

**Date:** Monday, June 12, 2017  
**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  
A. Molaro Assistant Director Urban Design

**Advisory Panel**

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

**Regrets**

R. Chaster Representative of the General Public  
P. Mochrie Deputy City Manager  
G. Kelley General Manager of Planning and Development Services  
M. Pollard Representative of the General Public  
H. Aguirre Puértolas Representative of the General Public  
H. Ahmadian Representative of the Development Industry

**ALSO PRESENT:**

**City Staff:**

J. Greer Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development  
T. Potter Development Planner  
D. Wiley Development Planner  
L. King Project Facilitator  
A. Wroblewski Project Facilitator

**401 W STREET - DP-2017-00119 - ZONE DD**

Delegation  
Bruce Knapp, Architect, B & H Architects  
Carlo Timpano, Owner, Oxford Properties

**1488 Robson STREET - DP-2017-00376 - ZONE C-6**

Delegation  
Mark Thompson, Architect, MM  
Andy Tam, Owner, Asia Standard Americas Ltd.

**Recording Secretary: C.Lade**

**1. MINUTES**

It was moved by Ms. Molaro, seconded by J. Dobrovolny, and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on May 1st, 2017.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

**3. 401 W Georgia Street - DP-2017-00119 - ZONE DD  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: B & H Architects

Request: To develop a 9 storey office building over two levels of existing underground parking accessed from the lane and seeking a 10% increase in the Floor Space Ratio using a Heritage Density Transfer of 3,822 square meters.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Mr. Tim Potter, Development Planner, presented the proposal and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Tim Potter took questions from the Board and Panel members.

**Applicant's Comments**

The applicant was concerned about certain conditions. Condition 1.1, in terms of Heritage density, will be met by working with Planning. Condition 2.2 will be addressed by working with planning in regards to massing. Condition 1.3 will be implemented with engineering in terms of parking requirements, and a traffic management plan and car sharing spaces will be provided. With regards to item 1.4, the applicant is required to have 2 class B loading bays in proximity to the existing tower. But the applicant said this recommendation would be challenging for operational efficiency. The applicant requests 5 Class B loading bays on the site and allow the applicant to investigate the rationale. Second it would have one point of security in the site. And three, enables the applicant to use the pre-existing structure to accommodate the loading bays. The consolidate loading bay is preferred by the applicant after investigating and the applicant outlined the urban design rationale for the location of the loading bay due to the impact on the retail operations.

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

**Comments from other Speakers**

Speaker, one Reverend Stanley Galvon, outlined the impact of the Holy Rosary Cathedral and the concerns around seismic upgrades. The current proposal it crowds the cathedral and blocks views. Modifications to the current proposal are requested.

The lane parking and traffic is also a concern. A loading management plan and a no loading zone is recommended.

Speaker two, Mr. Ari Smits, is a parishioner from the Cathedral and an architect. Mr. Smits suggested setting back the proposed development 6 meters. The upper floors should align from

the north face of the tower. Mr. Smits summarized his concerns, and noted the cathedral would be fully seismically upgraded.

The speakers took question from the Board and Panel members.

### Panel Opinion

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

Chair Kim Smith, Urban Design Panel, noted the proposal could pay more attention to the heritage aspect of the cathedral. The loading suggestions should be taken into consideration.

Panel member Mr. Jarvis previously recommended a system put in place to reimburse parking. Mr. Jarvis noted that engineering had a parking relaxation discussion in the downtown core that was announced publicly. Cash in lieu for parking or negotiating parking relaxations were debated. Mr. Jarvis inquired as to whether the conversation was still ongoing internally to having parking relaxed all together in the downtown core. Furthermore, Mr. Jarvis wanted to know why there are still negotiations for parking relaxations in ongoing development applications.

With respect to loading, Mr. Jarvis agreed with the applicant in terms of loading requirements. With respect to timber columns, if they are not outbound they will change the look of the building.

Panel member Mr. Wittstock noted his concern of the light coming into the transept. Anything to minimize that impact would be a good gesture. Retail should be setback at the street. It is not an optimal configuration for success. The loading bays should not be opposite of the church.

Panel member Ms. Maust mentioned that it was a shame that the heritage comments did not come earlier. A loading management plan would benefit them greatly. Look at the loading and parking to not occur in the lane. More heritage input would help the development. The colour and wood columns could be changed.

Panel member Mr. Lai, agreed with the staff recommendations. A loading management plan should be implemented. Features on the building that affect the neighbouring heritage building should be taken into consideration.

### Board Discussion

Ms. Molaro noted the shadow impacts from staff recommendation from Mr. Potter, would not be significant to the west with a further setback.

Ms. Molaro noted the heritage 10% bonus is supporting heritage retention of a different heritage building. While there is no direct correlation between the proposal and the heritage bonus, it is supporting another heritage building. There is a concern on the Dunsmuir side of the site that the project has pushed in front of the church and affected it.

Ms. Molaro proposed to make an amendment on condition 1.2, instead of 'design consideration' make it 'design development'. The goal is to set back the massing of levels 5 through 7 to improve the site lines and views of the church spires up and down Dunsmuir. The amendments at the Design Development stage are to revise the massing of the office towers as follows:

Under A, instead of increase 'roof terrace' at level 5, change it to 'relocate roof terrace' at level 5 to the south side.

Item B can remain as is.

Item C could be deleted 'to align levels 5-9 on the south side' and instead should be changed to 'to align levels 5-9 on the north side'. The rationale is to allow the vertical spires to be seen down the street.

Item D could be deleted.

Ms. Molaro noted the discretionary nature of ODP development based on performance but that it does not mean that there cannot be development on this part of the site. The full amount of density may not always be achievable. There are sensitivities with the site in relation to the church. The amendment would mean the proposal would not return to the Board by addressing the conditions.

Mr. Dobrovlny noted that a comprehensive loading management plan for the site would be at staff discretion as to how it is arranged. Ms. Molaro stated the condition would be amended to state 'or alternative location to the satisfaction of engineering services based on an acceptable loading management plan'. A staff member noted that the 'connection should be at grade' and should be clear in the condition.

Ms. Molaro added another condition 1.6 'provide continuous weather condition' and proposed an additional condition in regards to the proposed colour, but asked the applicant to consider alternate colours that are empathetic to the adjacent historic building.

Mr. Potter noted the condition 1.4 sub A: "design development to provide 2 class B loading spaces to serve the new development to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering services and the Director of Planning". Furthermore, in the note to applicant, related to the condition, leave the language as it is. But, add one more line to say "an exploration of an at-grade condition of the two towers or loading areas or cores can be considered". And finally a comprehensive loading management plan should be added.

Mr. Dobrovlny appreciated the design of the building, but the challenge is the context of the building coming into the space. Some work should be done to make the buildings fit better together. Mr. Dobrovlny supported the amendments.

#### **Motion**

It was moved by Ms. Molaro and seconded by J. Dobrovlny, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DP-2017-00119, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated June 12, 2017, to amend condition 1.2 and 1.4 and add conditions 1.6. and 1.7 as follows:

1.2 design development to increase setbacks at levels 5 to 7 of the office tower as follows:

- a) Decrease the terrace at level 5; and
- b) Eliminate roof terrace at level 8 south side.

Note to applicant: This design condition is to improve the visibility of the church spires to be more readily seen or apparent and will entail revising the massing on Dunsmuir Street.

- 1.4 design development to provide loading spaces and enhancements to existing loading spaces compliant to the Parking By-law as follows:
- a) design development to provide two Class B loading spaces to serve the new development, supported by a comprehensive loading management plan to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and the Director Of Planning (see also standard condition A1.5).
  - b) provision of Class A loading as outlined in Table 4.5 of the provided Transportation Review, including five (5) Class A loading spaces serving the existing tower, and three (3) Class A loading spaces serving the proposed tower;
  - c) reinstatement/restoration of the loading spaces of the existing building to meet minimum vertical clearance requirements; and

Note to Applicant: The loading for the new building is circuitous and needs to be conveniently linked to the proposed office and retail facility. An at-grade connection from the loading spaces to the new building's elevator core can be considered.

- 1.6 design development to provide continuous weather protection  
1.7 design consideration for an alternative building color that is more empathetic to the adjacent historic church

#### 4. 1488 Robson Street - DP-2017-00376 - ZONE C-6 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership

Request: To develop the site with a mixed use building (31 and 32 storey towers) that includes 300 dwelling units (237 market/63 social housing), retail use on ground floor, and office use on the second and third floors all over three levels of underground parking accessed from the lane and also requesting an increase in the Floor Space Ratio using a Heritage Density Transfer from a donor site at 12 Water Street (providing 35,800 square feet).

#### Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ms. Wiley, 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. Wiley took questions from the Board and Panel members.

#### Applicant's Comments

The applicant agreed with most of the conditions, except one condition. The applicant noted the slope of the site, with active uses on all four sides of the project and the servicing of the

building internalized to provide activity all the way around. In the lane there are residential entries and on Robson there are office entries as well as retail use. It has been very difficult to find a location for the public bike share (pbs) that is 60 feet long and does not have a significant impact on one or more of those elements. With the significant slope and location on Nicola Street, the pbs at the requested location is not preferred.

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

### Comments from other Speakers

Speaker one, Mr John Huston addressed the panel with reference in the West End Plan in regards to the Arts and Culture sector. Mr. Huston outlined the West End plan's work to address building arts and culture facilities. Mr. Huston asked to reconsider implementing Arts and Culture facilities into the building.

Speaker two, Mr. Mark Robins, represented the neighbouring condo development. With development comes responsibility and a moral requirement. The proposed developer has not shown the true impact on their neighbouring site. The tower will affect the quality of life in for the neighbours. Traffic is also a huge concern due in the laneway, especially with pollution and traffic. The impact of construction will also impact the neighbours. Bike share should not be expanded because the developer does not prefer it. Mr. Robins outlined the reasons for considering development concerns.

Eddie Elmer noted concerns in a letter regarding the proposal including the demolition and roof top lighting.

Mr. Ken Kato, speaker three, noted view concerns from neighbours.

Speaker four noted his rebuttal and said that he was in favour of the development and noted the positive contributions outweighed the negatives, especially when it comes to social housing. The speaker noted that those who spoke out against the development were a minority of home owners in the area against the social and rental housing.

Mr. Donahee, owner of the building next door, is not opposed to the development. The concern is for the engineering component in terms of truck traffic. The second concern is in regards to the heritage building, which might be at risk of damage by the construction.

Staff addressed questions raised by speakers.

### Panel Opinion

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

Ms. Kim Smith, UDP Chair, noted the concerns of the UDP. The buildings were too monotonous for the street and the tops of the buildings should have something distinctive architecturally. There were concerns about the juxtaposition of the playground. Ms. Smith understood the concern for the public realm and the period of construction. It would be helpful to see the contextual effect of the development. The trade-off for low income housing is necessary.

Mr. Wittstock noted the concern for turning the balconies into Juliet balconies. There is a concern for the bicycle parking being below minimum. More outdoor space is encouraged. If there was some height flexibility it would be appreciated.

Ms. Maust appreciated the social housing. The lane is appreciated, and recommended not losing the lane cut out for character.

Mr. Lai appreciated the needs for arts and culture, but noted the project met the zoning requirements. The livability of the non-market housing units was appreciated.

Staff noted the bicycle parking was lower than minimum the requirements.

#### **Board Discussion**

Engineering staff noted the construction management plans and Mr. John Greer noted the hazardous materials abatement plans required during the permit stage.

Ms. Molaro noted the consideration of 1.6 of the architectural expression and shape of the towers. The building design was not meant to be prescriptive, and Ms. Molaro was confident the design would develop. Ms. Molaro thanked the public for their input. And thanked staff for the comprehensive report.

Mr. Dobrovolny thanked the speakers that attended. There were a number of very important points that were made in terms of construction and traffic management plans. The West End Arts suggestion was also noted as something to consider in future.

#### **Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DP-2017-00376

#### **5. 1236 Bidwell Street - DE416018 - ZONE RM-5A (COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: The Owners Strata Plan VR457

Request: Alterations to validate balcony enclosures that have been previously converted to floor space and to convert existing enclosed balconies into floor space in units 201, 202, 203, 401, 402, 403, 601, 602, 603, 801, 802, 803, 1001, 1002, 1003, 1201, 1202, 1203, 1401, 1402, 1403, 1601, 1602, & 1603, for a total of 3,616 square feet in this multiple dwelling building, thereby granting an increase in floor area through a Heritage Transfer of Density, in accordance with the decision of the Development Permit Board.

#### **Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Ms. Wiley, Development Planner, noted the recommendation was for support of the application.

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

#### **Applicant's Comments**

The applicant did not give a presentation.

**Comments from other Speakers**

There were no comments from speakers.

**Panel Opinion**

Panel members did not offer comments on the proposal.

**Board Discussion**

There was no board discussion.

**Motion**

It was moved by Mr. Dobrovolny and seconded by Ms. Molaro, and was the decision of the Board to move to amend 101:

    THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE416018

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:45 pm.