

Date: Monday, April 18, 2011
Time: N/A
Place: N/A

PRESENT:

8600 KERR STREET - DE414514 - ZONE CD-1
Minutes
Motion

900 PACIFIC STREET - DE414522 - ZONE FCCDD
Minutes
Motion

Board

C. Warren Director of Development Services (Chair)
B. Toderian Director of Planning
D. McLellan General Manager of Community Services Group
P. Judd General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

S. Romses Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel) [Alberni Street]
F. Rafii Representative of the Design Professions
J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry
M. Biazi Representative of the General Public
S. Bozorgzadeh Representative of the General Public
J. Miletic-Prelovac Representative of the General Public
P. Sanderson Representative of the General Public
M. Pez Representative of the Development Industry

Regrets

K. Maust Representative of the Design Professions
C. Chung Representative of the General Public
P. Sanderson Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

City Staff:

B. Boons Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
J. Greer Processing Centre - Manager
P. Storer Engineering Services - Projects Branch
R. Thé Engineering Services - Projects Branch
P. St. Michel Development Planner
A. Molaro Development Planner
D. Autiero Project Facilitator
S. Barker Project Facilitator
M. Holm Streets Design
D. Naundorf Social Infrastructure
D. Anderson Social Policy

8600 KERR STREET - DE414514 - ZONE CD-1

N. Shearing Parklane Homes
C. Halkier Shift Architecture
P. Buchanan Shift Architecture
C. Sterry PWL Partnership (Landscape Architect)

900 PACIFIC STREET - DE414522 - ZONE FCCDD

D. Jantzen DYS Architecture
K. Madsen DYS Architecture
R. Aebi Directions Youth Services

CLERK TO THE BOARD: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Judd seconded by Mr. Toderian, and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on April 4, 2011 with with the following amendments:

Amend Condition A.2.14 to add the following sentence after the first sentence:

Staff may consider the use of the loading space on the east side of the westerly building in considering the car sharing solution and potentially grant relief to the loading requirement;

There were also some minor typographical errors.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 8600 KERR STREET - DE414514 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Polygon Development 147 Ltd.

Request: To develop this site with a 158 unit Multiple Dwelling over one level of underground parking having vehicular access from Riverwalk Avenue.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Pat St. Michel, Development Planner, introduced the application for parcels 7A and 7B within the Area 2 South of the East Fraser Lands (EFL). This is the second development permit application to proceed in Area 2. The Development Permit Board approved the first application for 77 townhouses on the hillside above this site on December 10, 2010.

Ms. St. Michel briefly described the larger context for East Fraser Lands noting that the context model was not available as it was on display at the Vancouver Art Gallery. She noted that EFL

consists of about 126 acres in the southeast corner of Vancouver and is located between Marine Drive and the Fraser River, Kerr Street and Boundary Road. A CP rail-line bi-sects the site with there being only two trains a day on the line and the aspiration is that it will ultimately be used for transit. She also noted that when fully developed, there will be over seven million square feet of residential development in the three neighbourhoods including a central mixed-use neighbourhood providing local shopping and services. The buildings will range from 3-storeys to 24-storeys with a full range of building forms from townhouses, low-rise and mid-rise buildings as well as towers. There will also be over 25 acres of park including a variety of public spaces and a continuous walkway/bikeway along a mile of shoreline. As well there will be two eco-corridors that are to focus on habitat restoration and creation, rainwater management and recreation.

The site is located on the western edge of EFL and is part of what is called Area 2 or the western neighbourhood. Area 2 is primarily residential and is being developed in advance of the higher density mixed use neighbourhood to enable more modestly scaled wood-frame development to proceed.

The site is bounded by Kerr Street to the west, the CP rail-line to the north, and a newly created and named street called Riverwalk Avenue (referred to as Road 'H' in the EFL Design Guidelines). At the eastern end of the site is a statutory right-of-way that will be part of a north/south open space corridor connecting from Marine Drive to the riverfront. The north/south corridor provides a visual connection to the river, and a physical connection which is desired, but as yet a pedestrian crossing has not been secured across the tracks. Immediately east of the site is Parcel 8A, a future non-market housing site.

Ms. St. Michel noted that future developments around the site will be apartments and townhouses ranging from three to eleven storeys, with building forms stepping up in height as development approaches the future Kinross Park corridor to the east. The site is the second row of development back from the riverfront. Immediately to the south along the river, buildings from four to seven storeys in height are planned.

To the immediate west are the Kerr Street properties, owned by the City of Vancouver, which were approved for rezoning at the same time as 'Area 2 South'. Further west are the existing developments of West Fraser Lands, consisting of townhouses and apartments.

The site is located by the Kerr Street Landing which will be a public square with a small parking area adding to the amenity of the existing Kerr Street pier, and for which public realm improvements are currently under construction. There will be an EFL experience centre, which houses presentation space, a small restaurant and meeting rooms temporarily located on the City-owned property on the west side of Kerr Street. This building is nearing completion, and will serve as a community meeting space until construction of the community centre in Area 1.

An off-street bike route is currently under construction on Kerr Street. It will connect to an off-street route on the north side of the rail-line, and to what will be a continuous bike route and pedestrian path linking a variety of park space and public places along the full riverfront of both EFL and West Fraserlands.

Ms. St. Michel reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated March 23, 2011. 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. St. Michel:

- The original form of development included a streetwall expression and the Urban Design Panel thought it was better to create a defined streetwall and create a more useable courtyard to the north.
- The path would be reduced by 2 to 2.5 meters (it is now at 3 meters) in order to provide more planting area for urban agriculture.
- The applicant wishes to remain at four storeys as wood frame construction is being used.
- The buildings would be connected to a district energy utility which will be available from the start. The source of fuel will be natural gas and boilers, however, in the future they will be using, subject to negotiations, the waste energy facility that Metro Vancouver has in Burnaby.

Applicant's Comments

Kevin Shoemaker noted that they are using a four storey wood frame construction as it is the first building in the area and they want a more conservative and affordable project. He noted that the amount of parking and the cost of digging out the parkade was also a consideration. The next projects will be higher buildings using concrete construction. Mr. Shoemaker was concerned with the condition relating to the path to the east that is half shared with the adjacent property. He noted that the path would be temporary until the adjacent building was constructed and, knowing that it will probably be torn out again, wanted to ask the Board to change the condition to provide a temporary path. He was also concerned with the condition regarding the car share. He noted that there isn't any place to park the car share on the surface and they know that having car share spaces in the parkade doesn't work as well for the residents.

Peter Buchanan noted that they have been working with staff and the owner to evolve a design relative to the commentary from the Urban Design Panel. Regarding the amenity space, he noted that in Building 7A there will be gym facilities. As well they have moved one of the elevator cores to the east in both of the buildings to allow for a visual connection to the street and the courtyard beyond. He said they are looking at making the timber and steel elements more robust on the exterior of the buildings and that they are looking at other colour options. They are also planning to make Building 7B a more horizontal expression and Building 7A more vertical. Mr. Buchanan noted that they have looked at the sun studies and the shading in the courtyard and have reduced the building's pop ups on the north side towards the courtyard to capture more sunlight. They are also reconsidering the access from the courtyard and are considering some improvements. As well they are looking at reducing the mews between Buildings 7A and 7B and stepping the retaining walls on the east end. The car share stall is still a little constrained on the site at the mews but they are working on resolving the issues.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The project will have one car stall per unit in the parkade.

- Neither staff nor the applicant knew when the adjacent project would be developed.
- There is currently no agreement with CP Rail to provide access across the tracks.
- The applicant is looking for a location for the district energy system.
- The unit in Building B adjacent to the elevator has been changed to an amenity space.
- The developer doesn't build roof decks due to the envelope issue with wood frame construction. However their concrete buildings often have roof decks over living space.

Comments from other Speakers

Terry Slack, director of the Fraser River Coalition, thought the Board was not considering the impact the development will have on the river. He was concerned that the water running down Kerr Street from the former land fill might be highly toxic. He also wanted some assurance that the new trees to be planted on the site would be native species. Mr. Slack was also concerned that there hadn't been any archaeological processing of the site and as well he wanted to know if bus service was planned for the area.

Paul Peel, a resident in the area, was concerned that Kent Street was going to be blocked off with no access to Boundary Road. He said he appreciated the level of information provided by the proponents regarding the development.

Questions/Discussion

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

- Parklane Homes is working with The Musqueam First Nation regarding the fish habitat and is entering into a friendship agreement with them.
- Parklane Homes has done an archaeological investigation of the site which came back negative regarding any First Nation's history on the site.
- The city has collection lines along Marine Drive at the base of the old city dump that take any run off to be treated at the sewage treatment centre.
- The entire site has been remediated to Provincial standards so there won't be any ground water contamination. The area around the central part of the site is looked after under an agreement with the Provincial Government so there will be no contaminated water running into the Fraser River.
- The new trees to be planted on the site are all red coded zoned trees as well as any new plantings.
- TransLink will be improving the bus route as the site is developed.
- The section between Kerr and Kinross Streets is currently under construction. This section will be dedicated for bikes and pedestrians and will only be temporarily closed to traffic for another month or so. Access to Boundary Road will be maintained.

Panel Opinion

Scott Romses noted that the Panel voted 4/3 in favour of the development and did have some concerns but thought the applicant was addressing those concerns. The Panel thought there was too much similarity between the two buildings but thought there was a richness in the detailing. Mr. Romses urged the applicant to continue moving forward with the design. The Panel was also concerned with the courtyard on the north side but felt that the streetwall character was worth sacrificing sunlight into the area. Mr. Romses said he thought the design team was doing a good job of addressing the Panel's concerns and that access from the core was better.

Mr. Rafii thought the project was on the right track and supported the conditions in the Staff Committee Report. He had some concerns with Condition 1.12 because of the uncertainty about the completion of the adjacent project but he said he was satisfied that the applicant would complete the path at a later date.

Mr. Biazi said he was in support of the application subject to the conditions set out in the Staff Committee Report.

Ms. Miletic-Prelovac said she wished there were updated drawings with the changes since the Urban Design Panel's review. She said she would like to see a more industrial expression to the buildings although she said she liked the shroud expression but would like to see it stand out more. She suggested connecting the shroud to the entrance. Ms. Miletic-Prelovac added that she would like to have seen a southern exposed courtyard.

Mr. Stovell thought it was important that the conditions be pursued by the applicant. He said he didn't have any concerns with the north facing courtyard as there are lots of other examples in the city where that exposure has worked well. He added that he thought the streetwall character was more important.

Ms. Bozorgzadeh stated that as a public representative she felt she should be notified regarding members of the public who wished to address the Board. She said she felt there was a lack of transparency. She wanted to know if there was any means for her to connect with members of the public before the meeting.

Mr. Pez was in support of the application. He said he had confidence that the applicant team would look after the conditions but was disappointed that the programming was driven by the building form. He noted that there were lots of deep floor plates which had sacrificed the liveability of some of the units. He said he was happy to support the application but thought a five storey building would have produced better, more liveable units.

Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian stated that on behalf of the Board he wanted to provide a bit of clarity regarding Ms. Bozorgzadeh's comments. There is a strong procedural challenge with what she suggested, and he was concerned with the comments around "lack of transparency". The Advisory Panel members who represent the public are appointed by Council to speak on behalf of the public but not to engage with the public outside of the Board meeting. He noted that the Board is a quasi judicial body and is required to adhere to principles of administrative law. It is important for the Advisory Panel members to look at the applications with fresh eyes based on what is presented during the meeting. He added that the Panel is not appointed by members of Council to canvas the public for their commentary but to speak on behalf of the public in a general sense.

Mr. Toderian moved the recommendation of Staff with a couple of minor amendments. He said he thought staff was correct in asking for the full path between the two buildings. In amending the condition, Mr. Toderian stated that it makes it clear that it is a full path construction but when the time is right staff will look at the timing of the permanent path construction.

Mr. Toderian said he appreciated the members of the public for coming out to the meeting and sharing their concerns. He noted that the application is reasonable architecture but noted that it was a shame that other options for five storeys weren't considered further but he was

prepared to support the application at four storeys. Regarding the courtyard, he thought emphasizing the streetwall character was the better choice even though it wasn't an optimal courtyard and sunlight result. He added that there are examples of courtyards with less than ideal solar orientation and they can still be positive places. Mr. Toderian explained why he wanted to make the amendment to Condition 1.1. He said he very much supports the need for the condition. He said he had to agree with the comments from the Urban Design Panel that the architectural expression was relentless. It's a commendable piece of architecture but there is too much of it in the sense that it needs to be broken up more into individual expressions. He added that there is a need for architectural diversity and variety. He noted that this was the second application for this area with a similar issue. Mr. Toderian said he hoped more architectural variety would show up in the upcoming projects. He said his actual preference would be that the two buildings in this application looked different. He added that they could look like they came from the same family but not be identical. Mr. Toderian encouraged the applicant team to take a robust thought process around the architecture varieties issues.

Mr. McLellan said he was concerned with the north facing courtyard and thought it wasn't the ideal solution but noted that it could be well designed. He added that he wouldn't want to see the same approach taken on all similar sites in the area. Because it is a set of terraces back from the river, there is still room to have different approaches that can be taken to get a different impact. He said he hoped that would be considered as other sites were developed. Mr. McLellan suggested an amendment regarding the loading space. He was concerned that there was 120 feet from the loading space to the door. He suggested turning the loading space into the car share spot.

Mr. Judd had no additional comments.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE414514, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated March 23, 2010, with the following amendments:

To amend the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.1 to read: While the project was supported by the Urban Design Panel, there was common concern expressed about the length of frontage with such similar expression, materials and colour. While some thought it was possible that the subtle variations may read successfully, others felt the expression was 'relentless'. ***Approaches should include*** varying brick and panel colours and giving greater emphasis to the differences between the components and details of the buildings.

Amend the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.12 to read: The proposed pedestrian path spans both this and the adjacent property. To ensure an appropriate pedestrian connection, without having to rely on the development of the adjacent site, a full path should be provided with this building. ***Consideration may be given to options for full path construction approaches that recognize the timing of ultimate permanent path***

construction. The applicant must provide plans and specifications for the public access path along the east property line to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services pursuant to the Section 219 Covenant (BB1726901) registered on Lot 4. Landscape and site plans are to illustrate the statutory right-of way of 2.0 m on both Parcel 7B and the adjacent Parcel 8A, and to annotate public use of adjacent seating height walls and the widened public seating area adjacent to Riverwalk Avenue.

Delete Condition A.1.3 and move the entire Note to Applicant to Condition A.2.14;

Re-number Condition A.1.4 through A.1.18 to A.1.3 to A.1.17;

Amend Condition A.2.14 to read: ***make arrangements to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and General Manager of Engineering Services for the provision of car share vehicles and spaces and the Class B Loading Space. Staff may consider the use of the loading space on the east side of the westerly building in considering the car sharing solution and potentially grant relief to the loading requirement;***

Note to Applicant:

In accordance with the condition of CD-1 By-law enactment, a total of two car share vehicles and spaces are required based on the number of dwelling units proposed. Currently only one car share vehicle space has been indicated on the plans, and the location of this space does not meet Section 4.8.6 of the Parking By-law. Both Car Share vehicles shall meet Section 4.8.6 (located a minimum of 15.1 ft. from any window, vent or wall opening providing access to residential accommodation in any building).

The loading space shall be located a minimum of 15.1 ft from any window, vent or wall opening of a residential building. This loading space would also require modification in order to provide adequate space for the truck to back into it, and a hard surface space at the rear to unload furniture from the truck to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services. It should be noted that modification to allow the loading space to function as described above may result in unsupportable impacts on the landscape plans. Where Class B loading is anticipated on other parcels in EFL, the illustrative built form located these loading spaces off the mews, beside the underground parking ramp and under the second storey of building. It should be anticipated that addressing this condition will result in some reduction of residential floor space.

**4. 900 PACIFIC STREET - DE414522 - ZONE FCCDD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: DYS Architecture

Request: To renovate this existing City-owned building and change the use to Social Service Centre to accommodate an integrated youth services centre with off-site parking on a temporary basis until the permanent facility is constructed at 1134 Burrard Street.

Development Planner's Opening Comments:

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the application to renovate an existing building to temporarily accommodate the social services facility. The site is located at the corner of Pacific and Hornby Streets. The building is a two storey building with the primary façade facing onto Pacific Street. The building is the vacated Kettle of Fish restaurant. Ms. Molaro described the context for the site. The proposal by Family Services of Greater Vancouver is to relocate the existing integrated youth services centre (Directions) from its current location at 1134 Burrard Street. The existing site is being redeveloped to accommodate the social service centre's permanent home along with supportive housing. That project has been approved through a rezoning and subsequent development permit. The Directions program currently offers a number of programs for at-risk youth including counselling and support, health services, life skill training and information and referral and operates on a 24 hour, 7 day a week basis. There are no significant external changes being proposed for the building. All the services are located within the building with staff and youth accessing from the entry off Pacific Street. To address concerns with loitering the proposal has introduced secure gate elements on some of the building existing alcoves at the lane and the unused entry along Pacific Street. The main entry itself has an internal vestibule to allow patrons to move indoors to be processed for entry into the facility. Ms. Molaro described the results of the notification noting that the public's concerns can be addressed through the implementation of the Facilities Management Plan.

Ms. Molaro reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated April 6, 2011. 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:

None.

Applicant's Comments

Dane Jansen said they were comfortable with the Conditions in the Staff Committee Report and thought they could be resolved.

Questions/Discussion

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

None.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Scott Romses said he had no comments to add.

Ms. Bozorgzadeh said she hoped the green wall would stay.

Board Discussion

Mr. McLellan said he thought the conditions were well stated and appropriate for the site and that this is a necessary use until Directions can move into its new facilities.

Mr. Toderian said he strongly supported the application.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. McLellan and seconded by Mr. Judd and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE414522, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated April 6, 2010.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. McLellan thanked Ms. Warren for her contribution as Board Chair and wished her well in her retirement. As well Mr. Toderian congratulated her on her retirement and a job well done as chair.

6. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:50 PM