

Date: Monday, Jan 20, 2020
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

A. Law Director, Development Services, (Chair)
T. O'Donnell Deputy Director of Current Planning
P. Mochrie Deputy City Manager
K. Mulji Director, Engineering Projects & Development Services

Advisory Panel

J. Stamp Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
L. Shenkute Representative of the General Public
M. Cree Smith Representative of the Design Professions
N. Hayward Representative of the General Public
K. May Representative of the General Public

Regrets

C. Karu Representative of the Development Industry
P. Sihota Representative of the General Public
D. Pretto Representative of the Development Industry

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

J. Greer Assistant Director, Development Review Branch
P. Chan Development Planner, Urban Design & Development
C. Stanford Development Planner, Urban Design & Development
O. Aljebouri Development Planner, Urban Design & Development

52 E Hastings - DP-2019-00680

Jennifer Marshall, Architect, Urban Arts Architecture
Kent Patenaude, Owner/Developer, Luima/ALT

1616 W 7th Ave - DP-2019-00407

M. Bruckner, Architect, IBI Group
Jane Durante, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk
Michael Bosa, Owner/Developer, Solterra Development.

6103 W Boulevard - 2019-00404

Taizo Yamamoto, Architect, Yamamoto Architecture

Recording Secretary: K. Cermeno

1. MINUTES

No minutes to be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 52 East Hastings -
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Urban Arts Architecture

Request: To develop this site with an 11 storey mixed-use building containing 111 dwelling units (social housing), a healing centre, food centre, and a long house gathering space (social service centre), all over 2 levels of underground parking having vehicular access from the lane.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mr. Patrick Chan, 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. Patrick Chan took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Applicant's Comments

The applicant noted they have had an extensive look at all the requirements and conditions and along with the developer they are open to meeting all the conditions as outlined in the report.

Comments from other Speakers

No speakers

Panel Opinion

Ms. Stamp noted the project was support unanimously at UDP.

Ms. Stamp noted it is a strong application that incorporated all community issues.

Ms. Stamp noted the conditions are reflective of what was discussed at panel, such as design development at the ground floor and lane elevation, also the request to bring some materials down to grade.

Ms. Stamp noted another suggestion was to have the art expressed differently from the long house.

Ms. Stamp noted there was a good mixture of indoor and outdoor amenities.

Ms. Stamp noted her support.

Ms. Cree-Smith noted it will be a pivotal project for the community.

Ms. Hayward noted she did not have any comments.

Mr. Shenkute noted as a downtown eastside resident the street market is a concern for residents and how will the applicant address this. Will the amenities be for the residents of the building or will they will be shared.

The applicant noted 1/3 of the project is rain city housing, will become self-contained residents that will be moved in the future. The site for the market is a temporary site. True home will be across from Oppenheimer Park. The amenities there are a wide range of programs that are opened to all.

Board Discussion

Mr. Mochrie thanked the advisory panel and applicant for their comments.

Mr. Mochrie noted this is an important project for the neighbourhood and noted his support.

Mr. Mochrie noted this will make a difference to the corner.

Ms. O'Donnell echoed Mr. Mochrie comments.

Ms. O'Donnell noted it is an important project and noted her support.

Ms. Mulji noted she was happy the applicant was able to work with city staff regarding the enhanced public realm

Ms. Mulji noted her support.

Motion

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

THAT the Board **APPROVE** Development Application No. DP-2019-00680, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated Dec 11, 2019.

4. 1616 W 7th Ave - DP-2019-00407
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: IBI Group

Request: To develop an 11-storey, multiple dwelling containing 47 dwelling units and approximately 6,000 sq. ft. of community amenity space all over four levels of underground parking accessed from the lane and using a heritage density transfer of 1,323 sq. ft. from donor site at 135 Keefer Street and 1,500 sq. ft. from donor site at 163 West Hastings.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mr. Carl Stanford, 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. Carl Stanford took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Applicant's Comments

The applicant noted they had some concerns regarding the DPB report and outlined them in a memorandum as follows:

1. Relaxation to 1.1. - "design development to confirm a minimum separation of 82' from the proposed tower building to existing residential towers."
2. Relaxation to A.1.13 - "provisional of semi-private open space in accordance with Section 7.2. of the Burrard Slopes C-3A" Guidelines;
3. Amendment to A.2.11 i) Bicycle parking elevator;
4. Amendment to A.2.13.i) Parking Ramp Width;
5. Amendment to A1.30-viii.

The applicant noted they are seeking flexibility and clarification on the above items.

Mr. Mochrie asked staff for a response in regards to the amendments listed by the applicant team.

Staff noted all these conditions are to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering services and can still be worked through.

Staff noted the conditions already provide enough flexibility in the wording, so an amendment is not necessary. Conditions are open to further discussion.

Comments from other Speakers

Speaker one, Rob Stewart, representing the Society for the Advancement of Artists and musicians, noted his strong support for the project.

Mr. Stewart noted he currently offers work space to a large number of bands and musicians, and noted there is a lack of cultural amenities with an over dense area.

The city cultural services department has put forward a project that allows for the city to embrace and improve the cultural legacy without pushing artists out to the outskirts.

Speaker one listed a number of cultural amenities that have been lost throughout the city. This project allows for a potential world class center of entertainment.

Speaker two, Keith Donaldson, noted this project is 20ft higher than the average building around the neighbourhood.

Mr. Donaldson noted the reason for the height is due to the music center, however when comparing to other music centers still much bigger.

Mr. Donaldson noted along 7th avenue there were three music studios that were closed due to lack of use.

Mr. Donaldson noted his concern that the music center is being used as an excuse for an oversized development.

Mr. Donaldson noted the city policies in protecting city views, and this development will obstruct the sight lines/views of many residents.

Speaker three, Steve Ressler, noted the developer gets to use the cultural space as an excuse to develop a project that is 67 percent much bigger.

Mr. Ressler noted it appears the benefits of the project are more for the applicant than the neighbourhood.

Mr. Ressler noted that in the northeast corner where he resides and the suites on the east side with a balcony will have obstructed views.

Mr. Ressler noted he is not opposed to the development but the massive increase that is being permitted and will have an impact on 50 percent of the owners in the adjacent building.

Speaker four, Max Rider, musician, noted musicians do not have safe spaces to unfold their creative endeavours. This project will bring a cultural hub for all walks of arts and culture. This project also allows for the ability to engage with the neighbourhood.

Speaker five, Brooke Parken, lives directly south of the proposal, noted she values music creativity but does not understand why the city is allowing for this trade to impinge on the rest of the community.

Ms. Parken noted it appears there are no rezoning rules for a purchaser. She bought into the building with the understanding that there would be city limitations and policies for future developments. This project does not build community or relationship it rather challenges this, and this is a big injustice.

Speaker six, Kyle Wilson, is a musician, noted the importance of spaces such as the cultural amenity. Mr. Wilson noted just as residents talk about the loss of sightlines musicians experience this daily with the loss of spaces that never get replaced.

Mr. Wilson noted for many the option to purchase a property is unlikely however the loss of being "human" expressing oneself creatively would be a great loss.

Speaker seven, Rob Leechman, New Westminster resident, noted so many venues have been lost throughout the years. Musicians previously could pay their rent off their creative endeavours and this is no longer a possibility as leases and rents are going up and the cost for musicians are high.

Mr. Leechman noted this sort of project could slowly reverse what is happening in Vancouver City. There are no longer spaces for musicians to play, live and practice, and this is badly needed for the music community.

Speaker, 8, Tristan Mill, manages a paint store and is also a musician. Echoed comments regarding safe places to practice are no longer available.

Mr. Mill noted it appears the trade-off is not as previously mentioned but much more for the art culture, Vancouver has a boom of talent with a lacking of support.

Panel Opinion

Ms. Stamp noted this application came to design panel twice last year.

Ms. Stamp noted the panel had no concern with height and scale.

Ms. Stamp noted most of the concerns raised in the initial meeting were addressed in the second meeting and had unanimous support.

Ms. Stamp noted the panel recommended design development to the facades of the building, particularly in the western façade. Good articulation at the podium level was achieved.

Ms. Stamp read the comments outlined in the urban design panel minutes.

Ms. Stamp noted the UDP supported the application.

Ms. Cree-Smith noted it was a commendable project in trying to find spaces for the musical community.

Ms. Cree-Smith noted her support.

Ms. Cree-Smith suggested public art in the cultural area.

Ms. Hayward noted it is an excellent development.

Ms. Hayward noted the cultural space is a wonderful addition.

Ms. Hayward noted her appreciation for previous concerns being addressed.

Mr. Shenkute had no comments.

Board Discussion

Ms. O'Donnell noted there is a DP at hand, and the existing DP granted the relaxation to the separation.

Ms. O'Donnell noted the revised project appears much more superior, especially with the inclusion of the arts space.

Ms. O'Donnell asked staff what kind of design development is needed to have the 80ft separation and still be a viable project.

Mr. Mochrie thanked the panel, applicant and the community for coming out to speak on their comments.

Mr. Mochrie noted this application does fit within the existing zoning and what is allowed for this site.

Mr. Mochrie noted the board does not have authority to question approved zoning.

Mr. Mochrie noted the city works on established rules regarding heritage.

Mr. Mochrie noted there is an absolute need for a cultural space.

Mr. Mochrie acknowledges the tower separation is a tricky issue however the established guidelines are being followed.

Mr. Mochrie noted it is relevant that there is an existing approval and agrees the present project is an improvement from the previous one.

Ms. Mulji noted the project meets established policy and guidelines.

Ms. Mulji noted the concerns brought by the applicant are something that can be worked with.

Mr. Olinek suggested the following amendment to condition 1.1 :

“Design development to maximize the separation from the proposed tower building to existing residential towers. Determine a tower separation of no less than 73’ and no more than 82’.”

All the board members were in favour of the amended condition.

Motion

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

THAT the Board **APPROVE** Development Application No. **DP-2019-00404**, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated Dec 11, 2019, with the following amendment:

Relaxation to 1.1. to read -

“Design development to maximize the separation from the proposed tower building to existing residential towers. Determine a tower separation of no less than 73’ and no more than 82’.”

6. 6103 West Boulevard- DP-2019-00404
Applicant: Gryphon Corporate Group Ltd.

Request: Rehabilitation and designation of the Stanley Ernest Peters Block (S.E.P. Block) and to develop the site with a 5 storey, mixed-use building consisting of retail and restaurant uses on the ground level and 64 dwelling units from the second to fifth storey all over two levels of underground parking having vehicular access from the lane

Development Planner’s Opening Comments

Mr. Aljebouri, 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. Aljebouri took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Applicant Comments

Applicant met with the Planning team on some of the items they had concerns with which they were assured can be handled through design development.

Applicant is satisfied with conditions.

Speakers

Mr. Perry family's has owned a building supply business in the area since 1927. He is fully supportive of this project as it will encourage businesses in the area to stay in the area. He thinks it is a great place to densify given the new greenway nearby.

Panel Opinion

Ms. Stamp noted the project was favourably received and supported by panel at UDP last year. She acknowledged the restoration of the project, the building being a good fit with the context and is an appropriate transition to the single family residential to the west.

Ms. Stamp noted one of the conditions was for there to be more differentiation, the transition of new and heritage building, it was felt the buildings were too up against each other.

Ms. Stamp acknowledge great efforts to make the SEP Block more prominent and back to its glory days.

Ms. Cree-smith noted the building fits well with the area and supports the SEP Building.

Ms. Hayward acknowledge the outstanding job of making the 5th story design of the building look like it is 4 storeys.

Ms. Hayward noted the building is attractive and makes good use of the outdoor space.

Mr. Shenkute supports the project, appreciating the indoor and outdoor amenity and the connection with the new and old building.

Mr. Shekute noted concern with the 4th floor open space and privacy.

Board Discussion

Mr. Mochrie, Ms. O'Donnell and Ms. Mulji noted support and approval for the project.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DP-2019-00404 - C-2, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated November 27, 2019

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:21pm.