

Date: Monday, May 1, 2017
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT:

Board

P. Mochrie Deputy City Manager
J. Dobrovlny General Manager of Engineering
G. Kelley General Manager of Planning and Development Services

Advisory Panel

K. Smith Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
H. Ahmadian Representative of the Development Industry
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission
B. Jarvis Representative of the Development Industry
R. Wittstock Representative of the Design Professions
M. Pollard Representative of the General Public
N.Lai Representative of the General Public

Regrets

A. Law Director, Development Services, (Chair)
R. Chaster Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

City Staff:

J. Greer Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
A. Molaro (Chair) Assistant Director of Urban Design
T. Potter Development Planner
W. LeBreton Project Facilitator

199 East 1st STREET - DE420195 - ZONE CD-1

M. Brunane, Architect, Itsi
J. Mok, Architect, Itsy
J. Vaughn, Developer, Onni
Chip Iyall, Owner, Onni

Recording Secretary: C.Lade

1. **399 East 1st Ave - DE420195 - ZONE CD-1(402)
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Onni Group

Request: The development of 4 buildings ranging in height from 7 to 15 storeys comprised of: 2 Live/Work buildings with a commercial podium; 1 Hotel building; and 1 Office building all over a common 4 level underground parkade and storage facility.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Tim Potter, Development Planner for the project, introduced the site located on E 1st Avenue at Thornton Street. There is a significant slope (north to south) across the site. The BNSF railway is located immediately to the north of the site, and the site is governed by CD-1 (402) which was updated in 2013. The proposed development application is comprised of a hotel building, an office building, two live-work buildings and a public plaza, and a landscaped area on the Brewery Creek Statutory right of-Way (SRW). The proposed maximum height of the buildings on the site is 150 ft. Mr. Potter then summarized the recommendations in the Staff Committee Report recommending support of the application, subject to the conditions contained in the report.

Tim Potter took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Applicant's Comments

Thanked staff and design panel for support of project. The applicant stated that the building massing has a different building geometry. It was taken from the cues from the art and technology environment that is evolving in the area. Brick was introduced as base for the buildings.

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

The applicant requested to work with Engineering to understand the Amended version of 2.6 and 2.7 conditions.

Comments from other Speakers

Speaker, Ms. Woods, who lives a 366 east 1st, directly adjacent to the building commented on the design of the building is a lot better in the current iteration. The 50.4 meter strip of land to the west of the lot is supported as a creek. The speaker is pleased about the daylighting of the creek and how that would flow. The speaker questioned whether artists could actually afford the units with their live work use. It is sad to see the use of the building disappear and change into a hotel.

Ms. Woods had questions about the intersection have traffic control before construction and whether Thornton Street is going to get blocked for construction because it is not safe and regarding garbage cans in the bike path, stated the safety.

Mr. Dobrovolny from Engineering addressed the question as to whether there will be a traffic signal at this location, and responded that conditions 2.6 and 2.7 would address the construction plan.

Panel Opinion

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

Chair Kim Smith, Urban Design Panel, stated the project was improved. Ms. Smith also stated the live work use was questioned by the Panel as well. There were questions about the bike paths, and the size of the units to accommodate live work. There were questions about public art being developed in this project. It was felt that the urban agriculture was not appropriate because it was not accessible yet.

A panel member supported the project but had concerns about the late notification of the Engineering conditions. Live work functions were questioned, in particular compartmentalizing the spaces. Lastly, the building by law may conflict with the planning comments on live work space. The rooftop amenity space requires more accessibility to accommodate the project.

A panel member mentioned that the strata should clamp down on the live work uses in the space. The architecture and connectivity of the site is good. It has a potential to be amazing but could potentially be dead. The daylighting likely needs maintenance. The hotel would be a great opportunity for residential rental rather than a hotel use.

A panel member mentioned that it was a bonus the amount of the project built for families.

A panel member noted that the live work would not be affordable for artists. Interactive art was welcomed on the project. The retail was a concern regarding the ability of local businesses to rent the space.

A panel member noted the student housing and daycare should be developed. The live work should have certain parameters. The purchaser should know the parameters of the use, and recommends a covenant on the title to create certainty for the purchasers. The project is well designed.

Mr. Dobrovolny discussed whether the aspect of Covenant was explored, and asked the applicant whether the project would be District Energy ready.

The applicant responded that the project will be District Energy ready. The applicant noted that they could not guarantee that the live work use would be ensured.

Mr. Gil Kelley noted the addition of condition 1.6 to better ensure live work use.

Board Discussion

The board clarified the condition for live work use.

Mr. Dobrovolny was in support of challenging the applicant to figure out how the live work use would be clarified. The traffic and conditions need to be timed appropriately and Mr. Dobrovolny appreciated that there was not a lot of warning for the engineering conditions but iterated that the conditions needed coordinating.

Mr. Mochrie supported the project and was happy to work out the conditions.

Motion

It was moved by J. Dobrovolny and seconded by P. Mochrie, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE420195, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated 1.5, 1.6, 2.5. and 2.6, with the following amendments:

ADD condition 1.6 to read as follows:

Arrangements to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services and the General Manager of Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability, for the provision of a legal covenant, or other suitable means, that would ensure that marketing, disposition, and or rental and ongoing management of the live-work project would will optimize the work functions of the live work units and common areas subject to usual nuisance restrictions and reasonable enjoyment of others.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:25 pm.