

Date: Monday, Sept 4, 2018
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT:

Board

A. Law	Director, Development Services, (Chair)
J. Dobrovlny	General Manager of Engineering
P. Mochrie	Deputy City Manager Item #1
S. Singh	General Manager, Arts, Culture, & Community Services Item #2
A. Molaro	Assistant Director of Urban Design

Advisory Panel

D. Neale	Representative of the Design Professionals (Urban Design Panel)
M. Norfolk	Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission
D. Pretto	Representative of the General Public
R. Rohani	Representative of the General Public
S. Allen	Representative of the General Public

Regrets

G. Kelley	General Manager of Planning, Urban Design & Sustainability
A. Brudar	Representative of the Design Professionals (Urban Design Panel)
R. Chaster	Representative of the General Public
B. Jarvis	Representative of the Development Industry
R. Wittstock	Representative of the Design Professions
J. Greer	Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development

ALSO PRESENT:

City Staff:

P. Cheng	Development Planner
M. Au	Assistant Director of Services Center - Development
D. Autiero	Project Facilitator
A. Cheng	Engineering
N. Szeto	Engineering

349 W Georgia St (Post Office)- DP-2018 00380-DD
Delegation
Mark Thomson, Architect, MCMP

1551 Quebec St - DP-2018-00406-CD-1
Delegation
Patrick Cotter , ZGF
Ford Rafii, Architect, Racfii Architects
Brian Mcaovey, Owner/Developer, Concert

Recording Secretary: K.Cermeno

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Dobrovolny seconded by Mr. Mochrie and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on July 23, 2018.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 349 W Georgia St (Post Office) - DP-2018-00380-DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Musson Cattell Mackey

Request: To develop the site with two office towers (21 and 22 storey) with the retention of the Post Office façade and structure containing commercial and parking uses. The proposal includes a Heritage Density Transfer.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

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

Applicant's Comments

We have been working with the city cooperatively and appreciate the collegial atmosphere from staff. Very happy to proceed and continue working together.

Comments from other Speakers

No Speakers

Panel Opinion

Mr. Neale noted nothing contrary in the motion against the consensus of the Urban Design panel.

Mr. Neale noted there was some mixed comments in regards to how the building sits on top of the heritage building on Georgia St. Some felt it was controlled and respectful of the heritage structural grid and others thought it should not be doing that.

Mr. Neale noted the plans were skillfully handled and how they fit into the existing building, including the atrium and the amount of natural light introduced. This was a large heritage building repurposed into something beneficial.

Mr. Neale noted there is much improvement to the public realm.

Mr. Neale noted comments around the industry changing, hi-tec is rising, and the fact the architects were able to retain so much of the building, the structure itself, was supported.

Ms. Allen noted the statutory right away is a good suggestion for that public access. Wheelchair accessibility for the top of the plaza would be good to ensure it happened.

Ms. Allen commended social policy for capturing funding for a daycare.

Mr. Norfolk noted the heritage commission's support. This was received as a positive development.

Mr. Norfolk noted the setback at the conjunction between the old and new is not consistent. The commission members like the distinction to be quite firm, the one storey setback should be consistent all way around.

Mr. Rohani noted it was a fantastic project.

Mr. Rohani noted with a lot of heritage buildings you get a façade that kills the heritage however in this project it was well done. Wish it were a bit taller, limited in office space in downtown. Understand the view cone issues but seems like a missed opportunity for more density and office space.

Ms. Pretto noted this is an incredible project that took an unfriendly asset and made it very usable.

Mrs. Pretto noted more public space will be beneficial to the area.

Mrs. Pretto noted the way the uses have been mixed is very well done, particularly given the large floor plates.

Mrs. Pretto notes she is looking forward to see the automated bike system.

Board Discussion

Ms. Molaro recommended moving to approving the project.

Mr. Dobrovolny seconded.

Ms. Molaro noted her acknowledgement to the architects and property owner. This building is an incredible asset to the city and applicant team did a remarkable job respecting the building.

Ms. Molaro noted the contribution to the daycare is much appreciated.

Mr. Mochrie noted his support.

Mr. Mochrie noted when the project is completed will make a major difference in the downtown area.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted his support

Mr. Dobrovolny congratulated the design team and their work.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted Initial concerns with the retaining of the heritage and parts of the buildings however the end product is unique and a well done design.

Motion

It was moved by Ms. Molaro and seconded by Mr. Mochrie, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DP-2018-00380-DD, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated August 8, 2018, with the following amendments:

- i) Recommended Condition 1.5, to remove the word "full", new condition reads:

1.5 provision of a surface Statutory Right of Way (SRW) to allow public access to the proposed new plaza off Georgia Street;

- ii) Engineering Condition A.2.2 to be modified to the following:

A.2.2 arrangements are to be made to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and the Director of Legal Services for the decommissioning (infill) of the remnant portion of the disused mail tunnel within the Dunsmuir Street building line area (shown on page DP202) to be dedicated as road;"

Note to Applicant: Refer to the Structures Engineer, Dane Doleman (604-871-6930), to determine the requirements for decommissioning the remnant portion of the mail tunnel.

- iii) Engineering Condition A.2.3 to be modified to the following "existing and required new structure below and above grade":

A.2.3 arrangements (legal agreements) are to be made to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and the Director of Legal Services for all building elements which encroach onto City property (including those post-dedication);

Note to Applicant: The encroachments such as the decorative precast concrete panels which sit proud of the rest of the façade at levels 4 to 7 **existing and required new structure below and above grade**, the 3 existing aluminum-clad canopies, and the relocated "Postman" sculpture. The sizable anodized aluminum frames proposed on the two new towers to encroach over Hamilton, Homer & the ultimate Dunsmuir property line will also require standard encroachment arrangements. Note: an application to the City Surveyor is required. To enable permit issuance a letter of commitment, to enter into a City standard encroachment agreement, is required. For general information, see the Encroachment Guide (http://vancouver.ca/files/cov/building_encroachment_guide.pdf).

- iv) Bullet point #5 of Engineering Condition A.2.13 to be changed to the following to clarify that the improvements are directly related to the site:
- “Improved curb ramps and pedestrian crossings directly adjacent to the site at the following intersections:
 - o Dunsmuir and Homer
 - o Georgia and Homer
 - o Georgia and Hamilton”

3. 1551 Quebec St - DP-2018-00406-CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Concert Properties

Request: To develop the site with a 17-storey, residential building, over three levels of underground parking with access off of Switchmen Street.

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. Cheng took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Applicant’s Comments

There was an expectation that this design would go on a path of redesign to meet the landmark path and belief that the design has been carried through to a level of architectural significance that is appropriate and embedded in the history of the site.

The staff report itemized a series of conditions, one being a reduction of mass from levels 10 - 13. Coming up with the final design we have already left about 6000 square feet of buildable density off the table, this is under the density permitted. This was a commitment to give the design integrity in its shape and form, therefore a further reduction in mass would mean an even further reduction in the density.

In respect to the shading to the park at 10:00am there is a bit of missing context. We actually manipulated the massing of the building in its rotation to the site in many different ways. The goal was to achieve a net increase of daylight hours to the park, and we ended up decreasing the amount of shading to the park by 12 percent. The second was a study of U-impacts to also achieve a net increase of the site lines around the property.

We are happy to accept the condition of modifying the building massing, recognizing that on all of the other conditions we would not want similar moves that could undermine the integrity of the design. In respect to the floor plate size and how that massing reduction is achieved it is never quite as simple as taking from one area and plugging into another. We are requesting an acceptance of the design condition with flexibility from staff staff on the execution of the remaining conditions (example flexibility on the floor plate size).

Another component to the integrity of the design we are noting we are not compliant with is the size and location of the mechanical penthouse and elevator over run. We suggest having a clear concept on how to integrate this then a more difficult modification.

The condition of the exterior detailing, we are happy to continue developing those details; however we believe it is there. The building is strongly connected to its history and site concept on both its smaller and larger building massing scale. There is a risk to adding detail and relocation density. The building presently has a feel of elegance, finesse, simplicity, and landmark status, that we would not want to lose. The shared goal is to maintain the design integrity and landmark status.

It was noted that at the public open house, there was a good amount of attendance and support.

Mr. Dobrovolny questioned what is being looked for when asked for flexibility in all the other conditions?

The applicant noted that staff have proposed a series of very specific design revisions, and they are requesting for more general conditions that would allow the applicant team to explore options that would be consistent with the present design approach and still achieve what collectively is wanted to be achieved.

Comments from other Speakers

Speaker one, Charles Bilash, on behalf of Chris and Carmen Grant, owners at the Lido, asked the DPB to consider the following: they purchased the apartment in 2017 and moved in mid-January of this year. What sold us on the place was the view. While doing our due diligence and inquired with the sellers we were told that the development plans of the site across the street was an 18 storeys tower on the north end of the site beside a lower 9 storey podium, and on the south end of the site aligned with a 3 storey town house. We decided, based on this information, that although there would be a bit of view compromise it was acceptable.

Mere months after moving in, we were notified what is being proposed is a new form of development including a single monolithic 17 storey wall stretching across the entire site. This will, and for many of the residents at the Lido, will block our view, reduce our property value, our connection with False Creek and sense of community.

Also, please consider City council's own condition of approval on form of development for the site which has been in place since June of 2014. Regardless of the long standing City conditions the board is on the cusp of approval. The slab wall does not meet any of the city's primary development conditions. The city's conditions mandated maximization of use but what is presented today is a minimization of use. Instead of the city mandating a building of east/west orientation there is wall that runs north and south.

The city council has said they want to protect views and achieve landmark status while respecting the surrounding buildings; this has not been achieved,

Speaker two, Richard Cook, registered Professional Planner since 1979, representing Ms. Julia Roudakova, owner at the Lido condominium building. Mr. Cook noted many of the owners share the same concerns he will express.

For owners of the Lido the alarming concerns are the major alteration from the form of development approved by council in both 2014 and 2015, which they relied very much on when purchasing their units. Even in the applicant's own view submission there is substantial loss of water views from levels 10-15, and the city distant view above. We calculated this to be a significant 44% reduction of the framed views from 5 floors in the northwest corner of the Lido. In addition, there is a significant 24% view reduction from the 5 floors located above, resulting in a multitude of owners radically impacted. In the 2014 staff report to council, an 18 storey building height is supported with a tower set on the north edge to maximize spacing. Highlights of the staff report were spacing for improved views and building orientation in an east-west direction, creating appropriate gaps. The current proposal completely abandoned the east-west direction and a wall edifice replaces the gap. The City's balanced accommodation of neighbouring concerns has been abandoned. This application violated the clear Council direction in its entirety. There is much decrease in public benefit and increase of devastating impact of the Lido residents achieved.

If approved, this development will intrude into the living spaces of the Lido residents; result in permanent, major reductions in light access and views, and the loss of millions of dollars of framed water-views value. Staff recommendations, while highlighting the need for a fundamental change, do not respect or recognize the depth of the issue. The tower should be shifted northwards as contemplated by the public process and approved by Council in 2014 & 2015. The consequence of this process will be to have robbed Lido owners and reward the applicant. We also have a number of concerns in regards to process, such as, lack of community awareness, notification, engagement, and available information/resources. We respectfully ask the Board to reconsider this application and defer for refinement to the project design to avoid major reduction in light and views to the Lido owners, now having to challenge an abrupt turnaround when they had relied in good faith on a plan adopted by the elected council. We ask you to exercise your discretion to do the right thing. We are willing partners.

Speaker 3, Mark Weintraub, on behalf of Ms. Julia Rodacova, shared the statements of Mr. Cook. Ms. Rodacova moved into her unit in December of 2015. She has been waiting patiently for the project to end for several years. She likes Concert and Lido as a developer. However, it is with a sense of disappointment and betrayal for her with the direction of this proposal.

Ms. Rodacova immigrated to Canada 22 years ago, worked hard as a single mother to raise her daughter and saved up for a down payment to purchase a home for her daughter and her. She thought she was buying a property with reasonable expectations of minor amendments that are in fact in the bylaw. Now the rules of the game have changed. She is now despairingly faced with the decision of having to move despite the amount of time and money investment or live across from a building that will have ongoing negative impacts.

Before purchasing, she did her due diligence of the developments across the street, and was told that the plans are being revised to ensure minimal obstruction to views, a plan that was in conjunction with the forms of development approved by City Council. Mr. Weintraub echoed Mr. Cook's comments on the lack of process by the City and applicant team to notify and engage the public. The staff report conditions does not undo the serious damage to light and views and most important to trust the integrity of the DPB process.

Speaker 4, Dave Heel, echoed the previous speaker's comments and read an insert of Mr. Cook's notes. "We acknowledge we are supplicants to the Board's processes and authority. Somewhere in 2017 the design rules for this site all changed, apparently under staff direction and only the barest of public processed by any contemporary standard engagement were

undertaken for the substantive changes and not before you. We have a number of concerns regarding the process such as:

- The lack of notice for the Open House and website access to the Open House boards or summary findings;
- Found no reference to the Open House staff report;
- No options have been presented for public comment;
- There are conflicting notices on the City's website for the date of this inexplicable deferred meeting;
- There was a lack of public availability of staff recommendations and hundreds of pages of material significant documents available only a couple working days before this meeting;
- Staff report was not made available until August 29, 2018;
- Verbal directives were given to limit our presentation to 5 minutes with no power point style visuals allowed as they would be 'disruptive';
- Where was the Citizen's Planning Committee for a major permit;
- In the critically relevant view submission, the schematic has a made-up and fuzzified background and is confusingly labelled 'From Lido/14th floor' when there is no 14 floor on the Lido, where is the view from and can it be relied upon?

Where are the procedural fairness and the authentic community engagement substantive impact on light, views and values for the Lido neighbours? It would be no small irony of the City which has petitioned Court for procedural fairness would then not apply these same principles of fairness to this particular situation."

Mr. Heel noted it does feel a BC ferry has been pulled up on the shore and parked there. Mr. Heel understands the amount of work put into it but urges the panel to consider the negative impacts and request a redesign.

Speaker 5, J.P. Boggin, owner at the Lido, understands the city is looking for a Landmark building. Mr. Boggin noted landmark status is achieved through its design. I urge you to rethink how landmark status is achieved in more considerate and innovative design that does not have so many negative impacts. A second point related to the height of the building, if you take into account the structure that sits on top it actually is much higher than the Lido building. The net effect is that it completely obstructs the view of every single resident at the Lido, including the view to False Creek end (the water) and Science World.

We bought on reliance of the city council policies put in place in 2014/2015 and it was not an inexpensive purchase. Can appreciate the work of the applicant put into the design however it really destroys and blocks all the views of the Lido. Urge the panel to consider all the individuals that spent a lot of money and look at how it affects quality of life.

Speaker 6, Ray Chu, Engineer who lives in the neighbourhood, questioned the Landmark status? Mr. Chu noted the proposed new building is not consistent or aligned with the other buildings in the neighbourhood. The proposal blocks the view of many of the neighbours. Mr. Chu noted the board should be sensitive and concerned with the public opinion to the development. Mr. Chu asked the board to reconsider approving as the approval will only benefit the greed of the developer. Mr. Chu noted a design with a smaller footprint that would continue the consistency of the neighbourhood is better suited.

Speaker 7, Neil Arbogast, owner at the Lido building, noted his disagreement with the originals and revised plans. Mr. Arbogast noted the ongoing process of the development is shaky and not

very clear. Both plans blocked the view corridors to Science World, North False Creek, and the north shore mountains. Both plans violate the City's own conditions of improvement on forms of development dealing with this corridor; the new plan is a complete blockage. There is lots of talk around a landmark, already have a landmark that is Science World.

Where the new building will go should blend in the park like setting and it blocks the park and views to the park. The building plan is inconsistent with the rest of buildings that surround the park. The corner where the revised building is located is one of the busier corners, this is park area that provides access to many areas of use and recreation, and now there will be deep shadows, no views, and a feeling of enclosure. Mr. Arbogast encouraged the City to deny the revised application and allow all Vancouverites continue to have access to the public areas and viewpoints. This revised plan is a huge departure from the original plan. This new design is a huge block with no architectural appeal which was the original goal. Request the panel to deny the revised request and look back at the original or an entirely new proposal.

Speaker 8, Gracen Sankster, has a background on historic buildings around the world, noted there is nothing of this building that fits the criteria of an iconic building. An iconic building represents the community and history. The building is not representing the individuals that live in that area, instead it blocks views and create a disconnected community by taking away social spaces and increase congestion of traffic.

Ms. Sankster came across a setting of what the Olympic City village stands for, "one of the greenest communities in the world making Vancouver a leader in development, especially in solar panels." this buildings does not represent this meaning especially with the dark glass that will heat up the area, which will essentially take away the wildlife and heat up the waters. Why are we putting a building that is going to destroy the nature of the area? Ms. Sankster noted reasons she moved into the area was for the lack of concrete and vast greenery, this proposal is only creating a concrete area. This project is not small it is huge it takes up a quarter of the Olympic village, if you want to put up a building that will destroy the community and not benefit anyone from the community, this is your building.

Speaker 9, Jim Tesha, noted this proposal is about integrity. The revised plan not the original plan. Mr. Tesha noted that his nephew, Jeremy Farkas, a City Councillor in Calgary has accomplished a lot with integrity. Mr. Tesha noted the Steveston fiasco where Onni came in with an original plan, then revised the plan and the City of Richmond stepped in enforcing the original plan. Mr. Tesha noted this example should be enforced with Concert; the original plan should be followed through. Mr. Tesha urged the panel to make a decision that is based on integrity.

Speaker 10, Anette Lebraus, noted she has attended a number of meetings. Back in 2012 she purchased a pre-build unit at Lido, and at the time the City promise was Olympic village was staying 10-12 storeys and the barrier would be Quebec St. However four years back the heights started going up, and has seen a lot of differences. This proposal is a lack of openness to the street and the building is really a big "screw you" to the rest of the community. This is not Vancouver striving to build a better community as the city states.

Speaker 11, Mr. Dominic Ingriano, a retired architectural technologist and lives in the Lido building, noted the only thing that would relate this building to the railroad history is if a helicopter was placed on top of the building. The staff or applicant at no point mentioned the neighbours and individuals around the building. There was also no talk about Leed requirement. It is just another glass building in Vancouver. It appears the revised proposal is just a better buck for the hands of the developers. Mr. Ingriano noted with a bit of imagination

from the architectural firm with the original proposal could come up with something that makes sense. The wall that is being proposed has taken the Lido from False Creek to East Vancouver which is a huge financial bang on the residents and no one else.

Questions of staff

Ms. Molaro asked staff to clarify about the open house process requirement.

Development planner, Mr. Cheng, noted during the process after a development permit application has been made, an open house is hosted. For this particular application the Open house happened earlier, because of the change to the form of development staff encouraged the applicant to host an open house before submitting their application in order to test the waters and see the level of acceptance this building would be viewed upon and gaged the level of concern.

Mr. Cheng noted Staff did attend the pre-application open house and there was quite a bit of attendance and staff did review all the comment forms received. From the open house feedback the majority liked the revised design and a small contingent of individuals, particularly from the Lido, were concerned with the loss of views.

Mr. Cheng noted that after considering the responses from the pre-application open house, Staff recommended the applicant proceed with their application.

Mr. Cheng noted it was not until about two weeks after the draft report being available did staff receive feedback that concurred with the public comments from the meeting today. Due to the fact that the meeting date was already being advertised and the report was well on its way staff decided to proceed with the DPB meeting.

Ms. Molaro clarified with staff that unlike a City Council report that is available on the web at the referral time period which is 4 -6 weeks ahead, the DPB only receives the report around the same time the public is notified on the web.

Panel Opinion

Panel members offered a range of comments on the proposal, including:

Mr. Neale noted the Urban Design panel was asked to look at 4 types of views on this project. One was through and the other three views to the site from the public realm.

Mr. Neale noted the applicant presented an analysis of views through the site compared to the 2013 rezoning application. The presentation material show there is an increase in views through the site since the original application. The presentation shows there is only one area with a decrease in views which is the Lido building. A suggestion to reduce a portion of the building to 9 storeys may have been from trying to reduce negative impact on the Lido building.

Mr. Neale noted the panel was asked to look at the difference of short, medium, long distance views. The panel supported the project as strong. We considered the application as a Landmark statement due the uniqueness of the location, size and shape of the site, and falling to the corner post of False Creek.

Mr. Neale noted some members felt the building was respecting Science World, the majority of the UDP comments were around the public realm and the sea wall. It was important to have areas where the public can stop especially with the building acting as a backdrop.

Mr. Neale noted moving forward, it was important to document everything carefully.

Mr. Neale noted there was overall support from the UDP in regards to, form of the building, architectural detailing, and the heritage references made.

Mr. Neale suggested some type of heritage interpretation can be included in the project.

Mr. Neale noted reducing the footprint and lowering the floor areas could all be done correctly.

Ms. Allen noted the proposal is strong and compromises offered such as the contribution of the public realm and park dedication is a welcome asset in this area. The mix of family units is strong and much needed in the City.

Mr. Norfolk noted the reference to the heritage should not be subtle and be more apparent to the general public.

Mr. Norfolk noted in regards to the process the courier advertisement of the DPB meeting being made available prior to the reports appears out of order and hope an earlier deadline for the materials will be made in the future.

Mr. Rohani noted the developer had done a great job at building a community at the Creek. In regards to the heritage, if you walk through the space of the building it is quite apparent.

Mr. Rohani noted the massing of the buildings is a little too big it is just a massive wall; prefer the podium setting to it. Capturing as much water front and park view is important.

Mr. Rohani noted he wouldn't be opposed to a narrower building that is taller.

Mr. Rohani noted the human scale of the public realm does not do enough, presently a bit dark and unwelcoming on the Quebec side.

Ms. Pretto thanked the members of the public for their comments.

Ms. Pretto noted her first impression of the building was a fish bowl type, believe will see a lot of closed blinds.

Ms. Pretto noted her disappointment that the project is Leed Gold and not seeking something higher.

Ms. Pretto noted the layout in the building, especially with the two bedrooms plus den are not necessarily affordable ask the staff to make these into three bedrooms as they eventually will.

Ms. Pretto noted the amenity space inside is vast maybe and in excess, suggest if some of that amenity space can be used to reduce some of the massing.

Ms. Pretto noted shadows are necessarily a bad thing, and if shading will exist look at rain cover if you are looking for an increase in shade.

Board Discussion

Mr. Dobrovolny noted the applicant made a request that conditions not be so descriptive and asked staff if it is possible for a wording amendment.

Mr. Cheng noted as long as what is noted in appendix E can be retained, as this is of most importance, there is leeway for the wording to be changed.

Mr. Dobrovolny moved to the amended recommendations.

Ms. Molaro seconded.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted his appreciation to the public for attending and providing their comments.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted the timeliness of the availability of the documents.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted the materials were made at their designated time. However, he agreed that it is important to have materials made available sooner especially for contentious projects.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted that developments always impact other developments.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted that views are not enshrined and can be changed.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted that plans change and that council has the ability to change plans as part of their mandate.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted that the changes with the recommended conditions would create a less negative impact.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted his support for the amended proposal.

Mrs. Molaro noted her acknowledgement of the attendees and speakers.

Mrs. Molaro noted the architect had done a good job working around concerns.

Mrs. Molaro noted zoning anticipated for this building and would affect some views of the City and the staff recommended conditions would achieve to acknowledge some of the impact on the views through the site and there would be a major improvement on overall views.

Mrs. Molaro noted her support for the project and the amended conditions.

Mrs. Singh noted her appreciation for the public comments.

Mrs. Singh commented that the staff recommendations would seek to mitigate and resolve some of the concerns especially with the views and site lines through the site.

Mrs. Singh noted her appreciation for the condition trying to reduce the monolithic reading on the wall

Mrs. Singh concurred with the comment around creating shelters, converting the dens into another bedroom and improved detailing on the historical pieces.

Mrs. Singh noted her support and the amendments brought forward.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Dobrovolny and seconded by Ms. Molaro, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE the decision to Development Application No. DP-2018-00406-CD-1 in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated on July 11, 2018 , with the following amendments:

To replace the Condition 1.1 - Note to Applicant;

- 1.1 design development to reduce the impacts of the proposed upper-storey massing on the surround Parks, public realm and private properties, by deleting the south-western most units (Unit type UN-G) from storeys 10 to 13;

Note to Applicant: It is understood that some design finish will be required beyond a simple deletion of these units, but a commensurate amount of open view through south portion of the site above the ninth storey must be achieved, and the maximum floorplate size achievable on storeys 10-13 inclusive shall be 9800 sf. (not including balconies). Redistributing the floor space deleted from these floors to the third storey, where an added storey for the podium expression, is suggested.

With;

Note to Applicant: It is understood that some design finish will be required beyond a simple deletion of these units, but a commensurate amount of open view through south portion of the site above the ninth storey must be achieved, and the maximum floorplate size achievable on storeys 10-13 inclusive shall be 10,600 sf. (not including balconies). Redistributing the floor space deleted from these floors to the third storey, where an added storey for the podium expression, is suggested. **This would allow for some design refinement resulting from the deletion of the dwelling units, while still ensuring that views through that portion of the site are consistent with the illustrations in Appendix E.**

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:30pm.