' east-side of the building, and supported the retention of the tree as more work could be done on incorporating it. Overall she supported the project with the amendments and comments.

Motion

It was moved by C. Nelms and seconded by K. Llewellyn-Thomas, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE419775, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated March 21, 2016, with the following amendments:

AMEND condition 1.5 to read as follows:

“confirmation that the application is on track to meeting the Green Buildings Policy for Rezoning including a minimum of LEED® Gold rating, with a minimum of 63 points in the LEED® rating system, 1 point each for water efficiency and stormwater management, and a minimum of 6 points under Optimize Energy Performance;

Note to Applicant: Provide an updated LEED® checklist and sustainable design strategy outlining how the proposed points will be achieved, a letter of confirmation from an accredited professional confirming that the building has been designed to meet these goals, and a receipt including registration number from the CaGBC. The checklist, registration number and strategy should be incorporated into the drawing set. Application for certification of the project will also be encouraged under the policy.”

AMEND condition A.1.15 (ii) to read as follows:

“a minimum 4 foot wide landscape setback at the grade of the lane for substantial (layered) shrub plantings to create a softer more intimate scale transition between the building and lane edge, or other measures to the general satisfaction of the general manager of engineering and director of planning;”

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:17 pm.