

Date: Monday, January 14, 2008  
 Time: 3:00 p.m.  
 Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

**PRESENT:****Board**

D. McLellan Deputy General Manager, Community Services Group (Chair)  
 B. Toderian Director of Planning  
 J. Ridge Deputy City Manager  
 T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

**Advisory Panel**

J. Wall Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
 N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry  
 J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry  
 M. Braun Representative of the General Public  
 D. Chung Representative of the General Public  
 C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public  
 K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission (Excused Item 4)

**Regrets**

H. Hung Representative of the General Public  
 S. Tatomir Representative of the Design Professions

**ALSO PRESENT:****City Staff:**

B. Boons Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development  
 C. Edwards Acting Projects Manager  
 M. Rondeau Development Planner  
 A. Molaro Development Planner  
 A. Higginson Project Facilitator  
 D. Autiero Project Facilitator

**1206-822 SEYMOUR STREET - DE411631 - ZONE DD**

R. Utendale Owner

**2550 MAPLE STREET - DE410957 - ZONE DD**

N. Baldwin Nigel Baldwin Architects  
 K. Maust Bastion Development

**1887 CROWE STREET - DE411286 - ZONE CD-1**

J. Hancock IBI Group  
 B. Garcia IBI Group  
 V. De Cotiis Pinnacle International

**1138 GRANVILLE STREET - DE411393 - ZONE DD**

C. Bozyk Christopher Bozyk Architects  
 E. Loots Christopher Bozyk Architects  
 R. Wittstock Amacon  
 R. Vrooman Amacon

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

## 1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Ridge, seconded by Mr. Toderian and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on December 17, 2007 with the following amendments:

Amend the first paragraph under Board Discussion on page 4 to read:

*Although Mr. Toderian supported the consideration of additional colour in the project, he noted there is a danger of doing too much.* He thought there was an opportunity to put some *well resolved, careful colour into the project.* He encouraged the applicant to think about the opportunity and how colour could express itself during the day *as well as at night.* Mr. Toderian also thought it *would add interest that the building will express itself differently on varying facades.* Mr. Toderian congratulated the application on trying to achieve a high LEED™ Silver and thought the solar gain solution was insightful.

Amend the second sentence under Board Discussion on page 15 by deleting "Alicia's comments" and adding *a young person's perspective*;

Amend the last sentence on page 13 by adding *past* before "operation";

Amend the last sentence in the first paragraph on page 14 to read:

Mr. Toderian also noted, *in response to the comment that the matter should be move to Council for consideration rather than having a Board decision*, that it is not the role of the Board to bump challenging projects to Council.

Amend the second paragraph on page 14 to read:

Mr. Toderian thought the facility was necessary to support the existing population and that there was a need to *provide* the services to support the people who have *great* need.

Amend the second sentence in the fourth paragraph on page 14 to read:

Mr. Toderian asked the applicant to rethink the *amount of parking and to consider reducing the parking.*

## 2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

## 3. 1206-822 SEYMOUR STREET - DE411631 - ZONE DD (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Robert Utendale

Request: To construct interior alterations to enlarge Penthouse Unit No. 1206, by reducing the storage area on the main floor, to floor space through a purchase of heritage density of 130.0 square feet.

**Opening Comments**

Mr. McLellan, Chair, presented the applications for Suite 1206 being an application to transfer heritage density.

**Questions/Discussion**

None.

**Applicant's Comments**

The property owner, Mr. Utendale, accepted the conditions in the Staff Report.

**Comments from other Speakers**

None.

**Panel Opinion**

The members all recommended approval.

**Board Discussion**

None.

**Motion**

It was moved by Mr. Ridge and seconded by Mr. Timm, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE411631, in accordance with the Staff Report dated January 14, 2008.

**4. 2550 MAPLE STREET - DE410957 - ZONE DD  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Nigel Baldwin Architects

Request: To develop this site with a seven-storey mixed-use Retail/Residential building, containing 74 dwelling units over two levels of underground parking, requesting a relaxation of the minimum rear yard requirements and a discretionary height increase.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Mary Beth Rondeau, Development Planner asked the Board to consider two aspects of the application: the rear yard and location of the amenity space as well as the building height. The amenity building was originally located on the podium at the rear of the site. The Board at the previous meeting thought the open space was fairly small and amended the condition and as a result the amenity building has been reconfigured and meets the intent of the By-law.

The height of the building was calculated at seventy feet at the lane with one of the dimensions noted on the drawings as eight inches but was shown as two feet eight inches. What was presented to the previous Board meeting was two foot higher than reported. The view studies and shadow impacts showed the higher elevation.

Ms. Rondeau reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated December 19, 2007. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

**Questions/Discussion**

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by Ms. Rondeau:

- Most new buildings have floor to ceiling heights of between 8'7" and 9'.
- The view studies at the first Board meeting showed the height at 72 feet. There are no regulations within the zoning, merely guidelines suggesting a height of 70 feet.
- The amenity building will contain a washroom kitchenette and storage and as well the Strata Council meetings will use the facility.
- The height was consistently wrong throughout the plans.

**Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Baldwin, Architect, noted that the Board approved the application based on the view and shadow studies which used the seventy-two foot height. There was an error on the drawings and the Board wasn't being asked to approve anything differently from what was approved in March 2007. The high point of the lane was used as the base point for measuring the height of the building. In this case the deviation from the seventy foot figure is only six inches above the high point in the lane. Mr. Baldwin noted that the building three blocks to the west is higher than seventy-two feet. He added that all the other height elevations are correct. Mr. Baldwin also noted that the floor to ceiling heights will be nine feet.

Mr. Baldwin said he appreciated the flexibility given by the Board at the last meeting regarding the pavilion on the back of the site as it allows for a good relationship to the outdoor amenity space. The outdoor amenity space has been increased by 50% and the pavilion has been reshaped and moved closer to the lane. He added that there are non-operable windows facing the lane.

Ms. Maust, noted that the project has already gone to market and was almost sold out.

**Questions/Discussion**

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- Broadway has a variety of building heights.
- The highest point of the building will be seventy-two feet at the lane.
- The project was approved at seventy-two feet which is above the guidelines for the area.
- The seventy-two foot height will have some minor affects with shadowing on Broadway.

**Comments from other Speakers**

Chris Cooper lives directly at the back of the project on the lane just to the east of the proposed amenity building. He was concerned that there will be operable windows on the east wall of the amenity building. Ms. Rondeau noted that there are no windows on the east wall of the amenity building and the applicant, Mr. Baldwin concurred.

Carol Woods was concerned with the extra height and also that the extra height would be setting a precedent for the area.

Bill Raikes was opposed to a relaxation for the height. He noted that the applicant has already been granted a forty foot relaxation by the Board. He felt there was a larger issue and should be considered in the light of all other applications to come.

**Panel Opinion**

Mr. Wall said he would support the relaxation and the reconfigured plan to increase the open amenity space as it will have a minimal impact on the neighbours. Mr. Wall said he would support the extra height based on the height in the area being conditional and discretionary. He noted that the view studies had not changed and the impact on the neighbours would be the same as in the original presentation.

Mr. Shearing was in support of the setback with the amenity on the lane and also supported the additional height. He said it was a clear and consistent representation and the impacts are not any greater than when the Board last saw the application. Mr. Shearing added that the standard floor to ceiling heights in new construction is nine feet. He added that he supports the floor to ceiling heights in the project.

Mr. Stovell concurred that the ceiling height of nine feet was the standard in new construction. He said he had looked at the shadow and view impact analysis and didn't have any concerns with the height at seventy-two feet. Mr. Stovell added that he liked the amenity building next to the outdoor space.

Ms. Nystedt agreed that what was being asked by the applicant had already been approved by the Board and felt that it was an honest error on the part of the applicant. Ms. Nystedt added that she supported staff's recommendations as she felt there hadn't been any impropriety on the part of the applicant or staff.

Mr. Chung also agreed that the height was consistent with what had been seen by the Board in March 2007 and recommended approval.

Mr. Braun recommended approval and suggested that the applicant consider using a higher level of acoustical windows in the amenity building as a consideration to the neighbours across the lane.

**Board Discussion**

Ms. Rondeau read the guidelines for the area to the Board.

Mr. Toderian noted that there are no third party appeals unless there is a relaxation by the Board. The amenity space is a relaxation and could be subject to a third party appeal. However the seventy feet referenced as a maximum in the guidelines is not a rule and therefore allows for a discretionary height increase.

Mr. Toderian said he supported the recommendations in the Staff Committee Report, and thanked the members of the public for coming out. He said he wouldn't spend any time defending Bastion Development as he was unmoved by the comment regarding the possible loss of sales if the building height had to be lowered to seventy feet. He added that he felt that Mr. Baldwin would be incapable of making a mistake on purpose. Mr. Toderian noted that the Board would have approved the application as it was a reasonable discretionary height increase and the Board did determine that the height was reasonable at the Board meeting in March 2007. Mr. Toderian said that he did not see it as a precedent and would consider other applications on their own merit.

Mr. Timm stated that the view and shadow impact analysis showed the seventy-two foot height at the previous Board, so he felt there wasn't going to be any additional impact on the community. Mr. Timm added that he supported the height and the change in the amenity

building. He felt there was an advantage to the community in setting the amenity building closer to the lane as it would act as a screen from some of the ground floor patio spaces.

Mr. Ridge felt that it was an honest mistake on the part of the applicant and agreed that the height and amenity building could be supported.

#### Motion

It was moved by Mr. Timm and seconded by Mr. Ridge, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE410957, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated December 19, 2007.

#### 5. 1887 CROWE STREET - DE411286 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: IBI Group

Request: To develop this site with two (a ten storey and a six storey) buildings containing 84 residential units and nine live/work units at grade, all over two levels of underground parking with 120 parking spaces. Vehicle access is provided from the lane. Further, the project includes a transfer of heritage density of 8,452.5 sq. ft. to this site, from a donor site at 388 West 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue.

#### Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mary Beth Rondeau, Development Planner introduced the application on the private lands in South East False Creek. She noted that this was the second application on the private lands and the project will be located at the corner of Crowe Street and West 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. The property was rezoned a year ago and the application follows the form of development for the area. Ms. Rondeau added that a text amendment is being proposed to Council regarding the elevator penthouse as it doesn't meet the height requirements.

Ms. Rondeau described the architecture noting that the depth of the mid block massing had been reduced so that it doesn't over-shadow the open amenity space at the rear of the site. There will be a 10% heritage density transfer from the Best Building. Mr. Rondeau noted that there are no major issues and no view impacts. The applicant will be seeking LEED<sup>TM</sup> equivalency and other sustainable measures proposed for the development include a co-op car, connecting to the NEU, larger than regular size garbage recycling bins and greening of the roofs.

Ms. Rondeau reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated December 19, 2007. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

#### Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by Ms. Rondeau:

- There will be compost bins on the roof.
- The building is outside the security zone for the Olympics.
- The applicant is still undecided as to the colour palette for the materials.

**Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Hancock stated that he had no issues with the conditions in the Staff Committee Report and was happy to work with staff to come up with an appropriate colour palette.

**Questions/Discussion**

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- The landscape architect is currently looking at including an art feature on the property.
- There is an opportunity to have the project read as two separate buildings and the applicant is moving in that direction.
- The applicant is adding some height to the corner and introducing colour in a subtle way.

**Comments from other Speakers**

None.

**Panel Opinion**

Mr. Wall stated that the Urban Design Panel unanimously supported the proposal. He was concerned that the project did not represent SEFC and that it did not define the new neighbourhood and suggested adding a bit of colour, wood soffits, natural material and making sustainability read throughout the project. He said he would also like to see public art integrated into the building. Mr. Wall thought it was a very good project and particularly liked the double height units on the top of the lower mass, and the roof top access with private gardens. He encouraged the applicant to push the project a little further to make it one of the better projects in the SEFC.

Mr. Shearing recommended approval.

Mr. Stovell said he supported the project and the conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

Ms. Maust acknowledged that it was an excellent use of heritage density transfer.

Ms. Nystedt said she enthusiastically supported the application and thought the spirit of SEFC was being put into the project.

Mr. Chung thought it was a safe design and that it didn't stand out like some of the applicant's other projects. He thought the project needed to be enhanced with the use of colour or a design that would capture the eye. Mr. Chung did not like the grey façade and felt it needed more punch. He suggested adding colour to the street as well as the building and perhaps to the inside of the balconies. He added that the colour could be red or another accent colour, something that would identify the building. Mr. Chung added that he thought the form of development was excellent.

Mr. Braun recommended approval. He suggested that more refinement could be done on the south-east corner.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. Toderian commended the architect for a well resolved and finely designed building. He thought the conditions reflected the need for colour in the project but added that the applicant should use colour as an indication of taking more risk with the design. Mr. Toderian was confident in the architect and staff and looked forward to seeing how the design further developed. Mr. Toderian was also interested in the applicant integrating public art into the

building. He noted that too often the architecture and public art are seen as separate and he encouraged the applicant and staff to integrate the art with the architecture in a seamless way.

Mr. Ridge thought it was a good project and said he was happy to support the application.

Mr. Timm said he was also happy to support the approval of the project.

#### Motion

It was moved by Mr. Toderian and seconded by Mr. Ridge, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE411286, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated December 19, 2007, with the following amendments:

Amend the Note to Applicant following Standard Condition A.2.12 to reference Standard Condition A.2.11; and

Amend the Note to Applicant following Standard Condition A.2.13 to reference Standard Condition A.2.11.

#### 6. 1138 GRANVILLE STREET - DE411393 - ZONE DD (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Christopher Bozyk Architects

Request: To develop this site with a seven-storey mixed-use Retail/Residential building containing 36 dwelling units. The project includes a requested heritage density transfer from a donor site identified as 522 Beatty Street (The Bowman Block).

#### Development Planner's Opening Comments

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the application for a seven storey mixed-use residential building. The site is in the middle of the block on Granville Street between Helmcken and Davie Streets. Ms. Molaro described the surrounding development. She noted that the principle issues are the lack of enclosure in the loading off the lane and the treatment to the exposed side wall. Also, staff recommend further design development to incorporate sustainable measures.

Ms. Molaro reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated December 19, 2007. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

#### Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by Ms. Molaro:

- Standard condition A.1.8 asks for provision of parking in accordance to the Parking By-law.



- The applicant is currently proposing eight parking spaces. The requirement is twenty-eight and staff are asking for compliance.
- The additional parking spaces will not have an impact on the building form.
- The loading area will be screened as asked for in the guidelines and the lane will be secured.
- The application doesn't make a distinction in terms of its residential use as to whether the units will be market or strata.
- The Director of Planning administers the Parking By-law.
- The Development Permit Board can look at conditions of hardship in order to relax the Parking By-law.
- The banners on the front façade would be administered through the Sign By-law.
- There was a discussion between staff and the applicant regarding a greater range of unit types in the project.
- Granville Street has separate guidelines from Downtown South.

#### **Applicant's Comments**

Richard Wittstock, Amacon, stated that they are proposing that the application be a rental building and are offering the City a rental covenant with terms to be determined in the hopes that the City would be forward thinking and would grant them a 71% reduction in the overall parking as a pilot project. He added that Amacon is not interested in a strata building in this location. Originally it was to be a retail building. They tried to purchase the adjacent building in order to make for a bigger site but were unsuccessful. Mr. Wittstock noted that they are looking at a cost of \$40,000 per parking stall and these costs would make the project economically impossible. Mr. Wittstock referred the Board and Advisory Panel to the applicant's letter in Appendix F.

#### **Questions/Discussion**

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- There is currently no City policy that would allow for zero parking.
- The applicant stated that the need for parking is less in rental buildings than in strata.
- The applicant would consider renting the units for \$100-\$150 per month less without the provision of parking.
- The location of the building on the transit spine of the city makes it desirable to not provide parking spaces in the project.
- The applicant has considered providing a co-op car and has been in discussion with the Car Co-Op and Zip Cars.
- The site to the south of the applicant's property maintains parking for the hotel.
- The applicant can't afford to build a rental building if they have to include the twenty-eight parking spaces.
- The Parking By-law requirement is for twenty-seven residential spaces and eight retail spaces over three levels.
- The applicant would be interested in a rental covenant between ten and twenty years.
- The intention is to have two types of glass including coloured glass.
- The enclosed balconies will act as a sound buffer from street noise and also provide a certain amount of shading.
- The applicant is considering the Urban Design Panel suggestion to add a green roof and outdoor amenity space on the roof.
- The Board does not have the discretion to relax the parking to zero for a rental covenant.
- The Director of Planning also does not have the jurisdiction to relax the parking to zero. It would require a rezoning to Council.

**Comments from other Speakers**

Mohamed Ahmed, owns the rental building next door and is concerned that the building will compromise the liveability of his tenants.

**Questions/Discussion**

In response to questions raised by the speaker, the following clarification was provided by Ms. Molaro:

- The guidelines for the area are only applicable to new buildings and how they relate to existing buildings.
- Staff have tried to address the liveability issues by having the applicant include light wells in the design on the north side of the project.
- Staff feel the applicant has achieved a reasonable relationship between the new building and the existing building.

**Panel Opinion**

Mr. Wall noted that the Urban Design Panel unanimously supported the project and had some interesting discussion regarding the parking. However, the Panel felt the parking issue should be left to staff. The Panel thought the project would be a good fit for the neighbourhood and would provide affordable housing. They also thought reduced parking with the addition of co-op cars and bicycles to balance the reduced parking would be a good fit for the neighbourhood. The Panel recognized that if the applicant was going to design a green building, then the project would be a good case study for reduced parking. The Panel's main concern was the lack of an amenity and outdoor space as well as access to the roof. They were also concerned with light access into the adjacent building. Mr. Wall added that the prior to conditions in the Staff Committee Report address the Panel's concerns.

Mr. Shearing recommended support for the project. He suggested that there be no direct access to the roof from the units that overlook the neighbour. Mr. Shearing also suggested adding the green roofs as a benefit to the neighbours and to restrict noise.

Mr. Stovell recommended approval and supported the conditions in the Staff Committee Report. Mr. Stovell thought the applicant should look at rezoning in order to reduce or eliminate the parking. He said that affordability in the city was becoming an increasing concern and buildings without parking might be able to achieve a higher level of affordability and encouraged the applicant to build the project as it would be a great addition to the cityscape. Mr. Stovell thought it was a good idea to provide minimal parking on a transit route and thought this was something that the City should consider. He added that he thought there were lots of people who would love to live in the building and not have to pay for parking.

Ms. Maust recommended support for the application.

Ms. Nystedt thought the application should not have come to the Board at this time as it appears the owner has no intention in complying with the Parking By-law. She noted that surface parking has been lost in the area and there isn't any parking on the street. Ms. Nystedt thought the architect had done a great job with the design of the building but was uncomfortable with the application coming to the Board as she felt there was an under current of manipulation on the part of the owner.

Mr. Chung recommended approval of the application. He felt that the reduction in the parking should be dealt with by Council. Mr. Chung said he liked the façade with the different coloured glass as it made for an interesting building.

Mr. Braun recommended approval of the application. He thought the architecture made for one of the better buildings on Granville Street and thought the use of the enclosed balconies was innovative. Mr. Braun hoped there was a notation on the drawings regarding the coloured glass as he felt it was an important feature and wouldn't like to see it changed to clear glass. Mr. Braun would also like to see green roofs and would like to see an attractive design to the gates on the lane so they don't look like tractor trailer loading areas. He added he would like to see some balance in the parking issue.

#### Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian thanked the speaker for attending the Board meeting. He thought the application was awkwardly presented to the Board although he said he had some appreciation for what the developer was trying to achieve. Mr. Toderian has spent the last year talking about EcoDensity and the need for affordable rentals. He pointed out that a lot of parking spaces tend to be storage space. He also thought it was an interesting idea that the developer was willing to look at other incentives to build rental housing and was something that required further consideration. However, Mr. Toderian said it was not the purview of the Board to make a relaxation of this type for a public benefit.

Mr. Toderian supported the transfer of heritage density but was disappointed with the lack of sustainable measures in the project. He thought the applicant had done some interesting passive design on the front of the façade particularly with the use of the enclosed balconies.

Regarding the adjacency issues, Mr. Toderian thought the applicant had met the guidelines and thought the design of the building was what he liked best about the application. He added that it will be one of the more interesting buildings on Granville Street.

Mr. Ridge was dismayed that the Board had spent so much time dealing with the application that short of rezoning may not see the light of day. He was concerned that there was not a strong commitment on the part of the owner to construct the building without the parking relaxation.

Mr. Timm agreed that the design of the building was well done. He said he could feel for Mr. Ahmed, as this development certainly will have an impact on the liveability of his building, but unfortunately it is not a reasonable expectation that no development will happen on the adjoining lands. Mr. Timm thought that staff have done the best they can to try to accommodate an existing building on a narrow adjoining lot.

Regarding the issue of parking, Mr. Timm noted that parking needs to be provided according to the current Parking By-law, not based on speculation about future policy directions or by-law changes. He added that he couldn't foresee a time when the City would have a standard that would have a zero requirement for parking in residential buildings. Survey's that the City has undertaken to date do not indicate a significantly lower level of car ownership for rental properties than for strata properties so there is no basis for the linkage that the applicant draws between guaranteed rental tenure and parking demand. Mr. Timm also noted that the Downtown Vancouver Business Improvement Association (DVBIA) have voiced their concern with the current lack of parking in the Downtown South and South Granville areas and have even suggested that developments that displace existing surface lots ought to be required to replace that publicly accessible parking in addition to providing the for parking demand generated by the new development. While he does not support this proposal from the DVBIA, Mr. Timm also said that he does not believe that there is a good case for relaxing the parking standard to less than the demand generated by the development in this part of the City.

**Motion**

It was moved by Mr. Toderian and seconded by Mr. Ridge, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE411393, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated December 19, 2007, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition A.1.8 to read:  
provision of parking in accordance with the Parking By-law *in effect at the time of permit issuance*, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services.

**7. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:20 PM.

---

L. Harvey  
Assistant to the Board

---

D. McLellan  
Chair

H:\Clerical\DPB\Minutes\2008\1-Jan 14-08.doc