

Date: Monday, October 29, 2018
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

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

Advisory Panel

A. Brudar Representative of the Design Professionals (Urban Design Panel)
R. Rohani Representative of the General Public

Regrets

S. Allen Representative of the General Public
R. Chaster Representative of the General Public
B. Jarvis Representative of the Development Industry
D. Pretto Representative of the General Public
A. Norfolk Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission
R. Wittstock Representative of the Design Professions

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

P. O'Sullivan Development Planner
G. Jiang Development Planner
M. Au Assistant Director of Services Center - Development
D. Autiero Project Facilitator
C. Joseph Engineering

**688 W. 41st Ave Oakridge Centre Bldgs 3 & 4 - CD-1
DP-2018-00633****Delegation**

Peter Wood, Architect, HPA
Rui Nunes, Architect, HPA
Gregory Henriquez, Architect, HPA
Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, PFS

4188 Yew Street - CD-1 Delegation**DP-2018-00665**

Alireza Danesh, Architect, DIALOG

Recording Secretary: K.Cermeno

1. MINUTES

Chair Law noted the approval of October 15, 2018 minutes have been deferred to the next meeting of Nov 13, 2018.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 688 W. 41st Ave Oakridge Centre Bldgs 3 & 4 - CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Henriquez Partners Architects

Request: To develop a mixed-use building comprised of one 32-storey tower (Building 3) and one 42-storey tower (Building 4) containing a total of 504 Dwelling Units; atop one podium containing Retail/Office Uses (Levels P1 - 6); all over three levels of underground parking, and a portion of the future 9-acre Park.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mr. O'Sullivan, 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. O' Sullivan took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Applicant's Comments

The applicant requested if in the future design booklets for the DP Board can be provided via Ipads. The applicant team would provide the Ipads.

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

Mr. Kelley asked the applicant team for assurance if they are bounded to the main concerns of public realm, retail fine grain and porosity, signage and way finding, and spandrel recess issues and elegance of the exterior.

The applicant team confirmed their commitment to these issues and supportive of all the comments and recommendations from staff.

Mr. Dobrovolny asked the applicant team if they had any concerns with the recommendations.

The applicant team noted they did not.

Comments from Speakers

Speaker one, Devan Hussack noted his support of the application. The refinements of the project are what is considered to be a true crown jewel of this city. Support the DP staff recommendations. The applicant is both proud and committed to the vision. The veil effect allows for a great public realm. Appreciate the close access to storage accesses and feel this

building is welcoming for the elderly. Curious how the applicant will implement the 'slide.' Mr. Hussack asked the panel to consider his comments. This is a positive transformation.

Panel Opinion

Ms. Brudar noted there was support for this project at UDP. Panel found this project to be elegant and sophisticated. The conversation was mostly about maintaining the high level of design quality. There was also comments in regards to the porosity of the public realm, however panel also noted there is so much interest provided. The canopy was a supported unique feature. The curve linear of the glass was a highlighted feature and the nature of the glass adds to the organic nature of the project. There were comments in regards to the stairs but understand is not part of this DP, but hope in the future this will be considered. Also the possibility of a drop off zone was another suggestion at UDP.

Ms. Brudar noted their level of sustainability was of a much higher level than required.

Mr. Wittstock noted his support for the project.

Mr. Wittstock noted the architecture was beautiful and agreed with the conditions.

Mr. Wittstock noted his main concern was in regards to the public realm on west 41st and anything that can be done to improve this will be good.

Mr. Wittstock noted increasing the amount of retail and easy access to the department store would be good. Ensuring there is that porosity and as much CRU would be good. Also ensure the connection along 41st is pleasant and strong.

Mr. Wittstock noted his surprise at the lack of common spaces for the tenants.

Mr. Rohani noted his support and this was a great development.

Mr. Rohani noted he concurred there needs to be a better solution for the drop off point.

Mr. Rohani noted accessibility of the lower park to higher up could be smoother and same for the grade of getting to the top of the stairs.

Board Discussion

Mr. Mochrie asked about the timeline of construction.

Staff noted the applicant is proposing to do the early work in the next year or so. Once completed they will do excavation for the building.

Staff confirmed that the process for permitting the work has gone through engineering. There will be tree removals therefore staff will look into if tree removal offsite permits are needed.

Staff noted they will be working closely with communications

Mr. Mochrie noted his support for the project.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted the architecture is exceptional.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted his support.

Mr. Kelley noted his support.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DP-2018-00633, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated October 3, 2018.

3. 4188 Yew Street - CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Larco Investments Ltd.

Request: To add two storeys to the previously approved mixed-use building (Block A). The project includes 17,691 square feet of additional residential floor area; the total unit count for the entire building would increase from 215 units to 236 units. There are changes to the configuration of the social housing and market housing units to allow for an additional 25 social housing units.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ms. Jiang, 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.

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

Applicant's Comments

We have read the report and have no issues with the conditions as they are currently written.

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

Mr. Dobrovolny asked the applicant team to clarify the density has already been decided and what is being proposed is in regards to where to implement the density across the site.

The applicant team noted this was correct.

Comments from Speakers

Speaker one, Walter Maughn noted this is a project that has been ongoing since 1984. From that time several heights and densities have been approved. Developers just kept coming back and asking for more. City staff have been quite dismissive of public complaints. Would like to see the effect minimized on Arbutus Street. The brier is the only neighbours affected by the square footage. From the south elevation of the additional square footage you cant even see the brier. Mr. Maughn provided two alternative locations that provided minimal impact.

Mr. Kelley asked staff if the impacts of scale transition from the brier to across the street, with the added density, was this analyzed in terms of sunlight.

Development planner Jiang, visually demonstrated the shadow impact and transition height boards to staff and noted the impacts were minimal.

Speaker two, Katherine Reichert, member of the Arcs committee, noted this application was to replace density Larco did not receive at the last public hearing. Arcs in the neighbourhood has worked tirelessly with Larco over ten years and came up with a plan that worked for everyone. Afterwards Larco turned around and asked for more density and now they are coming back again this leaves the community and ARC feeling like the community consultation was not taken seriously or mocked. The density increase is to allow 25 social units can these not be placed on a site that was previously approved for blocks C & D? There is no reason to change block A as it will greatly affect the streetscape.

Speaker three, Dick Ballard, noted he does not understand the process. Members of Arcs and others have been working on this project for ten years and confused what is being presented at the board today. Last minute a different proposal was presented. Blocks C & D were changed and now this is being used as a reason to also change A. The community worked hard to get this to a place where the project was considered acceptable.

Mr. Kelley asked was block A not included in the rezoning in terms of receiving additional density

Development Planner Jiang, noted during the rezoning the additional density was approved for the overall site. Staff recommended the increased density should be spread out across the site and not centralized to blocks C & D.

Ms. Jiang noted during the application the public consultation and feedback was considered through out the process.

Ms. Jiang noted the possible additional density to block A was also approved in council and noted in the council report.

Panel Opinion

Ms. Brudar noted the question was asked to comment on the additional density that was located on block A.

Ms. Brudar noted at UDP it was a relatively quick review, panel found the density would be appropriate on the Arbutus side as this is a big street that could handle this.

Ms. Brudar noted the biggest impact on shadow would be on street itself and only hit parts of the bay. UDP felt the additional two floors balanced the buildings a bit more and the 6 storey street wall was very well handled.

Ms. Brudar noted the parti of the buildings was enhanced with the addition.

Mr. Wittstock noted the question is how is the density massed on block A and the choices are 8 storey on Arbutus or 12 storey on the internal muse.

Mr. Wittstock noted staff have shown the density on the north-south has the least impact.

Mr. Wittstock noted he is excited for the overall development it's a hub for the community. The setback on arbutus street appears fairly minimal.

Mr. Wittstock noted keeping all the social housing together on one block closest to transit makes sense.

Mr. Rohani noted where the additional density is proposed to go does make the most sense.

Board Discussion

Mr. Dobrovolny noted legitimate issues were raised by the speakers, such as the question as to how and where the density will be placed.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted he is comfortable with the recommendations that are being made, however concerned with the comments from Arcs who were involved in the process all the way through.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted he would like staff to look into how involvement with the public went sideways.

Staff noted the policy report indicated the floor area for the residential was supposed to be intended for block A.

Mr. Mochrie noted his shared concern from a procedural perspective there needs to be a sense of clarity as to what is being proposed.

Mr. Mochrie noted he is comfortable within the parameters the project is operating in.

Mr. Mochrie noted he is prepared to support the application.

Mr. Kelley noted his support for the project.

Mr. Kelley noted he is also concerned with how the neighbourhood group consultation was handled.

Mr. Kelley noted it is council's right to make changes to the rezoning. For that reason and comments articulated the response has been quite responsible on impacts to adjoining properties. The design work has been sensitive.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE the decision to Development Application No. DP-2018-00665-CD-1 in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated on October 3, 2018.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.