

**Date:** Tuesday, November 9th, 2020  
**Time:** 3:00 p.m.  
**Place:** Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall & Webex

---

**PRESENT:****Board**

A. Law Director, Development Services  
P. Mochrie Deputy City Manager  
L. LaClaire General Manager, Engineering  
T. O'Donnell Deputy Director of Current Planning

**Advisory Panel**

J. Stamp Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
D. Pretto Representative of the Development Industry (excused from item # 2)  
N. Hayward Representative of the General Public  
M. Cree Smith Representative of the Design Professions

**Regrets**

K. May Representative of the General Public  
L. Shenkute Representative of the General Public  
P. Sihota Representative of the General Public  
C. Karu Representative of the Development Industry

**ALSO PRESENT:****City Staff:**

John Greer Assistant Director, Development Review Branch  
John Turecki Civil Engineer, Major Projects  
Alina Maness Landscape Development Planner, Landscape  
Paul Cheng Senior Development Planner, Urban Design & Development  
Grace Jiang Development Planner, Urban Design & Development

**349 W Georgia – DP-2019-00968- DD**

Aaron Petruic, Architect, Musson Cattell Mackey

**1805 Larch St – DP-2020-00385- CD-1**

Sheridan MacRae, Architect, METRIC Architecture  
Tony Pappajohn Jameson Development Corporation

**Recording Secretary:** M. Sem

---

**1. MINUTES APPROVED**

It was moved by Mr. Mochrie and seconded by Ms. O'Donnell and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on August 17th, 2020.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

**3. 349 W Georgia – DP-2019-00968- DD (COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Musson Cattell Mackey

Request: Additional Heritage Density by Heritage Amenity Share to the approved floor area in DP-2018-00380 including heritage density transfer from a donor site at 1285 West Pender.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Mr. Paul Cheng, Development Planner, presented the proposal and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report. The recommendation was for support of the application, subject to the conditions noted.

Mr. Paul Cheng took questions from the Board and Panel members.

**Applicant's Comments**

The applicant noted they are confident they can work with staff to meet the conditions for approval.

**Comments from Speakers**

No Speakers

**Panel Opinion**

Ms. Stamp has no comments on this project.

Ms. Cree-Smith noted it is an exciting project for downtown Vancouver.

Ms. Hayward has no comments on this project.

Ms. Pretto noted her support for the project.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. LaClaire noted he has no concerns or issues with the changes.

Mr. Mochrie noted he has no concerns or issues with the changes.

Ms. O'Donnell noted her support for the project.

**Motion**

It was moved by Ms. O'Donnell and seconded by Mr. Mochrie, and was the decision of the Board: THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application – DP-2019-00968- DD, subject to the in accordance with the Staff Committee Report.

- 4. Address: 1805 Larch St – DP-2020-00385- CD-1
- Applicant: Metric Architecture
- Request: To develop this site, considered under the Moderate Income Rental Housing Pilot Program (MIRHPP), with a 6-storey multiple dwelling containing a total of sixty-eight (68) dwelling units (20% of residential floor area allocated to MIRHPP) over two levels of parking having vehicular access from the lane and one partial level of underground storage, subject to Council resolution of the Form of Development.

**Opening Comments**

Development Planner, Ms. Grace Jiang presented the proposal and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report. The recommendation was for support of the application, subject to the conditions noted.

Ms. Grace Jiang took questions from the Board and Panel members.

**Applicant's Comments**

The applicant noted they are pleased with what was presented.

**Comments from Speakers**

Speaker # 1, Mr. Andrew Brown is a resident in the neighbourhood where development is taking place. His major concerns were the drawings and the finances for this project.

Mr. Brown noted the drawings that were submitted for rezoning showed the heritage building next to the subject property to the west as being taller than it actually is.

Mr. Brown noted based on his observation that the drawings were submitted incorrectly and did not reflect the reality of the consultation process. from the start due to the submission of this incorrect drawing; this is a serious matter and needs to be rectified.

Regarding the finances of the project Mr. Brown noted he would like to ask those who are privy to the finances to ensure the projections are based on current land values and that the City is not making it a land lift and

protecting developers and land speculators from the declines in property values that ordinary homeowners experience.

Mr. Brown asked the Board to respond to Council's direction to explore height and massing of the building, requiring a substantial reduction in height.

Speaker # 2, Mr. Stuart Rush, is a resident in the neighbourhood where development is taking place. His major concern was the height of the project.

Mr. Rush noted the developer has misrepresented the height of the building as a 5 storey structure when this application it is really a 6 storey building. He noted there has been no change in the actual height notwithstanding Council's direction to address the height and massing of the building.

Mr. Rush noted the rezoning was predicated on a building that was painted as a 5 storey structure. Council directed Metric and the planners to "explore the building massing, height" and "more compatible with the existing neighbourhood character."

Mr. Rush noted the Board should not approve the 6 storey proposal and send it back to the architects.

Mr. Rush noted the only way to achieve a better compatibility with the neighbourhood character is to reduce the height of the building.

Speaker # 3, Ms. Janet Buckles, is a resident in the neighbourhood where development is taking place. She addressed her concerns of the underground parking and lane access.

Ms. Buckles noted the building traffic in and out of the garage should only be encouraged through out of a large street. The lane is narrow and even more narrower as it reaches Trafalgar. The increased traffic at this very narrow exit will contribute to the safety of the cyclist. There are poor sight lines at exit to Trafalgar with vehicles parked both sides, Trafalgar is a narrow right-of-way. Exiting square onto the lane and travelling up the garage ramp can lead to blinding sun in drivers' eyes on sunny winter days making exit more hazardous.

Ms. Buckles suggests vehicles exiting from the development should be directed east up the lane to access Larch Street and should be prevented from accessing down the lower lane to Trafalgar Street. The garage entrance should be angled towards Larch as was done for the Trinity Place development right across Larch or a curb/bollard barrier could be used with signage.

Ms. Buckles noted there is insufficient space provided in the development plans for temporary truck parking in the lane, for refuse and recycling, for building and utility maintenance. The lane should be double width, two-way traffic, from the underground parking entrance up to Larch Street to prevent congestion and prevent the necessity for vehicles to reverse out of the lane due to blockage, endangering pedestrians and through traffic.

Ms. Buckles noted the DPAB report refers very briefly to the fact that the garbage collection process is not yet being established. The current plan of keeping garbage inside and outside of the collection might not work from the neighbourhood perspective. The two homes of the south east corner of the lane will be either completely locked in and out of the parking during a potential lengthy garbage collection period. If the collection is to be changed and moved outside it will have a direct impact on the front doors of the units on the building's ground floor. She noted this is a problem that needs to be solved before the final approval of this project.

Regarding public amenity space, Ms. Buckles noted the Planners have said that a statutory right-of-way will be created to enable the site to be built. It is not clear who will be giving the right-of-way and so it remains ambiguous as to how the site will be set up. She noted emphasis is placed on the roof amenity area to enhance opportunities for creative play and socialization however this is not for public access. The requirement was that the space should ensure public access with substantial opportunities for neighbourhood socialization.

Ms. Buckles noted the benches provided for public use don't meet the requirements. The public amenity space is to be a child's play area and a place for community socialization. In the proposal the two separate public spaces have been brought together and over-lapped. There is no indication how people other than children will be able to use the site. The public amenity space remains undefined and incomplete with no clear proposal.

Ms. Buckles noted there is no details about the specific place the public amenity is to be located on the site.

Ms. Buckles is requesting the requirements be fulfilled before issuing a development permit for this property.

Speaker # 4, Ms. Judy Osburn, is a resident in the neighbourhood where development is taking place. She addressed her concerns with the design of the entrance/exit of cars onto the laneway.

Ms. Osburn noted the laneway between Larch and Trafalgar Streets is extremely narrow. It measures barely 11 feet in width between the houses where it reaches Trafalgar. A pedestrian or cyclist, heading up or down this laneway must pull right over to the side to keep out of the way of traffic using this route. If they are heading down the hill toward Trafalgar and a car heads up the lane, there is little if no room to pull over.

Ms. Osburn noted the developers have included 126 spaces for bicycles in the Larch building. Trafalgar Street is a designated and well used cycling route. The obvious route for most of those cyclists leaving and entering this building is along the laneway to and from Trafalgar Street. If 42 vehicles are added which will also have access to the laneway from this building to enter and exit this will create problems.

Ms. Osburn noted she appreciates adding more bicycle parking and bicycles should get priority but does not support 42 cars heading up and down the lane along side bicycles.

Ms. Osburn is requesting the Board to consider this issue and direct the architects to do what they said they could do and have yet to address.

Speaker # 5, Ms. Esther Alexander is a resident in the neighbourhood where development is taking place. She addressed the mis-representation of the number of floors for this project.

Ms. Alexander noted her recommendation to reduce the six floors for this project to five floors by removing the roof deck.

Ms. Alexander noted the results and financial savings will cover the costs of re-instating all the three-bedroom family units especially since they are so much more important to the project than the roof deck.

Ms. Alexander noted a proposed playground on the roof seems extraneous unsafe compared to the on ground playground that the city asked for when approving the rezoning change.

Ms. Alexander noted the savings and building costs can be re-directed for other considerations such as building operating costs, the elimination of the roof deck will result in enormous savings in insurance, maintenance, landscaping and extra roofing costs and repairs etc.

Ms. Alexander noted the benefit of keeping the roof deck is it adds to the potential sale price of the property,

Ms. Alexander noted a request for applicant to go back to the drawing board and complete the submission.

Speaker # 6, Bonny Norton is a resident in the neighbourhood where development is taking place. She the noted the project of this scale is in no way compatible with the look and feel of neighbourhood.

Ms. Norton suggests the applicant changing the roof deck to help the building fit into the neighbourhood.

Speaker # 7, Ms. Katerina Doumakis, is a resident in the neighbourhood where development is taking place. Her main concerns are the rain access and amenity space.

Ms. Doumakis noted her vehicle gets locked in from the trucks making it challenging to take her car out. She has to park her vehicle at the front because they are blocked in by the lane due to the trucks. She noted there is no information on how much congestion these trucks are going to bring.

Ms. Doumakis noted concerns with noise and disruption the amenity space will cause to the neighbours.

Ms. Doumakis is requesting the neighbourhood around the construction site be kept informed and communicated to regarding the noise and disruption.

Speaker # 8, Mr. Peter Saunderson, is a resident in the neighbourhood where development is taking place. He is concern with there being too much traffic on the lane and suggest a reduction in the congestion on the lane.

Mr. Mochrie asked staff regarding a reference to the error to the original drawings from the applicant. Mr. Mochrie is asking staff how that was addressed at the public hearing or if it was still outstanding at that point.

Planning staff presented the before and after drawings that addressed the updated rezoning conditions.

Ms. O'Donnell asked Planning staff to confirm these were early drawings, the applicant submitted revised drawings, city council was presented with original and revised drawings, during public hearing, it was made clear that they were not incorrect drawings; that it was correct the drawings and they did their evaluations based on the correct set of drawings and correct height. Panning staff confirmed this is correct.

Mr. Mochrie asked Engineering to address the comments from Speakers regarding the traffic and the lane.

Engineering staff, noted the following:

- Regarding, the drive way location on the lane, after reviewing the drawings, they are fairly good site lines at that drive way location, there is a setback from the edge of the lane, the walls of the ramp on either side are pulled back from the lane. Reviewing the site lines there are no concerns.
- The lane itself will be re-paved. This application is part of a service agreement and one of the conditions of rezoning - to improve the surfaces that is there. It is best practise to have a perpendicular driveway, not a situation where the drive way is skewed and encouraging people to making multi point turns.
- Regarding the traffic going west towards Trafalgar, the lane is quite narrow and one vehicle direction, this development is located adjacent to Larch that the lane is being repaved out to Larch and that will draw the vast majority of traffic out to that direction.
- Engineering does not see any concerns

Ms. O'Donnell asked staff to clarify on the outdoor amenity play space, referencing the condition "to explore the opportunity to provide outdoor amenity space for children's play and community socialization".

Planning staff noted they need to seek advice from Parks Board. Council did ask staff to seek to explore opportunity to provide public amenity space. This stems from the existing playground along W.2nd. Under the DP application staff found there is opportunity to provide public amenity space on site on the north east corner of the site. Staff will work with applicant to find a solution to address the Council's direction.

Mr. Mochrie asked staff to clarify on the management of the amenity space.

Planning staff noted that is Council's direction that this is a public amenity, secured public access is the key.

Engineering staff noted the shared right away is the most appropriate tool to secure public access on private property.

### **1) Panel Opinion**

Ms. Stamp shared the comments and recommendations from UDP at both the rezoning and DP stage.

Ms. Cree-Smith noted she has no comments.

Ms. Hayward noted her initial concerns with the setback from 3 to 10 feet.

Ms. Hayward appreciates the porch door entries and community feel.

Ms. Hayward noted she questions with the size of the amenity space.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. Lon LaClaire acknowledged Speakers who attended this meeting virtually to speak on the project.

Mr. LaClaire noted the changes were substantial and the height is relevant.

Mr. LaClaire noted he is satisfied with the comments from Engineering regarding the sight lines and changes to the lane.

Mr. LaClaire noted regarding changes the neighbourhood would like to see, Engineering department is welcome to feedback if other issues arise such as if people are seeing actual safety concerns at the lane or have issues with parking on the streets.

Mr. LaClaire supports the project.

Mr. Mochrie acknowledged staff and applicant for presentation of the project.

Mr. Mochrie acknowledged Speakers who attended this meeting virtually to speak on the project.

Mr. Mochrie acknowledged this building is a big change to the neighbourhood. He noted the Board does not have the authority to reduce the size of the building. Council has approved the density for the site. The Board is limited to operating within the conditions that Council has already set which include the amenity space on the top floor.

Mr. Mochrie noted he appreciates seeing the work that has gone into the feasibility of lane access and acknowledged project will change the traffic pattern for the lane.

Mr. Mochrie noted Council's policy goal of wanting to provide rental housing with a proportion to family size units and 20% reserved for people with moderate incomes. This projects achieves this goal.

Mr. Mochrie supports this project.

Ms. O'Donnell concurs with Mr. Mochrie and Mr. Le Clare.

Ms. O'Donnell acknowledged Speakers who attended this meeting virtually to speak on the project.

Ms. O'Donnell acknowledged UDP significant role and making this a better project.

Ms. O'Donnell acknowledged Applicant's patient and cooperation.

Ms. O'Donnell acknowledged City Staff for leading the project.

Ms. O'Donnell supports this project.

**Motion**

The decision of the Board: THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application – DP-2020-00385- CD-1, subject to the in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated Oct 14, 2020.