

Date: Monday, May 2, 2011  
Time: N/A  
Place: N/A

---

**PRESENT:**

**133 EAST 8TH AVENUE - DE414511 - ZONE C-3A**  
Minutes  
Motion

**Board**

K. Munroe Assistant Director - Current Planning Division (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  
K. Maust Representative of the Design Professions  
M. Biazzi Representative of the General Public  
S. Bozorgzadeh Representative of the General Public  
C. Chung Representative of the General Public  
J. Miletic-Prelovac Representative of the General Public  
P. Sanderson Representative of the General Public

**Regrets**

K. Maust Representative of the Design Professions

**ALSO PRESENT:**

**City Staff:**

J. Greer Processing Centre - Manager  
P. Storer Engineering Services - Projects Branch  
S. Hein Development Planner  
D. Autiero Project Facilitator  
P. Birch Community Plans & Implementation

**133 EAST 8TH AVENUE - DE414511 - C-3A**

W. Leung W.T. Leung Architects Inc.  
B. Krause W.T. Leung Architects Inc.

**CLERK TO THE BOARD:** L. Harvey

**1. MINUTES**

It was moved by Mr. Toderian, seconded by Mr. Judd, and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on April 18, 2011 with the following amendments:

---

Amend Condition A.2.14 by adding 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; after the first sentence.

As well there were some minor typographical errors.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

**3. 133 EAST 8TH AVENUE - DE414511 - ZONE C-3A  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: GBL Architects

Request: Mr. Hein, Development Planner, introduced the application and described the context for the surrounding area. He noted that the application is the first major proposal to be considered under the existing C-3A zoning in the context of the Mount Pleasant Community Plan. Mr. Hein noted that a public realm plan will be produced for Mount Pleasant which will address urban systems and the acknowledgement of artists as well as opportunities for the lanes. The application is not seeking a heritage transfer bonus. Mr. Hein described the relaxations being sought for height and for loading.

Mr. Hein 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.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Mr. Hein, Development Planner, introduced the application and described the context for the surrounding area. He noted that the application is the first major proposal to be considered under the existing C-3A zoning in the context of the Mount Pleasant Community Plan. Mr. Hein noted that a public realm plan will be produced for Mount Pleasant which will address urban systems and the acknowledgement of artists as well as opportunities for the lanes. The application is not seeking a heritage transfer bonus. Mr. Hein described the relaxations being sought for height and for loading.

Mr. Hein 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 clarifications were provided by Mr. Hein:

- The proposed neighbourhood cultural space has enough room to accommodate some artist production. Cultural Services may nominate an artist to occupy that space.
- The display spaces will not be on public property but will be provided by the owner of the building and will be an opportunity to make available for viewing some of the local artist's work.
- The proponents listened to the community interests and have offered space in the building to provide space for local art groups.
- The adjacent property to the west could see a maximum height of 60 feet with no sideyard conditions.
- The property to the west is zoned industrial.
- The breezeway proposed along the west boundary of the site will offer a mid block break.

### **Applicant's Comments**

Amela Brudar, Architect, further described the proposal noting that they are working with a transportation consultant and they feel that one loading bay at the back of the building is sufficient and asked the Board for a relaxation. She noted that they are creating a plaza at the loading bay area with landscaping along the lane. Ms. Brudar stated that the owner is planning on moving their offices into the building and is planning on putting a legal agreement in place so that the community space would be made available to local artists at an affordable rate. The public art display will be sculptural pieces that will have lighting to show off the works of local artists.

Ms. Brudar noted that the breezeway came at the request of the owner to allow for views to the north for the units on the west side of the building. It is a way to bring more light into the units as well. The main living spaces are oriented towards the north and south.

Andrew Emerson, Architect, noted that the west elevation has a high degree of articulation as a result of pulling back the building and making room for a breezeway as well as making the CRU spaces more useable.

### **Questions/Discussion**

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

- The owner of the site has done a lot of developing in Richmond and this is their first development in Vancouver. They want to connect with the community in Mt. Pleasant to make a development that fits the community context.
- In working with the public and staff, the owner has volunteered the public art and cultural space elements.
- It is the owner's intention to keep ownership of the artist's space and rent it back to local artists.
- No agreements have as yet been made regarding who will use the artist's space.
- The application is for 7,000 square feet and replaces an existing office building. It was unknown as to the impact regarding the net loss of office space with the new building.
- The new building will accommodate some office space however there are a number of larger sites that have been identified in the Mount Pleasant Community Plan that will include office space.
- It was anticipated that this site would be a mix of office and residential in keeping with City policy.

- Some of the units will be standard studio units with a Murphy bed for sleeping accommodations.
- There will be three sides of the buildings with frontages. One creates a mezzanine and there is a coffee shop planned on the corner with some outdoor seating. There will also be a yoga studio off the breezeway.
- In response to the directions noted in the Mount Pleasant Community Plan the community was engaged early in the design process and City staff plans to continue to do this as development in the area further evolves.
- The applicant is targeting LEED™ Silver through environmental and water conservation. They are proposing rain water management, solar gain strategies through the use of solar shades on the south and west elevation, cross ventilation in the suites and daylighting into the corridors.
- The applicant was aware that they could purchase from the Heritage Bank but felt that 3 FSR was optimum for the site.
- The owner looked at the demographics for the area and decided on providing 13 studio units of the 45 units with the rest mostly one-bedroom units.

#### Comments from other Speakers

Stuart Alcock, Manor Housing Coop, has lived there for 28 years. He thanked the applicant for being open to suggestions from the community and for providing artist's space. He said it was important to have public consultation and felt the plan was acceptable but had some concerns regarding the height of the project.

Robert Sullivan, Liveable Laneways, complimented staff and the proponents for the recent public meeting where the community's concerns were addressed. He said he thought the site was precedent setting for the area. He added that he thought it was important for the development to have a permeable pedestrian environment on the laneway.

Peter Graham, Mount Pleasant Artist Society, said he would like to see the reduction of parking spaces to make for more affordable housing.

Mark Ostry, co-owner of the adjacent property to the west, was concerned with the impact the project would have on their property. He was concerned that new purchasers would be upset when their views were taken away when they develop their site as they could potentially build a 60 foot blank wall along the side yard. He said they wanted to avoid any future conflict and they were looking for some assurance that the City wouldn't ask them to preserve the neighbour's views.

Russell Acton, co-owner of the adjacent property to the west, noted that the application was an infill site and found it odd that the architects had designed the building without recognizing that a 60 foot blank wall could be built on the adjacent site.

#### Questions/Discussion

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

- The owner will retain ownership of the artist's community space.
- There wasn't an analysis of what could be developed on the adjacent site to the west.

- Only one suite per floor would be impacted should a blank wall be built on the adjacent property, however the windows are oriented towards the north and will still have direct views.

### Panel Opinion

Scott Romses said the Urban Design Panel strongly supported the project. He said he thought some of the public realm ideas were positive. As this was the first project to be built after the adoption of the new Mount Pleasant Community Plan he thought it would set the bar for future developments. He noted that the Panel thought the amount of glazing was a bit much on the west side from a sustainability point of view and suggested more screening. He said because the units are oriented to the north and the west there could be less emphasis to the glazing on the west side.

Mr. Rafii complimented the architect and thought the project was well done. He said he liked that it was a four sided project. Mr. Rafii said he didn't have any concerns regarding future loss of views as the two units facing west have windows that face north and south and wouldn't lose much if the site was redeveloped. He said he supported the relaxations regarding the height and the loading bay as he felt the project didn't require two loading bays. Mr. Rafii said he had some concern with the two-storey units as he thought a second exit would be a requirement of the building permit on their second floor. Mr. Rafii said he supported the application.

Mr. Stovell thought it was exemplary that the developer was providing artist's space. He wanted staff to acknowledge that this was voluntary on the part of the developer and not as a way to pursue a relaxation. He suggested that instead of stating this as a requirement in condition 1.5 and 1.6, that they be amended to reflect that the owner offered the space. Mr. Stovell thought the owners of the adjacent property had an interesting point and suggested a long balcony on the west elevation could be cut back to clarify the expectation that the site might end up with a 60 foot blank wall adjacent. Mr. Stovell said he supported the relaxation regarding the loading bay.

Mr. Sanderson thought the architect had done a good job but was concerned with the redevelopment of the adjacent property. He thought adjustments could be made to the west elevation and having a covenant on title to let purchasers know about the potential impact should the site be redeveloped. Mr. Sanderson said he was concerned with the net loss of office space and thought it should be retained on site.

Mr. Biazi said he heard the concerns from Mr. Ostry and Mr. Acton and thought they could design their building to respect the setbacks. He also thought that cutting back the balcony was a good option. He thanked staff and the architect and thought it was a good project and said he supported the application.

Mr. Pez said it was unusual to see an interior site developed the way this one had been and thought it would be an interesting building. He noted that the applicant hadn't used all their density. He said he didn't think it was a good idea to put a covenant on the title letting purchasers know about the potential for redevelopment on the adjoining property as he thought it wasn't a good precedent. He added that he thought purchasers would know that the site might be redeveloped in the future and that a 60 foot blank wall could be adjacent to the property. He also thought it was great that the owner wanted something different and he was supportive of the application. Mr. Pez said he thought the mews was exciting and that it would add to a more liveable laneway. He said he supported the relaxation of the loading bay.

Ms. Miletic-Prelovac thought the architect and the owner had done more than they were asked in developing the site. She said she appreciated the public realm design but would like to see more consideration to the existing laneway on the east and encouraged the applicant to explore how to improve the animation of the laneway. She added that she would like to see something more permanent regarding animation of the laneways.

Mr. Chung commended the applicant and owner for pulling the building back from the west property line and giving a break in between the western neighbour as a strong move that adds some excitement and contributes more than what was asked. He felt that in terms of breaking up some of the fenestration, the clues could come from the east elevation and just needed some fine tuning. He felt that would address the concerns of the western neighbour and that there was room for them to be as sensitive to the site as this applicant had been with their design.

Ms. Bozorgzadeh complimented the architect and thought the building was well done. She had some concerns regarding the liveability of the studio units and suggested taking out the wall between the storage room and the rest of the unit for more liveable floor space. She suggested that more public involvement from the early stages seemed to be needed with the community and suggested adding more workshops.

#### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Toderian thanked the members of the public and the co-owners of adjacent property for their comments. He noted the positive comments made about the design including comments on the cultural moves and further parking relaxations. He also thanked the public for their work on the community plan. Mr. Toderian noted that City staff are still considering how they will move forward in addressing commentary in the Community Plan regarding community-based design review approaches while also considering city-side related requests as well.

Mr. Toderian complimented the applicant on a very interesting proposal. He said he was pleased with the architectural expression. He noted that although it was a background building it was the kind of design he hoped to see more of in the city. He commended the firm, GBL Architects, as he thought the approaches they had been taking to the architectural challenges to not have all the buildings look the same, had made for some interesting designs. He added that he thought the application was another example of that kind of architecture in terms of its expression and materiality. He also thought it was an innovative floor plan approach and a very unusual consideration to some of the issues the designers faced. Mr. Toderian asked the applicant to pass along his compliments to the client. He also commended the applicant for going above what was needed by adding the artist's space and the public art. He added that he believed the applicant deserved thanks for offering something exceptional, reflecting a real commitment by the applicant regarding the Community Plan the desire for an artist's environment.

Mr. Toderian suggested a number of amendments for consideration by the Board.

Mr. McLellan said he was pleased with the design and was a good understanding of what the City was trying to achieve in the Mount Pleasant Community Plan. They want to be able to activate the streets and the lanes and he thought the development did that well. He noted that this was first building after adoption of the new plan and they will have the advantage of the views to the west until the adjacent lot to the west was further developed. He suggested that if the owner of the adjacent property developed at the same density they could do an equally

good response on that site as it has exposure on two streets and the lane as well. He added that he was confident that the owners could come up with an equal or better response on their site. Mr. McLellan said he thought the artist's community was to be commended for working with the applicant and the applicant's offering of space was impressive and a great contribution to advancing the plan. He added that he had some nervousness about how the arrangement would come into place but thought the idea of a covenant on title was not very practical. Mr. McLellan said he was supportive of the relaxation of the height and the loading.

Mr. Judd suggested a couple of other amendments that were accepted by the Board. Regarding the parking and a further relaxation, Mr. Judd said he didn't support that because the parking standards were set in 2009 and also the transit use on the Broadway corridor was not particularly high. He noted that rapid transit is a high priority but he didn't see that evolving for at least a decade at the earliest. Mr. Judd added that there is a need for additional space regarding waste management and different methods of dealing with waste. He didn't think the current provisions for garbage would accommodate that but as the need for parking declined in the future some of that space could be converted for waste management or the cultural space could be expanded into that space in the future.

#### 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. DE414511, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated April 6, 2010, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.4 and Condition 1.5 by adding the following at the beginning of the Note to Applicant: ***Staff note that these requirements have been offered to staff and the community through the process and have been accepted and thus conditioned.***

Amend Condition A.1.5 by replacing the "Managing Director of Cultural Services" to the ***General Manager of Community Services.***

Add a new Condition 1.7 to read: ***consideration of the amount of glazing on the west façade, and/or other design details, to address possible design conflicts within an anticipated adjacent industrial use;***

***Note to Applicant: Tools and techniques such as warnings on title may also be considered in addition to design approaches. It is noted that the City's intent is to allow all opportunities to develop the adjacent land for industrial uses in keeping with the zoning in place.***

Clarification of the Development Permit Staff Committee Report in the Note on Parking on Page 5 by changing "a 10 percent reduction" to ***four spaces.***

Amend the Note to Applicant in Condition A.1.10 to read: ***Note to Applicant: Provision of a car share vehicle and space would reduce parking requirement by four spaces.***

Delete Condition A.1.15

Renumber Condition A.1.16 through Condition A.1.25 to Condition A.1.15 to Condition A.2.24.

**4. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:35 PM