Date: Monday, October 17, 2016
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT:

Board

A. Law  Assistant Director, Customer Service, (Chair)
P. Mochrie  Deputy City Manager
J. Dobrovolny  General Manager of Engineering
A. Molaro  Assistant Director of Planning, Urban Design & Sustainability

Advisory Panel

R. Hughes  Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
H. Ahmadian  Representative of the Development Industry
P. Sanderson  Representative of the Design Professions
N. Lai  Representative of the General Public
J. Ross  Representative of the General Public

Regrets

K. Maust  Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission
R. Chaster  Representative of the General Public
J. Denis-Jacob  Representative of the General Public
S. Chandler  Representative of the Development Industry

ALSO PRESENT:

City Staff:

J. Greer  Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
T. Potter  Development Planner
T. Tenney  Project Facilitator
D. Naundorf  Housing Policy and Projects
C. Joseph  Section Head, Engineering Projects and Development Services
N. Tokgoz  Engineering Projects and Development Services

1255 W PENDER - DE420258 - ZONE DD
Dean Waltz, Shugeru Ban  Sefan Aepli, Francl  Corelia Oberlander

3185 RIVERWALK AVENUE - DP-2016-00246 - CD-1
Taizo Yamamoto, Yamamoto  Mukhtar Latif, Vaha  Luke Harrison, VAHA

3183 PIERVIEW CRESCENT - DP-2016-00243 - CD-1
Taizo Yamamoto, Yamamoto  Mukhtar Latif, Vaha  Luke Harrison, VAHA

3245 PIERVIEW CRESCENT - DP-2016-00245 - CD-1
Taizo Yamamoto, Yamamoto  Mukhtar Latif, Vaha  Luke Harrison, VAHA

Recording Secretary:  L. McLeod
1. MINUTES

It was moved by A. Molaro, seconded by J. Dobrovolny, and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on September 21, 2016.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 1255 W PENDER - DE420258 - ZONE DD (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: William G Jackson

Request: To develop the site with a new mixed use building comprising 20 dwelling units and 3,600 ft.\(^2\) of commercial use at grade; all over three levels of underground parking accessed off of Hastings Street and also requesting an increase in the Floor Space Ratio using a Heritage Density Transfer from a donor site at 12 Water Street (providing 4,955 ft.\(^2\)).

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 thanked City staff and the Urban Design Panel for their support of the project, and made a few comments about the proposed conditions.

More latitude is requested on condition 1.1. The second to last line of condition: “in no case can the setback be reduced” is requested to be changed. Applicant requested the word ‘substantially’ be placed in front of reduced as the language restricts the architectural ‘quality’ of project according to the applicant.

The lower level currently has five steps which add a total of 40 ft. of setback to the upper tower portion, and the applicant team proposed to change this to four steps of 10 ft. each. If the terraces are reduced from five to four it would ‘improve the integrity’ of the design by adding 1000 sq. ft.

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

Comments from other Speakers
Several speakers objected to the development proposal because it would affect the views on neighbouring properties. The building has a height increase of 22% more than the previous proposal, and there is no view analysis for the lower flowers of the project, only the upper floors.
Panel Opinion
Panel members offered a range of comments on the proposal, including:

- It was very well received as an ‘exemplary’ project when it was presented to the urban design panel.
- The way it integrates with the neighbouring Evergreen building and compliments the entrance was commended.
- One panel member is supportive of the transfer of density to Gastown and noted that the project followed Heritage Standards Guidelines.
- Another board member endorsed the architectural merits with respect to the neighbouring buildings.
- A board member acknowledged it affected views of certain units, but noted the positive aspects overshadow this element.

Board Discussion
Mr. Dobrovolny supported the proposed setbacks and stepping of the project.

Ms. Molaro commented on the architecture of the project as exemplary and unique structure of neighbouring heritage building. The proposal has affected neighbouring site views, but there are still substantial views to the north.

Mr. Mochrie commended the applicant for working within site constraints.

Motion
It was moved by J. Dobrovolny and seconded by P. Mochrie, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE420258, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated September 21, 2016, with the following amendments:

AMEND condition 1.1 to read as follows:

“design development in response to structural or building requirements shall not reduce previously approved setbacks;

Note to Applicant: An increase in the setback from the west property line to the upper storeys of the building, estimated at 225 mm (9 in.) by the applicants, is contemplated by the applicants to meet structural or building requirements. Consideration will be given to relocation of the affected floor area to lower levels, but in no case will the previously approved minimum setbacks be substantially reduced. Standard Condition Error! Reference source not found. should be resolved before consideration of this item.”

4. 3185 RIVERWALK AVENUE - DP-2016-00246 - CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Vancouver Affordable Housing Agency (VAHA)

Request: To develop this site with a multiple dwelling containing 107 affordable rental dwelling units with one level of underground parking having vehicular access from Riverwalk Avenue (Parcel 8A).
Development Planner’s Opening Comments
Mr. Standeven, 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. Standeven took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Applicant’s Comments
The applicant team declined to give a presentation but noted a few opinions on the conditions.

For Condition 1.7 they requested flexible wording as they are attempting to increase solar shading in ways other than using fins.

For Condition 1.8 they requested some flexibility in the wording to reflect the deeper balconies needed to achieve better solar performance.

The applicant team 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:

- All of the Urban Design Panel comments have been addressed satisfactorily;
- The amenity space should be created at the third floor, not above it;
- A bit more detail on the north courtyard needs to be provided to address the streetwall condition;
- The three bedroom unit plans have problems with privacy;
- The design on the ends of the building seem to work against the economy of the building;
- The form seems to take precedence over the livability of the units.

Board Discussion
Ms. Molaro looked forward to seeing the resolution of design issues between staff and the applicant, even though it will be the Director of Planning whom will approve the finalized version.

Mr. Dobrovolny was happy to support the project. He also noted that he would like to see more issues resolved before projects come to the board from now on.

Mr. Mochrie thanked the panel, and especially Roger Hughes, for their advice.

Motion
It was moved by A. Molaro and seconded by J. Dobrovolny, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DP-2016-00246, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated September 21, 2016, with the following amendments:

AMEND Condition 1.2i and 1.2ii to read as follows:

“design development to interface with lane mews to improve access and loading;
i. provide additional loading space(s) and establish a monitoring plan documenting unit turnover and move in/out methods. Refer also to Standard Conditions A.1.13, A.2.11 and A.2.12;

ii. design development to the interface between the mews and the parking ramp and any loading area;

Note to Applicant: Potentially negative impacts on the mews from the vehicular entrance to the parking ramp and any loading area should be minimized through proper treatment such as enclosure, screening, high quality finishes, sensitive lighting and landscaping. Privacy screening and adequate landscape buffering between all mews facing dwelling units and the parking ramp and any loading area is required.”

AMEND Condition A.1.13 to read as follows:

“provision of a minimum of one Class B loading space in accordance with the Parking By-Law or provision of alternate arrangements to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services.

Note to Applicant: Engineering Services may support a Class B loading relaxation, see also Standard Condition A.2.11”

AMEND Condition A.2.11 to read as follows:

“provision of one (1) Class A and one (1) Class B Loading as per CD-1 By-Law or provision of one (1) Class A and two (2) wider Class A Loading spaces;

Note to Applicant: Wider Class A space to be minimum 2.9m wide. Although Engineering may support the relaxation of 1 Class B to 2 wider Class A spaces on this project, this should not create a precedent for future social housing applications; see Standard Condition A.2.12.”

AMEND Condition A.2.12 to read as follows:

“provision of a monitoring plan documenting unit turnover and move in/out methods, one year after first occupancy and every 12 months thereafter for 3 years;”

5. **3183 PIERVIEW CRESCENT - DP-2016-00243 - CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Vancouver Affordable Housing Agency

Request: To develop this site with a multiple dwelling building containing 89 affordable rental dwelling units over one level of underground parking with vehicular access from Pierview Crescent (Parcel 3).
Development Planner’s Opening Comments
Mr. Standeven, 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. Standeven took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Applicant’s Comments
The applicant team noted that they are working to provide more accessibility to the units and children's play area. They will also access to private balconies from the unit living rooms.

The applicant team further noted that subdivision conditions A2.1 - A2.3 are the responsibility of Wesgroup as the master developer. As such they are outside the applicant’s control, and will leave it to the developer and City staff to work through them together.

The applicant team 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:

- Were well received by UDP considering the sloped design;
- There is concern about the acoustic condition along Marine Way, and the design should respond better to the acoustic environment through architecture;
- The project has great porosity, and the outdoor amenity will provide a wonderful accommodation for families.

Board Discussion
A. Molaro supported the project and noted that it is good that urban agriculture is being provided as there is a real opportunity for it on the upper levels.

J. Dobrovolny expressed support for the project.

P. Mochrie expressed support for the project.

Motion
It was moved by A. Molaro and seconded by J. Dobrovolny, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DP-2016-00243, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated September 21, 2016, with the following amendments:

AMEND condition A.2.16 to read as follows:

“provision of a monitoring plan documenting unit turnover and move in/out methods, one year after first occupancy and every 12 months thereafter for 3 years;”
6. 3245 PIERVIEW CRESCENT - DP-2016-00245 - CD-1
(COMplete Application)

Applicant:  Vancouver Affordable Housing Agency

Request:  To develop this site with a multiple dwelling containing 51 affordable rental dwelling units with one level of underground parking having vehicular access from Pierview Crescent (Parcel 5A).

Development Planner’s Opening Comments
Mr. Standeven, 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. Standeven 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 end elevations could better recognize the sound environment;
- Consider better integrating the building with the landscape on the east end;

Board Discussion
Ms. Molaro expressed support for the project with the proposed changes.

Mr. Dobrovolny expressed support for the project.

Mr. Mochrie expressed support for the project.

Motion
It was moved by A. Molaro and seconded by J. Dobrovolny, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DP-2016-00245, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated March 21, 2016, with the following amendments:

ADD Condition A.2.14:

“arrangements to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and General Manager of Community Services and Director of Legal Services for the access of residents of the adjacent parcel, 3183 Pierview Crescent, to the play area on this parcel. See also Standard Condition A.1.34;”
ADD Condition A.2.15:

“provision of a monitoring plan documenting unit turnover and move in/out methods, one year after first occupancy and every 12 months thereafter for 3 years;”

7. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:39 pm.