

**Date:** Tuesday, April 3, 2018  
**Time:** 3:00 p.m.  
**Place:** Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

---

**PRESENT:****Board**

P. Mochrie Deputy City Manager  
A. Law Director, Development Services, (Chair)  
J. Greer Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development  
J. Dobrovolny General Manager of Engineering  
A. Molaro Assistant Director Urban Design

**Advisory Panel**

A. Brudar Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
A. Norfolk Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission  
D. Pretto Representative of the General Public  
S. Allen Representative of the General Public

**Regrets**

R. Wittstock Representative of the Development Industry  
G. Kelley General Manager of Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability  
R. Rohani Representative of the General Public  
B. Jarvis Representative of the Development Industry  
R. Chaster Representative of the General Public

**ALSO PRESENT:****City Staff:**

M. Linehan Development Planner  
P. O'Sullivan Development Planner  
L. King Project Facilitator  
C. Joseph Engineering  
K. Imani Project Facilitator  
C. Stanford Project Facilitator  
D. Naundorf Social Planner II

**7433 Cambie Street - DP-2017-01150- ZONE RT-2**

## Delegation

Martin Brinkleve, Architect, ITSY  
Tony Wai, Architect, IBI  
Bryce Gauthier, Landscape Architect, EGLA  
Jamie Vaughan, Developer, Onni Group  
Jason Paclar, LEE Consultant, Recollective

**1810 Alberni Street - DP-2017-01157- C-5A**

## Delegation

Foad Rafii, Architect, Rafii Architects Inc.  
Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, Durante Kreuk Ltd.

---

Recording Secretary: C.Lade

1. MINUTES

It was moved by P. Mochrie, and seconded by A. Molaro, and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting March 5, 2018.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 7433 Cambie Street - DP-2017-001150- ZONE RT-2 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: ONNI/IBI

Request: To develop the site with a 22 storey mixed-use building and a 26 storey mixed-use building with 307 market dwelling units, 138 social housing dwelling units, 44 Pearson supportive units and retail use on the ground floors all over 4 levels of underground parking accessed from a new internal street. This is Parcel A of Phase 1 of the Pearson Dogwood redevelopment.

**Development Planner’s Opening Comments**

M. Linehan, Development Planner, presented the proposal and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report.

M. Linehan then took questions from the Board and Panel members.

**Applicant’s Comments**

The applicant noted the two biggest concerns. The concern is that the amenity requirement is too expensive due to using FSR, but can be workable using the pavilion as an amenity space. Condition A is not a condition the applicant agrees with because it brings two uses together that are very challenging. Condition A causes too much of a conflict for the Strata and other parties. The social housing entry can be improved, made more ‘grand’, and storm water management can be addressed. The accessibility conditions in the report have much more than enhanced accessibility. The ramp and walkway accessibility is intended to be improved. There is a 33 000 square feet amenity proposed at the site. Stand-alone amenity pavilions are still a process of being developed in terms of who and what runs it, but every strata is meant to have sufficient amenity space.

The integrated rainwater plan commitment is intended by the applicant to meet the IRMP guidelines.

Staff noted the indoor amenity guidelines require indoor building guidelines and by-laws.

The Applicant took questions from the Board and Panel members.

**Comments from Speakers**

No speakers were in attendance.

### Advisory Panel Discussion

A. Brudar, Urban Design Panel Chair, noted UDP feedback as supported the project and that the project was ‘well-thought out, well received design, and the grid was well thought out with dynamic building forms while providing interest and porosity to the site. The panel thought the towers could use more articulation and solar orientation. The amenity was too under sized and in the wrong orientation. The amenity lobby needed more prominence. The public realm on Cambie Street also seems too generic. Overall, the project is supported by the panel.

Mr. Norfolk, Heritage Commission, expressed concern about a missed opportunity in adapting the power-house into a community amenity space. Mr. Norfolk urged re-assessment of the other buildings on the site.

Ms. Pretto noted the application was well thought out. Ms. Pretto noted the unit mix was supportable, particularly the mix of affordable units. Ms. Pretto noted disappointment on how much glass is on the building, particularly in the back of the building for the privacy. Heat loss and energy efficiency are also concerns due to the amount of glass.

Ms. Allen noted the accessibly dispersed around the site, and noted the unit mix was good for accessibility reasons. The pavilion building is a good opportunity to create social mixing. Ms. Allen thanked the applicant for the well done proposal.

Staff addressed the heritage concerns noted by Mr. Norfolk, by stating the difficulty to retain the heritage buildings. Ms. Linehan noted the public art plan would address First Nations history. Mr. Dobrovolny noted that communication between heritage and staff should be emphasized.

### Board Discussion

Ms. Molaro proposed some amendments to the conditions. Ms. Molaro noted the support for the units being accessible, considering the aging demographic, in all projects going forward.

Mr. Mochrie was happy to support the conditions.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted support for the application and expressed the complications of the site and lack of clarity between staff and applicant should be addressed with more meetings and communication overall going forward.

### Motion

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

THAT the **APPROVE** Development Application No. **DP-2017-01150** in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated February 21, 2018, with the following amendments:

At condition 1.1 a. Note to Applicant add the line ‘Other locations such as level 6 may also be considered’.

April 3, 2018

At condition 1.1 b at the end of the Note to Applicant, add the line: “A text amendment will be required to exclude the market amenity area”, to ensure there is no loss in floor area.

**4. 1810 Alberni Street - DP-2017-001157 - ZONE C-5A (COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Rafii Architects & Landa Global Properties

Request: To develop on the site a 21-storey mixed use building containing retail (first floor), social housing (second & third floor), and market residential (third to twenty first floor all over three levels of underground parking with vehicular access from the lane and a heritage density transfer of 9,278 square feet)

**Development Planner’s Opening Comments**

P. O’Sullivan, Development Planner, presented the proposal and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report.

P. O’Sullivan then took questions from the Board and Panel members.

**Applicant’s Comments**

The applicant noted condition 1.8 i. be deleted, re-locating the commercial unit, changes the whole project due to the location of the lobby. The area can be enhanced with a setback, landscaping and glazing, but commercial cannot be provided at that area due to the depth that cannot be met. The applicant would like to remove condition 1.8(i) moving the commercial unit.

Condition A1.3.7 and 1.3.9 required 50% but the applicant would like the 50% family units condition relaxed.

Ms. Molaro clarified that the mix of 50% family units was necessary. Ms. Molaro noted the goal was to reach the unit numbers for the family units. Staff clarified that the unit requirement is imbedded in the zoning. Mr. Greer challenged the architect to find the appropriate mix of social housing units in the podium. The podium area represents almost the entire required social housing unit mix in the building.

The Applicant took questions from the Board and Panel members.

**Comments from Speakers**

Speaker one, Danielle Dalbec, noted support for the design. Ms. Dalbec noted concerns about location in relation to the sidewalk and loss of views. Ms. Dalbec requested a definition of social housing.

Mr. Naundorf, from housing noted the definition of social housing would include lower end rent that would be affordable for people on disability, pensions and welfare, and other low rates. The mix would be 80% strata condos at market rates and 20% social housing.

**Advisory Panel Discussion**

A. Brudar, Urban Design Panel Chair, noted UDP feedback as supportive of the project design. Ms. Brudar noted the 'elegant and refined' tower form appropriate for the site. There were two major issues. The height was one issue, and noted a three storey podium was more supported to make the building more balanced. Also the other issue was the averaging of the floor plate size, which was necessary to create the expression. The window walls percentage to opaque walls and solar heat gain was supported.

Mr. Norfolk, Heritage Commission, noted support for the transfer of density and hoped the density would return. Mr. Norfolk supported the design.

Ms. Pretto, noted support for the application. Ms. Pretto noted the livability and comfort, and noted the loss of the restaurant, but noted the community piece was supportable. The ratio of car to bike parking spaces is not the correct ratio. Accessibility should be included in the project as a given.

Ms. Allen noted support for the project, and noted accessibility is something to consider. The outdoor amenity location is supportable for the affordable housing units.

**Board Discussion**

Ms. Molaro proposed amending a few conditions.

Mr. Dobrovoly noted support for the design. Mr. Dobrovoly noted challenges with the podium and supported a split of the podium to be relaxed.

Mr. Greer confirmed the 50/50 was in the technical guidelines and could be relaxed.

Mr. Mochrie concurred with not losing units to meet the 50/50 split.

Ms. Molaro also recommended amending condition A.1.39. Ms. Molaro noted support for the project.

**Motion**

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

THAT the **APPROVE** Development Application No. **DP-2017-01157** in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated February 21, 2018, with the following amendments:

Remove from condition 1.8 section i. "Locating a commercial unit at this corner" and iv. "Providing potential ..."

Amend condition 1.8 iii. to read "Introducing glazing into South elevation that permits sightlines into the corner entry lobby from passerby on the sidewalk."

Amend condition A.1.39 to read: "design development to the unit mix of the social housing to achieve as close as reasonably possible at least 50% of the units as 2 or more bedroom family units."

**6. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:50 pm.