

Date: Monday, June 2, 2008
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

R. Jenkins Assistant Director - Current Planning Division (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)
S. Tatomir Representative of the Design Professions
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 (Excused Item #2)
H. Hung Representative of the General Public
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

Regrets

C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

B. Boons Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
S. Brodie Civil Engineer
M. Rondeau Development Planner
A. Molaro Development Planner
A. Higginson Project Facilitator
D. Autiero Project Facilitator
R. Whitlock Senior Housing Officer

277 THURLOW STREET - DE411944 - ZONE CD-1

G. Vose IBI/HB Architects
J. Hancock IBI/HB Architects
J. Ryan ASPAC Developments Ltd.

1338 SEYMOUR STREET - DE411958 - ZONE DD

L. Adams NSDA Architects
L. Epp Granville Mennonite Housing Society
R. Kwong BC Housing

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of April 21, 2008 be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 277 THURLOW STREET - DE411944 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: IBI/HB Architects

Request: To develop the final site of the Harbour Green precinct with a 32-storey residential tower containing a total of 82 dwelling units, over four levels of underground parking for 223 vehicles.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ralph Segal, Senior Architect/Development Planner introduced the application for the final tower in the Harbour Green Park area. Using the context model, Mr. Segal described the surrounding developments including the Convention Centre and the public open space on the edge of the site with Harbour Green Park on the northern edge. The project includes 8 townhouses with an amenity room in the podium base. The design of the tower addresses the Canada Place axial view and has a very strong and distinctive expression within the urban design of Coal Harbour and takes on a character distinct from the other towers in Harbour Green. Mr. Segal noted that there were some issues including the tower height; although the roof elevation complies with the zoning height, the architectural completion of the tower exceeds the limit of the zoning. Staff are recommending the decorative roof relaxation clause be applied. Staff are also recommending the eight storey height restriction for family units be relaxed as the development will have 81 two bedroom units out of the 82 being proposed. There was a primary issue in the design conditions that referred to the podium where West Cordova Street wraps around to Thurlow Street. Staff would like to have the townhouse orientation strengthened with a better alignment to West Cordova Street. Also, staff are asking for design development to the blank walls with more landscaping and have suggested breaking down the walls with terraces. Staff are asking for an increase in the sidewalk width and to have the lobby more open to address the public space (Thurlow Plaza) and also a better interface with the Two Harbour Green porte-cochere.

Mr. Segal reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated May 7, 2008. 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 Mr. Segal:

- The applicant has offered to clarify their green building performance and will add a notation on the drawings.
- The applicant agreed with the issue of the lower level road area adjacent to the garage entrance being dark and will paint the area with a lighter paint colour to the exterior of the space.
- A site has been identified a few blocks west of the subject site as a future school but the timing will depend on the School Board and whether there are enough children to justify a new school.
- The building performs all that it is required as per the Harbour Green Neighbourhood Guidelines and creates its own distinctiveness especially in the way the tower terminates the east end of Harbour Green.
- The tower is “elegantly minimalistic” with simple but strong and clean lines. The eastern façade addresses the street while the west and north orientation is more expressive of the ins and outs of the unit expressions and includes sustainable measures on the western façade.
- The City’s Social Housing staff are discussing revisions for high density developments to change the requirement for family units being restricted to eight stories. They feel it is important to allow families to choose living above the eighth floor, if they wish to do so.
- The cap of the building has a translucency to the wall as it rises above the roof slab and will read similar to the glazing below.

Applicant’s Comments

Jim Hancock, Architect further described the project noting the intent was to give the building a split personality by simplifying the eastern façade so that it relates better to the commercial area of downtown and give the western façade a typical face to the adjacent buildings. He also noted that the south façade used green building design with a low amount of glazing and 50% glazing on the west façade with the addition of stone. The building takes on a slimness on the north side where there are a number of two storey elements (city homes in the sky). A lantern expression has been designed for the top of the tower which will be lit at night. Mr. Hancock noted that they are still working on making the transition as seamless as possible between the lantern expression and the tower. He also noted that they are planning on making some adjustments to the lounge area and will be recessing the glass and adding a water feature that will separate the lobby from the plaza. Mr. Hancock agreed that the interface between Three Harbour Green and Two Harbour Green is a challenge because of the grade change and there is an issue with how the wall will be treated. He added that they are proposing to step the wall with landscaped terraces. Mr. Hancock agreed with the prior-to conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The stone on the base will be a strong green/black colour, a stone found locally.
- The below grade wall at the entrance to the parkade should be painted a light colour to bring light into the area.
- The selection of the glazing will help to achieve LEED™ Silver with the different sides of the tower responding to their solar conditions.
- The applicant is committed to a high performance glazing system on the tower and is planning on capitalizing on the best technology available.

- The site is a little too small for geothermal and the applicant has opted for air pumps.
- The building will be air conditioned.
- The applicant is aware of the prior-to condition regarding construction during the Olympics and has set up a meeting with Paul Henderson, Director, Olympic and Paralympic Operations.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall noted that the Urban Design Panel found the project very compelling and having a strong central architectural idea. The building has two faces; one relating to the city and the other relating to Harbour Green Park and Stanley Park. All the Panel members commented on that and saw it as the strength of the design. The Panel was very supportive of the project noting that it was a difficult site. The ground plain changes in level by two to three stories and there is a difficult edge condition against the Two Harbour Green plaza. There is also no real back to the building and no easy place to put the service area. The Panel commended the applicants for their strategy and for how the project was developed. They did recognize a few areas that needed some refinement. They noted the new public realm in the plaza needed a better interface with the Convention Centre and also more work was needed at the West Cordova and Thurlow Streets side of the project with how the building massing addressed the urban realm. The Panel also had some concerns with the interface between Two Harbour Green and Three Harbour Green and suggested there was room for further refinement. They suggested making it a common entry or a separate entry with a strong definition. Also, the Panel thought some design development needed to be done with the blank wall. Mr. Wall added that the prior-to conditions reflected the concerns of the Panel and recommended support for the application and looked forward to seeing building completed.

Mr. Tatomir recommended approval for the application with the prior-to conditions. He said he would like to have seen more passive design elements to the skin of the building with more spandrel or shadow boxes on the facades. He also thought the townhouses on West Cordova Street needed some more design development and said he would like to have seen a large plaza that combines both driveways to Two Harbour Green and Three Harbour Green. Mr. Tatomir added that he thought the architect had done a good job with the design.

Mr. Shearing commended the architect for his design as he thought it was a very elegant building. He said he was in support of the lantern design at the top of the building and that he liked the way the building had been broken into two main elements. Mr. Shearing said he supported relaxing the family housing guidelines to allow for units above eight stories. He added that he was in support of the application.

Mr. Stovell supported the project and liked the duality of the building façade. He thought the east façade was going to reinforce the robustness of the downtown and thought it was a good idea to have the east façade look more like an office building. Mr. Stovell thought the building was beautifully designed and the use of curtain wall outweighed the use of passive design elements.

Ms. Maust recommended support for the application.

Mr. Chung commended the architect and said he liked the split personality of the building. Mr. Chung said he also liked the colour palette and thought it was a good contrast to the light colour on the Shaw Tower and made for two distinct buildings. Mr. Chung thought it was

unfortunate that there were two separate driveways between Two Harbour Green and Three Harbour Green and thought the space could be better developed. Mr. Chung thought the lantern top would be a nice addition to the skyline and recommended approval for the application.

Mr. Hung said he liked the design and thought it was modern and unique to the area. Mr. Hung recommended the relaxation requested for the extra height as he thought it would be minimal. He noted that the unit size and two parking spaces per unit are not EcoDensity friendly which is probably due to the market demand. Mr. Hung thought the building would be a good addition to the city and recommended approval for the application.

Mr. Braun recommended approval for the application. He thought One Harbour Green and Two Harbour Green have the most interesting residential facades and liked the quality of their interface. He recommended adding LED lights to the entrance to the parkade as it will be dark in that area and as well as to the tower cap. Mr. Braun thought the stone looked black in colour and hoped it would read more green when the building was finished. He added that he thought it would be a fabulous building. Mr. Braun noted that he resides in the adjacent building, Shaw Tower.

Board Discussion

Mr. Timm moved approval of the application with several amendments. Mr. Timm thought it was going to be a real landmark building in an important location with the development of the Trade and Convention Centre and the park.

Mr. Ridge supported Mr. Timm's amendments and seconded the motion of approval. Mr. Ridge said he was in support of the building and thought it would be an elegant and handsome building. He thanked the applicant for pursuing LEED™ Silver before the City makes the checklist mandatory.

Mr. Toderian supported the amendments. Mr. Toderian noted that at the moment there isn't applicable policy regarding sustainability but that Council is proposing to pass a new EcoDensity Charter at their meeting on June 10th which would be applicable. Mr. Toderian thought it was reasonable to relax the guidelines for family housing relative to allowing family housing above eight stories. Mr. Toderian also agreed with relaxing the height of the tower for the additional height on the cap. He encouraged the applicant and staff to look for all opportunities to allow for lighting showing through during the day and for the lantern to be lit at night. Mr. Toderian was pleased to see the applicant would be pursuing LEED™ Silver and encouraged them to look for the big LEED™ points relative to sustainability. With regard to the architecture, Mr. Toderian said he was a fan of the architecture of the building and that together with the other two buildings (One Harbour Green and Two Harbour Green) each presents their own flavour. They have all used different materials, colours and texture and all work well together. He challenged Mr. Hancock to take some risks with the architecture noting that it was a well designed and well resolved building. Mr. Toderian added that he was interested in the duality of the evolving office buildings in the city and was looking for greater exuberance and risk taking for new office buildings. Mr. Toderian supported the application and commended the architect.

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. DE411944, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated May 7, 2008, with the following amendments:

Add a new Condition 1.9 to read:

design development to provide a light coloured finish to the exterior of the parkade adjacent to the lower level of Thurlow Street (below Thurlow Viaduct) and the western turn around leading to the Harbour Green Parkade.

Amend the Technical Analysis Table on page 4 of the DPSC Report in the “Required” column, under Parking, replacing 193 with **180**.

Amend Standard Condition A.2.2 by inserting the following words at the beginning of the condition: ***arrangements to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services for*** to read:

arrangements to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services for completion of the applicable Phase of the “Works” as per the registered “Coal Harbour Services Agreement”;

Mr. Toderian sought a further minor amendment to the motion, which was seconded by Mr. Ridge and accepted by Mr. Timm:

Amend Condition 1.8 by adding “***clarified on the drawings***” at the end of the first sentence to read:

Specifics of the project’s Green Building performance, to be ***clarified on the drawings***;

**4. 1338 SEYMOUR STREET - DE411958 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: NSDA Architects

Request: To construct an 11-storey multiple dwelling containing 106 dwelling units and associated amenity areas all over 1 level of underground parking.

Development Planner’s Opening Comments

Robert Whitlock, Senior Housing Officer gave a short background for the site noting that there will be six other applications presented to the Board over the next several months regarding Social Housing and will be similar in scope and structure. The site is one of twelve City owned sites that were reported to City Council in November 2007 under the report entitled “City, Province Social and Supportive Housing Partnership”. The proposal was for the City to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with BC Housing to see the development of these sites with housing that would be targeted to individuals who are homeless or are at risk of homelessness. The buildings involve multiple dwellings under the management of a non-profit housing provider who will provide over all building management and basic support services to the tenants, and possibly meal programs on a site by site basis but otherwise the dwelling units are fully independent. Part of the work of staff on site is to link tenants to services that are

available at other locations throughout the community. The MOU outlined and described the roles and responsibilities of the City and BC Housing. Under the agreement the City will provide the sites with no cost and no property taxes paid by the individual sites once developed, and the sites will be remediated as part of the City's responsibilities. In return BC Housing will provide for all pre-approval design and related costs and eventually all capital construction and any operating subsidies that will be necessary to provide the continued operation for each building by its sponsor. As part of the operational considerations, BC Housing has also proposed to provide funding for full time staff coverage for a minimum of 24 hours, 7 days a week. Vancouver Coastal Health Authority while not part of the partnership will also provide additional resources to the existing mental health teams which are to be determined on a site by site bases.

The MOU also provided a description of each site and the general description of the use of each site. In the case of Seymour Street, the MOU states that it is proposed that the site be designed for 100 or more studio units. A third to a half of the units would be occupied by persons with a mental illness or substance abuse problem and all units will be tenanted by core need singles with priority to those living in shelters and SRO hotels in the Downtown South area. Several sites include commercial retail spaces and three of the twelve sites will include a social service component either for youth or a community resource centre for individuals with mental illnesses. Council referred that report to a special meeting to hear delegations that were heard over three nights. The majority of delegations spoke strongly in support of the twelve sites initiative sighting the critical need for housing in the face of roughly 2,000 people who are known to be on the street in the City of Vancouver on any one particular night. Most of these speakers urged the City and the Province to speed up the approvals and get on with construction of this much needed housing. A few individuals spoke against the initiative noting the concern about the size of a few of the projects and concerns about potential impacts on property values, schools and criminal activity. After hearing from the delegations, Council unanimously approved the MOU on December 19, 2007.

From that point on, BC Housing selected three architectural firms to each prepare designs for four of the twelve sites and housing sponsors were selected at the end of January after they discussed the proposals. Mr. Whitlock noted that their expectations are that seven of the twelve sites will be received for consideration by the Development Permit Board and the five remaining sites all involve a rezoning and that means they will be considered by Council at a public hearing. The decision by Council to approve the MOU follows the early consideration with the Supportive Housing Strategy in June 2007 which outlines an approach to dealing with homelessness in the city. This report received broad circulation in communities throughout Vancouver and set the framework for the twelve sites initiative. From a process perspective, the MOU provides a strong Council approved policy basis for assessing and recommending approval of these applications obviously subject to the preparation of the quality of design and the submission of an Operation Plan which provides City Staff with an overview of the intended staffing and support services for each building.

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the application noting this was the first of the twelve social housing sites. The project is located mid-block on Seymour Street and the proposal is for 106 single units plus support and amenity space on the main floor. The site is in Downtown South and qualifies for 5 FSR and a height of 120 feet. Ms. Molaro described the developments in the surrounding area noting the site has three view cones over it restricting the height to 125 feet. The building exceeds the height limitation on the lane which has resulted in the applicant requesting a height relaxation to 124 feet. The mechanical stair wells and elevator projections are within the view cone limitation. The unit sizes are between 320 and 454 square feet and requires a unit size relaxation which staff is supporting. The units

have a higher floor to floor height than normal resulting in higher ceiling heights in the units. Ms. Molaro noted that the proposal has met the Downtown South Guideline set backs for both the front and rear yards. For interior side yards the guidelines call for a forty foot setback for those portions of buildings above seven feet. The proposal has not provided that forty foot setback. Given that it is a hundred foot site there would be a very narrow building mass left making it very challenging to fulfill the building program. The applicant has proposed twelve foot setbacks on the side yards and articulated the building mass to provide some interest to those elevations. Staff are supportive of the reduction in the side yards as it will not affect the future development of the sites on either side. The applicant is proposing extensive green roofs that will not be accessible. As there is some uncertainty in the provision of this treatment, staff note in Condition 1.2, Note to Applicant, that this treatment is preferred. Ms. Molaro noted that the applicant has indicated that the solar panels being proposed on the upper most roof will not be included.

Ms. Molaro described the materials being proposed. The building will achieve a LEED™ Gold rating and staff are asking for a notation on the drawings clarifying the sustainable measures being proposed. Ms. Molaro described the comments regarding the number of social housing projects in the area that were received as a result of notification and public meetings. While a number of older, substandard accommodation are being replaced with better facilities the number of replacement units has kept pace with redevelopment and therefore while there maybe a perception of concentration because of newer and bigger buildings there has been one to one replacement. The building will be managed by a housing provider with many years of experience. In addition to working with the City and Province the operation of this building and the one across the lane at 1321 Richards Street will be managed by the same housing provider allowing them to share resources in having primary and backup staff within a short distance.

Ms. Molaro reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated May 7, 2008. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report. Ms. Molaro also recommended as an addition condition as A.1.9; “delete the solar panels proposed on the uppermost roof”.

Questions/Discussion

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

- Normal floor to floor heights are approximately 8.6 feet with this application proposing 9.8 feet.
- The ODP limits building heights in Downtown South to 120 feet with the view cone height at 125 feet for this site.
- When the site is developed next door the tower can't be built up against this building and will still be able to meet the 80 feet setback required.
- All the units are for single individuals.
- Eleven parking spaces are being provided which will be used by staff.
- Increasing the amount of glazing on the north façade will not impact neighbourliness.
- The applicant is choosing to remove the solar panels from the application.

Applicant's Comments

Larry Adams, Architect, accepted the prior-to conditions in the Staff Committee Report. Regarding the solar panels, Mr. Adams noted that after doing an extensive energy analysis it was decided because of the long pay back period there wasn't a benefit in using this type of energy and instead would be using geothermal. Mr. Adams described some of the sustainable measures noting the LEED™ credits. Regarding the parking stalls, Mr. Adams added that they

exceed what is required by the building noting that the residents won't be using the parking spaces.

Questions/Discussion

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

- If the solar panels were to be used for supplying hot water they would be doing the same job as the geothermal.
- Geothermal will be used for domestic hot water and for heating and cooling the building.
- BC Housing does not support green roofs as they are concerned with possible leaks and maintenance.
- The lack of balconies is a programming aspect however the design calls for operable windows.
- The programming of the building will be for low income single men and women, 65% men and 35% women. 30% will come as referrals from Vancouver Coastal Health and the rest through BC Housing and who live in the Downtown South area.
- The building will be a drug and alcohol free environment.
- Residents will be encouraged towards a lifestyle of sobriety and will be required to have completed an eighteen month program before becoming a resident which will be part of the Tenancy Agreement with each resident.
- The units will be rented month to month. Those residents who are referred from Vancouver Coastal Health will have housing attached to their program.
- Potential residents can pick up applications at the Gathering Place Community Centre and there is a waiting list for people coming from SRO hotels.

Comments from other Speakers

Patricia Rye, lives in the neighbourhood and wanted to see an Operations Management Plan. She also had an issue with the description of the scope of services as she felt there were too many social housing services within three blocks.

Barry Promislo felt there were already too many social housing units in the area and was concerned with the amount of garbage that may be left on the street by the residents.

Sharon Promislo had issues regarding notification and the result and lack of response from the neighbours. She would also like to see an Operations Management Plan. She wanted to be reassured that the project will be for low income residents and won't be for criminals and others.

Gerald Gasztoni had some concerns regarding the amount of social housing in the neighbourhood and the possibility of more problems in the neighbourhood.

Some speakers were concerned that because the operator is associated with a Church group that meals would be provided to non-residents resulting in additional neighbourhood impacts. Mr. Whitlock noted that a meal program will be provided for residents of the building although the units will be independent and also include a small kitchen. Mr. Boons noted that since this was not an actual church location meal services will not be provided to non-residents.

Mr. Timm inquired as to why staff did not feel an Operations Management Plan was necessary. Mr. Whitlock noted that there is an operating agreement with BC Housing with their sole mandate to provide housing. They are not interested in providing a social centre for people from offsite. Mr. Whitlock added that because of the low response from the neighbourhood it

was decided that one was not necessary, however if the Board wanted to apply that requirement he could provide the appropriate wording.

Mr. Whitlock noted that there had been a previous application that came to the Board around ten years ago from Parole Canada. It came in as an inquiry and didn't make it very far. Also there was an application for senior housing as well as an application for a youth social centre with housing on the upper floors. The Board put a one year time limit on the application and as a result the centre never got built and another site was found.

Mr. Toderian noted that the issue of social housing sites as a use was considered by Council and the Board can't reconsider the use issue as Council has already directed the Board to consider the application through the normal process.

Lorne Epp, Granville Mennonite Housing Society, said they encourage people to move towards employment. He noted that 25% of the residents will have low paying jobs and will be expected to engage in volunteer services which may lead to other employment.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall noted that the Urban Design Panel was receptive of the project and recognized the quality of the design and the challenge of the site. He noted that the Panel thought there were a few items that needed further consideration and had been addressed by Ms. Molaro in her presentation. The Panel thought the interface on Smythe Street should have a more urban face and they also thought some additional screening was required to create privacy from the public to the private on the patio and to mitigate some of the issues of litter. The Panel noted that the north elevation would be visible from across the street and suggested adding more windows to soften the blank wall. Mr. Wall recommended approval for the application.

Mr. Tatomir recommended approval for the application with the prior-to conditions. He liked the floor to floor height which would make the units more liveable. Mr. Tatomir noted that the initial cost of adding solar panels was very high and the return today was something in the range of 12% and would probably be reduced to 5-6% in Vancouver because of the lack of sunshine. He noted that a huge collection area was required and that there were also maintenance and storage considerations.

Mr. Tatomir recommended approval for the application with the prior-to conditions. He liked the floor to floor height which would make the units more liveable. Mr. Tatomir stated that he was in support of having the solar panels removed from the project. He noted that the initial cost of adding solar panels was very high and with today's technology the return would have 5-12% efficiency. In areas like Arizona with 270-290 sunny days per year the efficiency would be higher but in Vancouver because of the lack of sunshine the efficiency might only be 5-6%. That would mean \$600.00 would need to be spent in order to produce \$100.00 worth of energy. Also a huge collection area would be required and there would also be maintenance and storage considerations.

Mr. Shearing recommended support for the application. He thought the project was very good and was well thought through. Mr. Shearing agreed that the conditions in the Staff Committee Report were acceptable. Regarding the speakers, Mr. Shearing thought the issues were well articulated and recommended including a Operation Management Plan which will bring a level of comfort to the neighbours.

Mr. Stovell said he supported the application and felt sympathetic to the speakers around the number of social service units in the neighbourhood. He said he was in support of some sort of management plan as it would only be fair to the neighbours and give them some assurance.

Mr. Stovell thought that for a small building to achieve LEED™ Gold was a model for affordable housing and was needed in order to encourage minimum suite sizes and reduced parking with high LEED™ standards in new buildings.

Ms. Maust recommended support for the application and thought the height variance had been justified. She thought the colour was fantastic and would like to see the addition of glazing on the north side of the building. Regarding the solar panels, Ms. Maust noted that in doing research for her company's projects, it was determined that they could double up on the energy systems by using geothermal. She also thought the management plan would be a good idea as well as a community advisory group.

Mr. Hung liked the architectural design of the building. He was pleased to see the City taking on the project for providing social housing for the homeless in the city. He also thought the management plan was the right thing to do and suggested including the police department to help resolve any future problems.

Mr. Braun recommended approval for the application and thought the design was fabulous. He also recommended included a management plan because it sets up an expectation for the neighbourhood. It would be a tool for enforcing good neighbourliness and a protection for the City to ensure the neighbourhood is working together. Mr. Braun said he was disappointed that the application of green roofs was not supported by BC Housing.

Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian moved approval of the application with amendments. Mr. Toderian said he was inclined to agree with including an Operating Management Plan which could be a condition of the release of the development permit or as a requirement before receiving the occupancy permit. Mr. Toderian thanked and acknowledged BC Housing for their funding. He noted that it has been a long time coming and was a positive move to house people as a way to address social issues. In addressing the speakers, Mr. Toderian noted that it was not the purview of the Board whether or not the site was appropriate for social housing as Council has already made that decision. The Board's role is to discuss the technical aspects of the project and both the Planning Department and the Housing Centre were side by side in their support to recommend approval of the twelve sites. He thought it was a very good thing to allow for social housing in the city while providing for a good neighbour relationship. Regarding sustainability, Mr. Toderian didn't disagree with BC Housing regarding solar energy relative to geothermal. He accepted that they had done the analysis for the technology and felt the applicant was not bound by keeping the condition but he wouldn't want to rule it out.

Mr. Toderian said he was disappointed with the approach to green roofs. He also thought the Province should be commended for their leadership regarding LEED™ Gold and thought they were walking the talk and being a strong model for energy performance and green design aspirations. Mr. Toderian noted the City was worried about the growing perception as to whether or not green roofs could be leaky and not withstanding the conversation with the Homeowner Protection Group, it was still the City's position that green roofs are good technology and can be done well. He encouraged the Province to be careful with its messaging. He noted that the City is telling developers that this is proven technology around the world. He added that he didn't disagree with BC Housing's assessment as to whether or not the technology is economical. Regarding the architecture, Mr. Toderian thought it was an exceptional design and noted that the Urban Design Panel (UDP) was very complimentary. He strongly encouraged BC Housing to keep the colour as it was one of the things he liked best about the project. When the UDP heard that BC Housing had used the end users to choose the colour palette they commented that the group should choose more colour palettes for new

development in the city and maybe the market housing developers could learn about taking risks regarding colour. Mr. Toderian added that he thought it set not only a new bar for social housing but sets a new bar for any housing in the mid rise scale in the city and hoped it changed the nature of the dialogue around architectural exuberance in the city.

Mr. Boons clarified the issue of height noting the current recommendations in the Staff Committee Report do not reflect the solar panels on the roof. He noted that staff are concerned about maintaining the view cone height. Mr. Toderian added that if the solar panels were to be included in the design they must not project into the view cone.

Mr. Timm supported Mr. Toderian's amendments and seconded the motion of approval. He agreed that the use of the site was not up to the Board as Council had already made that decision. He thought there was a need for social housing and personally agreed that this was the best location for that type of housing. Mr. Timm said he understood the neighbour's concern and that the Board needs to insure that with the addition of the Operations Management Plan those issues that Council contemplated can be taken care of in order to protect the community. He agreed that a draft plan should be prepared prior to occupancy and finalized in consultation with the community.

Mr. Timm suggested an additional condition be added stating that "the permit does not include the provision of food service to non-residents of the building" which Mr. Toderian supported. Also in the absence of Council policy, he thought it was inappropriate for the Board to comment on sustainability other than to ask for the applicant to indicate their sustainable measures on the drawings.

Mr. Ridge supported the motion and agreed that an Operations Management Plan was needed.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE411958, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated May 7, 2008, with the following amendments:

Add the following in the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.4: ***The applicant does not intend to include solar panels*** to read:

Note to Applicant: The intent is to define those features referred to on the LEED checklist attaining Gold level and as discussed at the Urban Design Panel, on the final approved permit drawings. ***The applicant does not intend to include solar panels.***

Add a new Condition 1.5 to read:

provision of an Operational Management Plan, including provisions of a Community Advisory Committee, finalized in consultation with the community and to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and the Director of the Housing Centre, prior to issuance of an occupancy permit.

Delete Condition to B.2.4 and replace with the following:

This permit does not include the provision of food services to non-residents of this building.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

6. ADJOURNMENT

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

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

R. Jenkins
Chair

H:\Clerical\DPB\Minutes\2008\7-Jun 2-08.doc