

Date: Monday, October 15, 2018
Time: 3:09 p.m.
Place: Council Chamber, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

A. Law Director, Development Services, (Chair)
J. Dobrovolny General Manager of Engineering
P. Mochrie Deputy City Manager
G. Kelley General Manager of Planning, Urban Design & Sustainability

Advisory Panel

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
A. Norfolk Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission
R. Rohani Representative of the General Public
S. Allen Representative of the General Public

Regrets

J. Greer Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
D. Neale Representative of the Design Professionals (Urban Design Panel)
D. Pretto Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

P. Cheng Development Planner
M. So Assistant Director of Services Center - Development
C. Sanford Project Facilitator
C. Joseph Section Head, Engineering
J. Rautenberg Planner, Housing & Social Policy
M. Vernooy Social Planner, Housing & Social Policy

1485 Davie St - DP-2017-01183-RM-5D
Wing Leung WT Leung Architects

Recording Secretary: D.Fung

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Mochrie and seconded by Mr. Dobrovolny and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on Sept 17, 2018.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None

**3. 1485 Davie St - DP-2017-01183-RM-5D
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: WT Leung Architects

Request: To develop a 21-storey market strata multiple dwelling building on the west side and a 6-storey social housing multiple dwelling building on the east side all over five levels of underground parking all with vehicular access from the lane.

Ms. Law, Chair, introduced the additional amendments provided by Staff.

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

The Applicant thanked Staff for the Staff Committee Report. The Applicant is in general agreement with the report and is confident that they are able to meet the requirements.

The Applicant would like to request the following consideration to the report conditions:

To allow the increase of balcony area to upwards of 12%

The Applicant took questions from the Board and panel members.

Comments from other Speakers

Speaker one, Meris Ngan Colby, resident on the 6th floor of the building about a block north of this project, commented that she was happy to see it go from affordable housing to social housing and that there was not a net loss of housing in neighbourhood. In her current building, she has felt shadowing from a 15 storey building two blocks away and feels disappointed with the height of this new building and feels she will lose further sunlight due to shadowing from this

new building. This will be an impact on her space and her gardening especially in the winter months. Ms. Colby commented the increased sizes of the balcony would make the building wider and therefore create more shading which would not only impact the units in her building but the public realm below like the public walks and the landscaping. Ms. Colby feels that the neighbourhood's current buildings which are 10 storeys or less create this shading impact and that this impact has not been addressed by this project.

Ms. Colby notes that there hasn't been any discussion on the impact of tenants on the Knights of Columbus building. With the huge amount of parking proposed, there will be significant construction and excavation which will be a huge impact on the residents with extremely disruptive construction starting early and ending late. Many of the residents aren't able to leave the neighbourhood and the request is to consider reduction of the parking construction.

Speaker two, Brian Broster, resident of the building directly across the lane across from low rise mass, echoes the previous speaker's comments. Mr. Broster is a tenant of 25 years in this tight knit community. Mr. Broster questioned parking spaces from previous developments which were not being used and has now been converted to parking spots by the film industry.

Mr. Broster commented that in the previous scheme, their building wrote many emails and letters to support the overall form. They asked for reduction of parking and to provide retail on Davie St.

Mr. Broster expressed concern that whereas the podium in the previous scheme had 3 storey townhouses, their very tight community is now going to be blocked by a 6 storey building. Mr. Broster pointed out that in the Cambie Corridor, there are townhouse developments similar to this project's original scheme accomplishing what this project is trying to do. In addition, Mr. Broster points out that to the east, there are townhouses being developed and approved.

Mr. Broster points out that the new building is not accessible from the lane and reduces safety due to a lack of visibility and access. In addition, the building would reduce sunlight to the residents of the lane. Mr. Broster proposes that residents in the buildings along the lane be given access to the courtyard as part of the community.

Mr. Broster reiterates that the new scheme is not what he wants to support.

Speaker three, Ian Main, resident of 1485 Davie Street, is concerned about making sure that all residents will have access to the new building regardless of pets, or income level or what their current status is as part of the requirement.

Panel Opinion

Ms. Brudar reiterated that the Urban Design Panel strongly supported the revised massing. It was felt that the courtyard, providing solar access, was very successful and provided the heart of the project for the residents.

Ms. Brudar commented that the panel had some hesitation in the public realm treatment and in the tower. There was expression that the 6 storey building was more successfully resolved than the tower itself. Specifically, the panel felt that some of the strong concepts that were represented in the original scheme were diluted and the parti wasn't as strong. The expression and the guiding idea were not as apparent in the new scheme.

Ms. Brudar stressed that the Applicant was strongly encouraged to revisit the design concept and come up with a stronger scheme. Given the significance of this tower in a great location, it was felt that the scheme should have come back to the panel. But the panel is confident that any issues can be resolved with Staff.

Ms. Brudar noted that there was commentary around the public realm and in particular, the water feature, which was cutting off the building from pedestrian. It was suggested that through some manipulation and reduction of the water feature, the public realm could be widened.

Ms. Allen thanked the Applicant and Staff for their presentation and their report and thanked the public for their comments. Ms. Allen commends the Applicant for a strong proposal.

Ms. Allen feels this is a strong proposal which prioritize residents to be able to return to this great location if they wish. The urban design comments are to ensure that the design remains as one development in particular with the shared courtyard.

Ms. Allen's preference is that the larger balcony consideration remains and commented that she welcomes the larger balconies because unit sizes in the market development are quite economical and this allows for families to have just a bit more space which prioritizes the livability of the units over the priority of bulk.

Ms. Allen affirmed the preference to make this a family friendly project. The points about childcare units are important. It's a great economic development opportunity for people in residence who live in social housing. Ms. Allen would support the bulking of the building as a trade-off.

Ms. Allen encourages the allowance of increased height for mobility aids and wheelchair accessibility to the common areas. There's a lot of work being done on the national and provincial level about making sure those with accessibility issue are not cut off from these important aspects of social life.

Mr. Norfolk reiterated his previous comments on the reuse of the existing granite along the corridor rather than bringing new granite. Mr. Norfolk discussed that it would be consistent to the public realm to use the existing granite.

Ms. Chaster appreciates that this project has a high proportion of family size units especially 3 BR across both buildings. The larger balconies would provide more private outdoor space especially for units with children. Ms. Chaster points out that this would be the difficult trade-off for the impact of the shadowing of the balconies on neighbouring buildings as brought up by the comment from the public.

Ms. Chaster reiterates to ensure that the existing tenants know their options if they choose to leave and not return.

Ms. Chaster comments that it was an interesting idea to use the existing granite to improve the lane way.

Mr. Jarvis thanked the Applicant and Staff for their presentation and thanked the public for their comments.

Mr. Jarvis applauded Staff for waiving requirement of the project from going to UDP for a 3rd time. However, Mr. Jarvis agreed that some of the elements of the first proposal have been lost.

Mr. Jarvis feels that massing and placement of the building is appropriate.

Mr. Jarvis pointed out that while the Applicant is willing to expand the rooftop amenities space, there is an example whereby they deactivated a rooftop space for a rental property and the projected savings was over \$400,000 which included eliminating elevator stops, the buildup for pavers, the railings, etc. Mr. Jarvis comments that the conditions seem to stipulate that Staff is telling the Applicant what to do and that cost savings should be a consideration.

Mr. Jarvis referred to the report citing condition 1.6 on triple glazed glass and noted that although this may be to enforce a standard, the language limits use of other methods to reach the standard.

Mr. Jarvis agreed that it is important that the granite on site be salvaged but that language should allow the Applicant to work with Staff on how it's applied.

Mr. Jarvis encourages being able to take advantage of the ability to provide outdoor space by providing larger balconies while respecting neighbours.

Mr. Rohani commented that it was refreshing and good to see projects with the 5D zone. Many developers shy away from 5D to avoid the social housing aspect of the zone.

Mr. Rohani supports the big balconies, especially since it is under the FSR. Mr. Rohani reminded the panel to consider that with the larger balconies, they tend to end up as additional storage space and it becomes cluttered. Mr. Rohani suggested that consideration be given to having more storage given that there are many extra parking stalls.

Board Discussion

Mr. Dobrovolny commended the Applicant and Staff for their collaboration and expressed support for the project.

Mr. Dobrovolny suggests three amendments which can be grouped together with other suggestions from the board members.

Mr. Dobrovolny proposes to reword the condition for balconies to increase up to 17%.

Mr. Dobrovolny would like to see the use of the existing granite and would leave it with Staff and the Applicant to work out how to keep the granite on site to respect the heritage of the neighbourhood.

Mr. Dobrovolny points out the City's accessibility strategy is to provide and maximize universal accessibility for both the rooftops.

Mr. Dobrovolny comments that one of the trade-offs of this project is the impact on the neighbouring building and stresses to ensure that the centre panel to be made green to lessen the impact.

Mr. Mochrie thanked the speakers for their comments and congratulated the Applicant on their work to recreate this design. The resulting project works really well. Mr. Mochrie feels comfortable with 3 additional concepts from Mr. Dobrovlny.

Mr. Mochrie points out that there should be some considerations regarding the amount of parking proposed which is a bigger issue.

Mr. Kelley is sympathetic to the 3 issues pointed out by Mr. Dobrovlny.

Mr. Kelly confirms that Staff is instructing the Applicant to maximize the accessible area on the roof as commented by Mr. Jarvis. Mr. Kelly points out that Staff is suggesting those conditions to be included unequivocally.

Mr. Kelly agrees with providing accessibility to the rooftop and was told it was not a huge cost item. Mr. Kelly refers to Ms. Allen's points and agrees it is extremely important to make that work.

Mr. Kelly asks if the Applicant is open to working with Staff on eliminating costly parking in a neighbourhood that doesn't demand that level of parking. Mr. Kelly points out that the proposed parking is twice as much as required. Mr. Kelly proposes a consideration for lesser amount of parking

Mr. Kelly comments that the new concept is a vast improvement over the old form. Mr. Kelly supports the increase of the balcony allowance to strike a balance between size and the building form with an allowance up to 17%.

Mr. Dobrovlny comments that a review of West End parking was done and found that while there was demand for street parking, many of the parking stalls in buildings remained unoccupied. Mr. Dobrovlny points out that we have a parking management issue rather than a parking supply issue. Mr. Dobrovlny asks the Applicant to consider a reduction in parking which would save money and reduce impact on the area.

Motion

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

THAT the Board **APPROVE** the Development Application No. DP-2017-01183, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated September 19, 2018, with the following amendments:

A.2.3 provision of seating along Davie Street located on private property that includes detailed specifications including a minimum of 50% of the proposed benches to meet ADA Standards for Accessible Design;

A.2.4 provision of a landscape plan is to be submitted for review to Engineering Services addressing the following requirements and including the following notation on the plan as stated;

i. provision of a 1.53 m (5'-0") sod grass front boulevard with trees, 3.05m (10'-0") light broom finish saw cut concrete sidewalk, and landscaped back boulevard on Davie St frontage;

- ii. provision of a 1.83 m (6'-0") sod grass front boulevard with trees and 1.83 m (6'-0") light broom finish saw cut concrete sidewalk on Nicola St frontage;
- iii. provision of a standard concrete lane crossing on Nicola Street including new curb returns and curb ramps on both sides of the lane entry as per City standard;
- iv. provision of upgraded street lighting adjacent to the site to current standards including a review of the existing lighting to determine its adequacy and a lighting design as required. This is part of the Lower Davie area identified in the West End Community Plan;
- v. Include the following statement on the plan
This plan is "NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION" and is to be submitted for review to Engineering Services a minimum of 8 weeks prior to the start of any construction proposed for public property. No work on public property may begin until such plans receive "For Construction" approval and related permits are issued. Please contact Engineering, Development Services and/or your Engineering, Building Site Inspector for details."

Note to Applicant: Add the following note to landscape plans "Installation of parking regulatory signage on Davie Street and Nicola Street adjacent the site to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services".

In addition, the board has requested the following:

1. *Allow the increase of balcony area up to a maximum of 17% in the context of the project being below its maximum FSR with the excess 5% of balcony area deducted from its allowable FSR.*
2. *Design development to maximize reuse of existing granite in either the building materials, landscape or both as appropriate.*
3. *Provide accessibility to the rooftops of both buildings with an increase of the usable amenity area as required.*
4. *Design development to reduce the provision of parking to be appropriate in scale to the development but not below minimum requirements.*

4. **OTHER BUSINESS**

Presentation by Joyce Uyesugi

5. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:36 pm.