

Date: April 4, 2022
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: VIRTUAL, WEBEX

PRESENT:

Board

C. Okell Director, Permitting Services
T. O'Donnell General Manager, Planning
A. Law General Manager, Development, Buildings & Licensing
L. LaClaire General Manager, Engineering

Advisory Panel

M. Biazi Representative of the Design Professional
B. Wakelin Representative of the Urban Design Panel
K. Krangle General Public
C. Vaness General Public
M. Gordon Representative of the Heritage Commission

Regrets

D. Pretto Representative of the Development Industry
M. Moore General Public
M. Joko General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

City Staff:

Hamid Shayan, Development Planner
Hiroko Kobayashi, Development Planner
Zlatan, Jankovic, Senior Heritage Planner
Jason Olinek, Development Planner
Darren Lee, Senior Project Manager
Erica Tsang-Trinaistich, Project Facilitator

1661 Granville Street – DP-2021-00786 – (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Delegation
Russ Tyson (TyPlan)
Craig Douglas (FCYC)

470 Homer Street – DP-2021-00952 – (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Delegation

Recording Secretary: K. Cermeno

1. MINUTES APPROVED

The March 7, 2022 minutes were approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 1661 Granville Street - DP-2021-00786 - BCPED (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: TyPlan

Request: Alterations to the existing marina located at False Creek Yacht Club (FCYC) under the Granville Street Bridge, including the installation of an additional 6 new finger floats, relocation and expansion of the washroom structure within the City of Vancouver's lease area, and revision of surface parking stalls.

Opening Comments

Mr. Shayan, Development Planner, presented the proposal and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Applicant's Comments

The applicant began by presenting the design details of the proposal.

The applicant noted this proposal is a FCYC retrofit and renewal project objective to secure a 5 star rating from the BC Clean Marina program. The project is intended to address the long-term sustainability objectives by introducing eco friendly docks and implementing best practices on marine design.

The applicant noted their concern with the City's objective to extend the seawall and connection to the Marina. They are open to discussing in regards to who is responsible for the design and cost of the extension but their main concern is for a more sustainable marina and would like to move forward with this portion of the application.

The applicant noted to City staff they hope their project is not delayed due to the pending questions with the seawall, however the applicant understands a long-term solution is needed.

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

Comments from Speakers

Speaker 1, Mr. Jim Connolly, a resident of the neighbourhood and member of false creek yacht club.

Mr. Conley noted safety concerns with the proposed walkway coming together with a restricted passage, which appears as a driveway into an underground parking.

Mr. Conley noted there are service vehicles and garbage trucks that use this driveway and will be maneuvering back and forth with restricted visibility, which creates a safety concern to the pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Conley suggested leaving the access to the parking as it currently is and leave aside the proposal to go through the driveway.

Speaker 2, Tim Slater, noted the interactions between pedestrian and walkway seems generally manageable, however the issue is where the service vehicles drive in and reverse so they can unload, they are usually performing a 3 to 5 point turn. This should not be termed as a regular parking lot as it is an area for service vehicles with limited visibility. Mr. Slater noted upgrading the Marina and linking in to the seawall would create safety concerns and unnecessary high costs.

Speaker 3, Mr. Craig, noted in 2014 the engineering department was at this site and identified this plan had extreme safety issues and was no longer workable (the seawall portion), safety concerns included corrosion and collisions. Opening this area to the seawall will create a flood of bicycles, wheeled vehicles and confusion with pedestrians, in addition to a backing up of service vehicles.

Mr. Craig noted he does support the project moving forward with the improvement of the Marina and asks the board to separate the issue of the sea wall extension and validate the need for the Marina improvement.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wakelin noted his support for the principles of the project.

Mr. Wakelin noted the process to get the connection to the seawall is important however recommended further consultation. In regards to the amenity structure on the dock, recommended the building form and character be improved so as to be appropriate for a site so close to the public realm.

Mr. Biazi echoed Mr. Wakelin's comments.

Mr. Biazi noted support for securing the connection as part as this application.

Mr. Biazi noted it is not just a matter of opening the fence but overall design and materiality changes.

Mr. Biazi suggested if the service parking can be relocated so that it does not conflict with the pedestrian pathway.

Mr. Biazi noted support for the project with the conditions set forward.

Mr. Gordon noted his support for the project and the seawall project.

Mr. Vaness noted his support for the project but would like to see the connection through the parking area be provided in this project.

Ms. Krangle noted her uncertainty if the development of the sea wall connection should be at the responsibility of the applicant.

Ms. Krangle noted her support for the project and recommended a temporary walkway until further consultation is completed.

Board Discussion

Mr. LaClaire noted his support for the expansion of the marina and any parking relaxation the bylaw may trigger.

Mr. LaClaire recognized it is an unusual part of the seawall and encourage further consultation to create a safe pedestrian walkway.

Mr. LaClaire noted to the applicant the engineer department runs a number of right a ways and takes seriously to work with staff and applicants to create a design that is workable for everyone.

Ms. O'Donnell noted the conditions as written are satisfactory and noted her support for the application.

Ms. Law note her support for the project and the conditions as they are written.

Ms. Law noted her support for the walkway as it enhances the pedestrian realm.

In regards to safety concerns and interaction of pedestrian and vehicles Ms. Law noted her confidence that a solution can be found.

All board members voted in favour of the application to move forward.

Motion

The decision of the Board: THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application **DP-2021-00786** subject to the conditions in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated March 16, 2021.

4. 470 Homer St – DP-2021-00952 – DD (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Chard Development Ltd.

Request: To develop this site with a 6-storey plus basement mixed-use building with retail, office and restaurant uses at grade and office use on storeys 2 through 6 with surface parking at the basement level accessed via the rear lane. The proposal includes retention, rehabilitation and restoration of the 2 façades of the Hartney Chambers Vancouver Heritage 'B' building.

Opening Comments

Ms. Kobayashi, Development Planner, presented the proposal and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Applicant's Comments

The applicant noted in general they can work with staff and the conditions as presented, with the following exceptions:

1.1.(i) and 1.2 as they are quite descriptive with the setbacks and feel what is being presented is not tested and ask that staff revise these conditions and delete the prescriptive nature to find a more workable approach.

The challenges with the site is because of its corner location and unique slope when trying to meet the requested setbacks the project looks odd. The applicant would like to make the building look like a natural outgrowth of the site. It was subordinate to bring the project forward than stepping it back.

This project and approach was presented to the heritage commission, which they supported, and the vertical addition. The UDP also gave unanimous support for the design development and addition.

The applicant and City staff took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Comments from Speakers

Speaker 1, Emma Macklem, noted her support for the project. Vancouver has one of the lowest office vacancy rates nice too see a project providing more office space while preserving the heritage aspects.

Ms. Macklem looks forward to seeing the development of this area with mixed used buildings and believes the added presence will contribute to maintain the area clean and lively.

Speaker 2, Robin Buntain, a commercial real estate broker in Vancouver, noted his support for the project. Mr. Buntain noted coming back from pre pandemic, Vancouver has the lowest vacancy rates recorded so adding new office space to the market is important to attract and maintain organizations and keep them growing. Mr. Butane noted his appreciation for maintaining the heritage elements in the downtown core. Mr. Butane noted his support for the applicants request to revise the conditions regarding the required setbacks as this would shrink the floorplates.

Speaker 3, Colin Rose, noted his support for the project. Mr. Rose noted this development would revitalize the area and add much needed office space. Mr. Rose strongly supports the heritage review of the building.

Mr. Rose noted his support for the preservation of the interior heritage elements.

Speaker 4, Constantine Pappas, owner of the Pappas building, noted his support for the heritage retention of the façade. This proposal will have a positive impact to the community and will be a catalyst for more renewal and investment. Mr. Pappas noted the chard team should be commended for their overall design approach.

Mr. Pappas noted his support fort the design of the building and the applicants request to revise the conditions to allow for bigger floor space.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wakelin noted UDP was in support of the project as proposed.

Mr. Wakelin noted there was some language at UDP in regards to the livability of the adjacent units to the east, and strongly recommend the applicant to review this. There were comments from panel regarding concern of the aesthetic appearance in regards to the setback.

Mr. Biazi noted his appreciation to the applicant and staff.

Mr. Biazi noted his support for the project.

Mr. Biazi noted his confidence staff and the applicant will come to an appropriate resolution in regards to the setback and conditions.

Mr. Gordon noted his support for the project.

Mr. Vaness noted his support for the project.

Ms. Krangle noted her appreciation to the applicant and staff and support for the project.

Ms. Krangle noted there are some issues that require further discussion however, confident staff and applicant will come to a solution.

Ms. Krangle noted would like to see a CRU on the ground that will contribute to the animation of the street level.

Board Discussion

Ms. O'Donnell noted her appreciation to the applicant.

Ms. O'Donnell noted this is a great project

Ms. O'Donnell noted would like to see a higher level of conversation however confident this is workable.

Mr. LaClaire noted his support for the project and looks forward to see it moving forward.

Ms. Law noted her support for the project considering it follows the policies and guidelines of the project.

Ms. Law noted her support for the conditions and the amended conditions put forward by staff.

Ms. Law recognized the importance of the heritage conservation and noted the importance of the livability of the adjacent units and the importance of light and ventilation to these units.

All the board members voted in favor of the proposal.

Motion

The decision of the Board: THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application **DP-2021-00952** subject to the conditions in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated March 2, 2022 with the following amendments:

1. To EDIT condition 1.1(i) Note to Applicant on page 2 to read as follows:

“Note to Applicant: Since the Conservation Plan is limited to façade-only retention, the contemporary addition must achieve high level of architectural compatibility that reinforces the historic “saw tooth” street wall profile in Victory Square Area. As noted by the Urban

Design Panel, positioning the envelope of the contemporary addition directly above and along the entire length of the historic masonry parapet wall results in an unsympathetic interface. Further, it will require challenging envelope detailing that could unintentionally promote accelerated deterioration of the raised masonry parapet wall and projecting cornices over time. This condition does not preclude the applicant from working with staff, at the Prior To response stage, to explore alternate design solutions, which achieve the applicable urban design and heritage performance objectives. See also Urban Design condition 1.2.”

Meeting adjourned at 6:08pm.