

Date: Tuesday, June 25, 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)
C. Nelms Deputy General Manager, Engineering (Item 1)
G. Kelley General Manager of Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability
J. Dobrovlny General Manager of Engineering (Item 2)

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

Regrets

B. Jarvis Representative of the Development Industry
R. Chaster Representative of the General Public
S. Allen Representative of the General Public
A. Molaro Assistant Director Urban Design
R. Wittstock Representative of the Development Industry
R. Rohani Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

G. Schaefer Development Planner
M. Linehan Development Planner
T. Tenney Project Facilitator
D. Lee Project Facilitator
C. Joseph Engineering
J. Greer Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development

129 Keefer – DE420078 – ZONE HA-1A

Deferred Decision from June 11th
Delegation
Darren Burns, Architect, Stantec
Nalon Smith, Landscape Architect, LEES + Associates
Andrew Collins, Owner

1515 Alberni Street – DP-2018-00139 – DD

Delegation:
Brendon Avery, Architect, FRANKL Architecture
Joseph Tribell, Architect, FRANKL Architecture
Mark Adams, BOSA Properties

Minute taker: C.Lade

Welcome

We acknowledge we that we are on the unceded homelands of the Musqueum, Squamish, and Tsleil-Wauthuth nations and we give thanks for their generosity and hospitality on these lands

1. MINUTES

It was moved by P. Mochrie, and seconded by G. Kelley, and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting June 11, 2018.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 129 Keefer Street – DE420078 – HA-1A (COMPLETE APPLICATION) Deferred Decision from June 11, 2018

Applicant: 0979100BC LTD

Request: To develop on this site a nine-storey mixed-use building with retail on the ground floor and 32 dwelling units on levels two through nine, all over 2 levels of underground parking providing 24 parking spaces having vehicular access from the lane via a car-elevator.

Development Planner’s Opening Comments

Ms. Linehan, Development Planner, noted revisions of conditions of 1.5 – 1.7.

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

Applicant’s Comments

The applicant expressed no concern for the amended conditions.

The Applicant took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Board Discussion

Mr. Kelley noted the amended conditions 1.5-1.7 did a lot to address the concerns and improve the standard in terms of culturally contextual architecture without being faux historic. Mr. Kelly expressed willingness to approve the project.

Advisory Panel Discussion

Ms. Amela Brudar, UDP Panel Chair, noted the design had become more pedestrian than the previous iteration. Ms. Brudar noted the architectural expression became less desirable. Ms. Brudar urged more design development of the cornice because it appears 'applied' and urged something more integrated.

Mr. Kelley, General Manager of Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability, concurred with Ms. Brudar's opinion of the cornice.

Motion

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

THAT the **APPROVE** Development Application No. **DE420078** in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated June 1, 2018 with the amendments to 1.5-1.7 as follows:

Condition 1.5 amended:

design development to delete the angled brick frame element surrounding main façade;

Condition 1.6 amended:

design development to the main facade to achieve a composition that is more compatible with historic buildings in the neighbourhood, including:

- i. strengthen the expression of two vertical bays reflecting the historic 25 ft. parcelization pattern through the use of brick piers;
- ii. strengthen the expression of a hierarchical tri-partite composition as follows:
 - a. Cornice: provide a prominent upper cornice element to cap the main façade. The cornice profile and material should be distinct from the vertical brick piers.
 - b. Middle Facade: bring the middle façade forward to align generally with the adjacent building to provide a consistent street wall with inset balconies. In particular, ensure delicate 'filigree' expression of balconies consistent with renderings.

3. 1515 Alberni Street – DP-2018-00139 – ZONE DD (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Adrian Lai

Request: To develop a 40-storey mixed-use building containing Retail (ground floor) and 195 Dwelling Units; all above 7 levels of underground parking providing a total of 315 parking spaces having vehicular access from Nicola Street

Staff: Patrick O'Sullivan/ Gavin Schaefer

Development Planner's Opening Comments

G. Schaefer, Development Planner, presented the proposal and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report.

G. Schaefer then took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Applicant's Comments

The applicant did not have any concerns about the conditions provided. The applicant noted the conditions that would be continued to be developed.

The applicant asked the Board for relaxation for the setback intrusions on Alberni and Georgia Streets. The cantilever should not have any significant impact on the public realm, according to the applicant. The south side property line, along Alberni Street, the building has relocated for the trees, and noted the balcony overhang is significantly setback from Alberni Street. The applicant noted the entrances, overhanging balconies, on the design drawings.

The Applicant took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Comments from Speakers

Speaker one, Ann Robson, noted the impact of the project on the neighbouring site. Ms. Robson noted the size of the building on a small site and the impact on the neighbours. The change of siting of the building raised concerns for neighbours. The overhangs and projections are a concern, and Ms. Robson urged the Board to address them. The shadowing is not consistent with family housing guidelines. The design conditions and contribution to the neighbourhood are a concern as well.

Speaker two, Virginia Richards, noted view from the neighbouring site and overhang potential effects from the proposed development. Ms. Richards noted the tower separation would not be 80 foot as required in the West End Plan.

Mr. O'Sullivan, Development Planner, noted the 80 foot standard separation for residential to commercial towers did not apply.

Advisory Panel Discussion

Ms. Brudar, Urban Design Panel Chair, noted UDP feedback was positive and noted the proposal would enhance the corridor. The high level of materials was supported by the panel. The public realm concerns were addressed by the applicant. The water feature would enhance the sidewalk public realm experience. The plaza renovations were handled exceptionally well. The mechanical elements were handled extremely well. The level of sustainability of the building was well beyond the minimum requirements.

Mr. Norfolk, Heritage Commission, noted that the building was well written up in the heritage section. The building proposal was well handled. The Heritage Commission supported the project. Mr. Norfolk noted personal opinion of the project is that it is too dominating, too tall, for the area. Mr. Norfolk noted the project design came a long way from the original design.

Ms. Pretto noted the application was appreciated. Ms. Pretto noted reducing the water feature and improving the public realm brought vibrancy to the neighbourhood in the proposal. The sense of arrival was added to the site with the water feature. Ms. Pretto supported the project.

Board Discussion

Mr. Dobrovolny noted agreement that a smaller building would have had better impact on the heritage aspects. Mr. Dobrovolny noted non-support for condition 1.1. In this case the overhang currently does not intrude into the public realm due to their height and lack of obstruction to the public realm and other buildings.

Mr. Kelley noted the approval would be only for what is proposed in the current application. Mr. Kelley queried as to whether the building scale would have been out of scale for the surroundings. Mr. O'Sullivan, Development Planner, noted the building height and floorplan do satisfy the requirements and fulfilled conditions for a gateway building in the West End Plan.

Mr. Mochrie referenced the double row of trees, in relation to the proposed setback, and Ms. Joseph from engineering, noted the streetscape would completely change. Mr. Mochrie noted support for removing condition 1.1 and the Motion to support the project. Furthermore, Mr. Mochrie noted the unit mix of 60% family units was a commendable aspect of the proposal.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted that the application was not a 'done deal' when the proposal was presented despite supporting the project, and acknowledged appreciation for the views expressed from the surrounding neighbours.

Mr. Gill noted the project conformed to the plan however fast the changes are happening in the West End neighbourhood. The applicant has responded well to staff and conditions, and noted appreciation of the neighbour's input. Mr. Gill supported the project.

Motion

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

THAT the Board **APPROVE** Development Application No. **DP-2018-00139** in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated May 30, 2018 with the following amendment:

REMOVE Condition 1.1.:

~~Design development to avoid building mass, including balconies, that overhangs or projects into the ultimate building setback at any level;~~

6. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:20 pm.