

Date: September 19, 2022
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Virtual, Webex

PRESENT:**Board**

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

Advisory Panel

M. Biazl Representative of the Design Professional
B. Wakelin Representative of the Urban Design Panel
K. Krangle General Public
C. Vaness General Public

Regrets:

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

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

J. Olinek, Urban Design & Development Planning
J. Parks, Urban Design & Development Planning
D. Robinson, Urban Design & Development Planning
J. Greer, Development Services
C. Chant, Engineering Services
J. Borsa, Development Services
P. Fouladianpour, Development Services

315 Main Street – DP-2021-00795 – DEOD - (COMPLETE APPLICATION)
605 Beach Crescent - DP-2021-00192 – CD-1 - (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Recording Secretary: M.Sem

1. MINUTES APPROVED

It was moved by Ms. Law and seconded by Mr. LaClaire and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting for September 6, 2022.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 315 Main Street – DP-2021-00795 – DEOD - (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: MA+HG Architects

Request: To develop this site with an 11 storey mixed use building containing retail, restaurant, school, office, theatre and 118 dwelling units (social housing), all over one level of underground parking having vehicular access from the lane.

Opening Comments

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

Applicant's Comments

The applicant will work with staff to meet the conditions for approval.

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

Comments from Speakers

No Speakers

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wakelin noted this project was supported by UDP. Based on the conditions put forward in the staff report which are consistent with the recommendations put forward by UDP, Mr. Wakelin noted support for the project.

Mr. Biazi noted appreciation for the massing, colour cladding, livability, landscape, amenities and addition of social housing spaces and noted support for this project.

Mr. Biazi suggested looking at the lighting design for the laneway.

Mr. Khan noted regrets to losing an existing theatre space but commended the applicant team for providing a variety of amenities to this project.

Ms. Krangle noted this project will be a great addition to the community especially with the attention to family housing and affordability and noted her support for the project.

Board Discussion

Ms. Law thanked the staff team and noted support for the project.

Ms. Law noted appreciation for the re-integration of theatre space into this development.

Ms. Law noted appreciation for some of the emerging themes coming out of the community engagement – the importance of accessibility and belonging, as well as the flexible indoor space as it relates to the building design.

Mr. LaClaire noted appreciation for the addition of the learning centre, the theatre, the retail and livability of units available in this building and noted support for project.

Ms. O'Donnell acknowledged it is a great project and noted support for the project

Motion

The decision of the Board: THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application **DP-2021-00795** subject to the conditions in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated August 17, 2022.

4. 605 Beach Crescent - DP-2021-00192 – CD-1 - (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: GBL Architects Inc.

Request: To develop this site with a 53-storey mixed-use building with retail and dwelling uses at grade and 455 dwelling units consisting of 152 social housing units on levels 1 through 6 and 303 market residential units on levels 7 through 53, all over 3 levels of underground parking, having vehicular access from Beach Crescent subject to Council enactment of the CD-1 By-Law and approval of the Form of Development.

Opening Comments

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

Applicant's Comments

The applicant will work with staff to meet the conditions for approval.

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

Comments from Speakers

Speaker # 1, Jessica Stuart noted the following concerns she has with the project:

1. The first is the project's relationship with Seymour Mews. For much of the development permit process, the mews has felt like an afterthought. Conditions of rezoning regarding the mews still have not been fully met at the development permit stage. Residents want to ensure that serious effort is made to thoughtfully integrate this project's eastern elevation with the existing fabric of the mews.
 - While some positive changes have been made at the ground level of Seymour Mews after similar comments from the urban design panel, there are still concerns. There still appears to be very little thought or exploration around the interface and scale between the nine-storey podium, the 53 storey tower, and how they relate to the existing two- storey townhouses to the east on the southern portion of Seymour Mews. The podium and tower are not set back or staggered from the existing townhouses in a meaningful way nor is there much delineation in this section of the podium which, as a result, will essentially create the appearance and feeling of a solid wall for anyone approaching or looking west across Seymour Mews. The scale and design of this nine-storey podium is not harmonious with the existing condition and pedestrian scale of development along the southern section of Seymour Mews.
 - In the staff report, staff say this concern has been addressed as follows: "The expression of the tower to grade along the mews has been revised and both architectural lighting and large feature canopies have been added to further improve the relationship between the tower and podium."
 - Further, it appears the application has simply mirrored the ground level townhouse typology on the southern end of Seymour Mews with little thought about scale, materials, and vegetation. The issues with this particular interface concern scale, use, access, circulation, vegetation, light, and more, and many of the issues still exist and need to be meaningfully explored and addressed.
 - Lastly, I wanted to ensure that that a minimum 15 meter setback between faces was achieved on the mews as per section 3.1 c of the Beach Neighbourhood CD-1 Guidelines. I could not find this setback measurement in the drawings provided.
2. The second issue I would like to raise are safety concerns with increased traffic along Beach Crescent and the proposed driveway adjacent to Seymour Mews. While the staff report notes that a transportation study was completed and determined that this tower would have no negative impact to traffic or safety in the area, residents are still concerned. At present, there are frequent close calls with cars, pedestrians and cyclists along this portion of Beach Crescent at also at the Richards and Pacific intersection. With the addition of 1000+ residents,

457 cars, and 929 cyclists from this tower, these safety concerns will only increase. This is particularly concerning because there are many families and children in the area.

- Residents implore staff to take our safety concerns seriously and require the applicant to take meaningful steps to mitigate potential conflict between vehicles and pedestrians in the area.
 - In particular, for the design of the project driveway, serious exploration needs to occur and safety measures should be implemented to ensure there is no conflict between pedestrians (especially children) along Beach Crescent and Seymour Mews and cars exiting the proposed driveway. For example, will the plazas to the east and west of the driveway create blind spots for drivers if there are pedestrians sitting in these plazas or if drivers use these plazas to illegally park temporarily? The UDP also expressed concern with safety and the driveway at their October 2021 meeting yet did not touch on this again at the meeting in April 2022 despite the driveway appearing mostly unchanged.
 - Consultants may face liability for those accidents.
3. The final concern I wanted to raise is to ask how the applicant and the City are contributing towards daycares and schools that will be needed in the area for the new children living in this tower. While it is wonderful that the applicant has provided social housing as part of its community contribution, these new residents will need somewhere for their children to go to school. I kindly ask staff to outline where the children living in this tower will go to daycare and school and how this project is helping contribute towards those community facilities? If the applicant is not required to contribute towards these facilities, who will?

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wakelin noted this project came to UDP three times – twice it was recommended for resubmission and the third time it was supported by panel. Mr. Wakelin noted the recent material submitted by applicant would not be sufficient for some of the recommendations that have been put forward by panel but based on the presentation and recommendations put forward by staff he is confident they understand the issues and where the project needs to get to and noted support for the project.

Mr. Biazi agreed with Mr. Wakelin that the project could still use some further design development and is confident applicant and staff can work to address the concerns recommended by UDP and noted support for the project.

Ms. Krangle agreed with Mr. Biazi and Mr. Wakelin that the project could use further design development, in particular the podium and improvement to the public realm and noted support for the project.

Board Discussion

Ms. Law thanked staff, panel, applicant and speaker for their comments.

Ms. Law noted it is great to see a significant high quality development being proposed on this site and noted support for the project.

Mr. LaClaire thanked staff, panel, applicant and UDP's comments in helping shape the project.

Mr. LaClaire thanked speaker for her comments in particular regarding the Seymour Mews. He is confident staff and applicant can work together to refine the neighborliness and experience of the Mews.

Mr. LaClaire noted support for the project.

Ms. O'Donnell thanked staff, panel, applicant and speaker.

Ms. O'Donnell recommended amendment to condition A.1.26 to include - provision **to the greatest extent feasible** of the minimum 2.43 m (8 ft.).

Ms. O'Donnell noted support for the project.

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

Motion

The decision of the Board: THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application **DP-2021-00192** subject to the conditions in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated August 17, 2022, with the following amendment:

Change wording to condition A.1.26 to include - *to the greatest extent feasible*:

A.1.26 provision **to the greatest extent feasible** of the minimum 2.43 m (8 ft.) clear floor-to-ceiling heights in the social housing ASP free of obstructions and projections including lighting and sprinkler heads in all circulation areas including corridors, common use areas including amenity, program and office spaces, as well as inside the units in living and dining rooms and bedrooms;

Change provision of A.1.27 from 2.43 m (8 ft.) to *2.74 m (9 ft.)*:

A.1.27 provision of a **2.74 m (9 ft.)** clear floor-to-ceiling height in the amenity room;