

Date: Monday, July 16, 2012
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

V. Potter Director of Development Services (Chair)
K. Munro Director of Planning (Acting)
S. Johnston Deputy City Manager
J. Dobrovlny Director of Transportation

Advisory Panel

G. Borowski Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry
S. Chandler Representative of the Development Industry
R. Keate Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission
K. Busby Representative of the General Public
D. Wlodarczak Representative of the General Public

Regrets

F. Rafii Representative of the Design Professions
K. Chen Representative of the General Public
J. Miletic-Prelovac Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

J. Greer Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
R. The Engineering Services - Projects Branch
A. Molaro Development Planner
S. Black Development Planner
M. Au Project Facilitator
D. Autiero Project Facilitator

8198 CAMBIE STREET - DE415707 - ZONE CD-1

J. McEwen James K.M. Cheng Architects Inc.
J. Cheng James K.M. Cheng Architects Inc.
L. Lin Phillips Farevaag Smallegen Landscape Architects

7299 GRANVILLE STREET - DE415627 - ZONE CD-1

R. Maas Perkins + Will
J. Durante Durante & Kreuk
R. Lemon Robert Lemon Architects

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Johnston, seconded by Mr. Dobrovolsky, and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on July 3, 2012 with the following amendments:

Minor typographical error.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 8198 CAMBIE STREET - DE415707 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: James K.M. Cheng Architects Inc.

Request: The development of a mixed use residential/retail development comprised of two residential towers of 25-storeys and 31-storeys on two podium bases of 5 and 7-storeys respectively, consisting of 444 market strata units, 110 market rental units under Short Term Incentives for Rental Housing (STIR) Program, 2 artist studios with associated residential units, commercial use on the ground floor and 4 levels of underground parking, subject to Council's enactment of the CD-1 By-law and approval of the Form of Development.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the application for this development application following a rezoning that has the CD-1 By-law pending. The site fronts Cambie Street and the Canada Line portal and extends between SW Marine Drive and West 65th Avenue. The site and context includes the Marine Gateway development across the street as well the Marine Garden site that is immediately east of the site which is a low rise rental residential complex.

The application includes two towers. The height of one of the towers is 285 feet and the other is 235 feet with 6,300 square foot floor plates which are consistent with the Cambie Corridor Policy and the CD-1 By-law. The proposal also includes both a 7-storey podium and a 5-storey podium that includes rental housing under the STIR program and secured with a Housing Agreement. The base of these rental podium buildings include a uniquely designed 2-storey townhouse that the current application proposes as residential but are designed to be flexible as potential live/work units. These through unit townhouses have frontages with private open space facing onto the lane and on the Cambie Street facing frontage there is a room that can be internally segmented to function as a work space combined with semi-private open space facing onto the courtyards. Also included in the proposal are two secured artist studios with associated residential as part of the on-site Community Amenity contribution. These artist studios are identified to be part of the Mayor's artist in residence program.

In terms of retail, a single storey component is proposed at the base of the Marine Drive tower that wraps the corner facing onto Cambie Street but does not extend to the open spaces in front of the live/work units. At the north end of the site a small boutique retail building is planned. There are important pedestrian connections through the site at the north and south to allow for pedestrian movement between the Cambie Street frontage and the lane.

Ms. Molaro described the history regarding the fire-lane access alongside the Canada Line which was necessary given the existing context and the remoteness of the two houses in the middle of the site. With the consolidation of the site the fire lane access is no longer a requirement along this frontage as fire access will be available from the lane. The Cambie Street public realm will continue to serve functionally as both an off-street bike lane and sidewalk. In other words, the design restrictions associated with the fire lane access would no longer be applicable (i.e. the asphalt surface treatment, the clear six metre wide asphalt surface treatment, and minimal planting). A condition of the rezoning was to improve this frontage, through better definition and treatment of the bikeway and sidewalk.

Also as part of the rezoning, this site should achieve LEED™ Silver and that the building be connectable to a district heating system.

Several key design aspects to the proposal were reflected in the design development conditions of the rezoning which focused on the public realm interface along the frontage; open space landscape treatments; pedestrian linkages through the site to the lane and building form and expression including material quality. Many of the rezoning conditions have been addressed appropriately in the Development Permit application as reflected in the report however Ms. Molaro noted that there remains some modest detailed design development to clarify functionality and usability of the open spaces and landscape treatments.

In response to notification, Ms. Molaro stated that the local neighbourhood group has been following the changes to this area through the Cambie Corridor Policy development, the rezoning process and now through the development permit process and have provided comments on the application that were included in the Staff Committee Report. Ms. Molaro thanked the participants for their input and involvement in the process.

Ms. Molaro reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated July 4, 2012. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarifications were provided by Ms. Molaro:

- Primary access to residential units should not be through the lane as emergency services would normally enter units through the front door. Therefore, Units M and N should have access through internal corridors to the main building entry.
- The proposed berm at the children's play area should have ground cover such as grass so it is useable for children
- There are some pathways through the development but there needs to be more options for pedestrian access and movement through the site.
- Staff are looking for a defined connection at the lane with multiple entries for the different residential units. As well, the gates should be set back to allow for good sightlines through the mews.
- The mechanical penthouses have two different materials with fritted glass screening the mechanical equipment.
- Staff are looking for direct access from Cambie Street to the bike storage which is unachievable so the applicant's solution is to widen the ramp to allow for a separated pathway up the ramp.

- A majority of the lane units are through units although three units do not have a through connection or an alternate choice other than from the lane. Staff want the applicant to ensure the lane facing units have access to the building from their units.
- At the time of the rezoning, the application was only required to achieve LEED™ Silver equivalent but the project will need to have the ability to connect to the neighbourhood energy system.

Applicant's Comments

James Cheng, Architect, stated that the purpose of the lane was not just as a service lane but the idea was to create a pedestrian mews. There is a rain garden to help treat water from the lane and they are hoping that the developer across the lane will also include this in their plans. He noted that they designed the ramp around a set of stairs with a channel for bikes so people can walk their bikes up the ramp or they can take the ramp as well. Mr. Cheng added that they will be pursuing LEED™ Gold and the project has also been designed to plug into the future district energy system.

Mr. Cheng said they had no issues with the recommendations in the Staff Committee Report however he did ask for some clarifications on some of the conditions. Regarding Condition A.1.2., subsection 2, Mr. Cheng noted that the mechanical penthouse is not normally considered in the FSR. It will be used for mechanical purposes only and not living space. Regarding the number of loading bays as noted in Condition A.1.25, Mr. Cheng said he did not understand why they were being asked to provide 7 Class B loading spaces since they only have 8,100 square feet of commercial space and according to the By-law they are required to provide 1 ½ Class B loading spaces. He added that on the north tower there is only one Class B loading space required based on his calculations. He asked the Board to change the condition to reflect what was approved at the rezoning which was four Class B loading spaces. He noted that they are trying to have loading bays that are shared by the commercial, residential and live work to make them more efficient. He requested that he be allowed to provide four Class A and two Class B loading bays. Regarding Condition A.1.33, Mr. Cheng asked the Board to allow him to have a rough-in for the kitchenette for future use in the gym area.

Mr. Cheng said they had no problems in meeting the conditions in Appendix C.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team and staff:

- The retail pavilion at the north end of the site was a result of consultation with the neighbours. They felt it was a long walk from West 64th Avenue to the river and wanted to see some retail on the site for a resting/pause for people on the way to the river.
- There were not any specific standards regarding the number of loading bays needed at the rezoning.
- Since the penthouse has two floors of mechanical as well as stairs and the elevator overrun, there was a disconnect regarding clarity in the drawings so staff included the square footage in the FSR calculations.
- Staff are comfortable with the shaping of the mechanical penthouse and the height being proposed.
- The mechanical penthouse will also house the equipment necessary to connect the building to the district energy system in the future.
- Social Planning staff required the kitchenette in the south tower so that the space could be adaptable for future uses.

- Parking for the market units will be separate from the commercial and the rental units parking. Rental buildings generally need less parking especially when the site is next to a major transit hub.
- Reducing the parking allows for more affordable units under the STIR program. The parking stalls will not be assigned to any particular unit.
- The applicant has carefully studied the bike parking requirements and they are trying to have as many spaces as possible and to make the storage area as accessible as possible.
- The intent is to have the lane be more private than the Cambie Street side. Area in the live/work units could be used to market the artist's work and that is why they are a split level design with extra floor to ceiling heights.
- The cost of the project is in the parking and the applicant wants to be efficient with the amount of parking that can serve the residents.
- The applicant is hoping to do more than deconstruct the existing building. They have found some old beams in the ceiling and are hoping to reuse them in the coffee shop pavilion.
- The lane will not have a sidewalk as they want it to be an informal area. A sidewalk would impact the rain garden. The applicant is planning a green strip for water run off along the edge of the lane.
- The applicant wanted the public realm to be more important than the buildings as this development is secondary to the buildings across Marine Drive on the Marine Gateway site.
- The applicant is planning to have the facades respond passively to solar with sunshades on the south side. Public art is planned for the public realm.
- The community came up with the Marine Landing name and as well with the idea of the public art walk from West 64th Avenue to the river.
- There are two plazas on the site, one at West 64th Avenue and one at Marine Drive.
- The applicant is working with the window manufacturer to enhance the energy savings. They want the mullions to help shade the windows on the west side.
- A car share program is proposed for the site and there will be outlets for future electric cars. The applicant is also looking at a bike share program.

Comments from other Speakers

Janet Fraser said she was excited about the project and wants to see it go well. She wanted to see some landscaping planted around the Canada Line portal. Also the area under the guideway is not attractive and she would like to see that cleaned up. Ms. Fraser said she liked the coffee shop pavilion and that the open space would be used as a children's space. She did have some concerns regarding the lane and thought there might be some safety issues. Ms. Fraser asked the Board how staff judge the success of the permitting process after a project gets completed.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the speaker and the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team and staff:

- It is always a learning process for staff from project to project. As well they need to make sure that what the applicants committed to is carried out at the construction stage.
- The applicant is planning a row of trees adjacent to the Canada Line portal as well as an art piece. The property is under the control of TransLink and so there is not much they can do up against the portal. TransLink does not want anything under the guideway as they need to be able to maintain the structure and as well landscaping would not be viable.
- When the Canada Line was designed with the portal staff pushed to have a higher quality fencing structure around the portal. Vines have been planted around the portal which have yet to grow around the fencing structure and the area under the guideway was envisioned

as hard landscape with the notion of a rain garden. It is a conversation that staff can have with TransLink to make some improvements.

- It is possible to explore public art along the fence but it is a conversation that needs to happen between Engineering Services and TransLink. As well the public art staff and the applicant can talk to TransLink but this is a separate process.
- The trees that the applicant has proposed need to be a species that do not lose its leaves and they need to be located two or three meters away from the portal.
- The applicant currently does not have a tenant for the commercial spaces in the project.
- The applicant had decided to enlarge the gathering space at Cambie Street and Marine Drive with an access elevator.
- Since Vancouver has a mild climate the sustainability consultant thought there was an opportunity to take advantage of a heat sink that will help in the winter to bring some of that energy into the suite.
- The coffee shop pavilion will have skylights that will provide a lantern effect in the evening but will not take away from the green roof.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Borowski said the Panel supported the project and thought it was a well thought out scheme. It was a restrained project with an appropriate language for the site. He noted that the Panel liked the retail pavilion. Mr. Borowski said the Panel had some concerns regarding the pinch point at Cambie Street and Marine Drive but he noted that the applicant has improved the area particularly for handicapped persons. He also stated that the Panel liked the idea of a mews on the lane and hoped that the future development across the lane would also contribute to the mews when it was built. The Panel were also interested in the addition of public art on the project. Mr. Borowski added that he felt the applicant had responded to the Panel's comments and recommend approval for the application.

Mr. Stovell said he thought the applicant had done a great job on the ground plane given the guideway. He said he did not accept the notion that this should be a background building as it is a key location. He added that he felt a little underwhelmed by the architecture. It is a valuable project and needs to speak to affordability but the architecture could be bolder. Mr. Stovell said he recommended approval for the application.

Mr. Chandler said he liked the architecture and the variety of treatments to the exterior as well as the various proposed materials. He added that he appreciated the initiatives that had been taken by the applicant on the project. He thought the courtyards were well done on the laneway and also that the coffee pavilion would be an important amenity to the community. Mr. Chandler thought the primary access to the residential units on the lane could be improved and thought the mews would work well. He added that the conditions in the Staff Committee Report would help to improve the project.

Mr. Keate stated that there were no heritage issues and had no further comments on the project.

Mr. Wlodarczak said he supported the project but had some concerns regarding the bike parking which he thought was fairly limited and would like to see more bike racks made available. Also, he felt that there shouldn't be minimum parking requirements for vehicles considering the development is on a major transit node. He added that this would make the units more affordable as well. Mr. Wlodarczak recommended approval for the application.

Ms. Busby thought it was a nice simple development and recommended approval for the application.

Board Discussion

Mr. Johnston congratulated the applicant for the passive design on the buildings and he complimented the staff for their work. He noted that the applicant had addressed a lot of complicated conditions that affect the site with respect to the Canada Line and the new development across the street.

Mr. Munro said he thought the public realm was the primary feature of the project and he thought the applicant had done an excellent job in that area. He added that he thought the development addressed the Canada Line portal appropriately.

Mr. Dobrovolny said he was happy to support the application. He appreciated all the work that had taken place with the applicant and staff. He said he also appreciated the passive design on the project and hoped to see more of that in other projects. Mr. Dobrovolny thought the few remaining issues could be worked out between the applicant and staff. He added that he would be interested in seeing how the commercial space and unloading was worked out.

In response to a question from a member of the public, Ms. Molaro explained that staff learn from each new project, especially the larger ones as they are often complex. There are a lot of issues that are identified through the rezoning process and then through the development permit process. She added that the discussion regarding the lane facing townhouse units and how staff want to treat the lane has to be thought about in the broader context of the Cambie Corridor Plan. There is a new direction in trying to animate the lanes and how to use them in different ways. Staff will also learn more when the plans are executed.

Ms. Molaro noted that there are a number of tools that staff can use regarding how the conditions in the Staff Committee Report get addressed and resolved. One tool is that Development Services re-notify the neighbours that the approval has been done and then if they wish they can come into City Hall and look at the drawings of what was finally approved. Ms. Molaro noted that it is the nature of construction that things can change due to unforeseen issues and the applicant can then apply for a minor amendment regarding any changes. Depending on the scope of the changes, Staff will decide whether or not a new development permit should be applied for by the applicant and then will notify the neighbours. She added that there is often smaller refining changes that happen and staff wouldn't necessarily notify on them.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Johnston and seconded by Mr. Munro and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE415707, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated July 4, 2012, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.3 to read as follows:

design development to provide for trees with a leaf type and canopy that minimizes the potential for an extended or multiple periods of vegetation drop between the pedestrian/cycling mews alongside and north of the Canada Line portal *and to engage with the City and TransLink to explore public art and other strategies to improve the edge of the Canada Line portal;*

Add a new Condition 1.6 to read as follows:

Development of a deconstruction strategy to maximize re-use of materials and reduction of demolition waste;

Add a new Condition 1.7 to read as follows:

Consider providing for increased bike parking with a bike parking system for stacking the bikes;

Amend Condition A.1.25 by removing the required number of Class B and Class A loading spaces.

Amend Condition A.1.43 to read as follows:

design development to the amenity gym in the North Building to make it into a multi-purpose amenity room by including an accessible washroom with baby change table, a *rough-in for a* kitchenette and storage closet.

Note: Condition 1.7 was made a consideration item from design development item after the Board members had a discussion on the break.

4. 7299 GRANVILLE STREET - DE415627 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Perkins + Will Architects

Request: This application is for Phase One of the development at Shannon Mews. The project includes the construction of two multiple dwelling buildings and one mixed use building (commercial and residential) all over underground parking; together with a public park; the restoration of three designated heritage buildings, landscaping elements and the perimeter walls; and the development of a local energy system.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the application to develop a range of buildings and features on the east half of this ten acre site. This includes two new buildings (Blocks A & B), one new mixed-use building with a small commercial space and residential above (Block C) and the renovation and restoration of three heritage buildings on the site including the Mansion, Coach House and Gate House. As well this application is for the renovation and restoration of the stone and brick perimeter wall and Italianate Garden. In all a total of 267 dwelling units will be built of which 207 will be permanent rental units. The application also includes a new formal garden directly east of the Mansion to replace the former Rose Garden, the establishment of a new public park to the south, thereby creating a new view from West 57th Avenue, the planting of 262 replacement trees and multiple planters for urban agriculture, the creation of a network of public paths in all four directions and as a condition of the rezoning, a local energy system, serving the Phase 1 buildings with air-source heat pumps and rooftop thermal solar panels.

Mr. Black noted that one of the many challenges to redeveloping the site has proved to be vehicle access as there are currently only two driveways into the Phase 2 portion of the 10 acre site. Ingress and egress to northbound Granville Street during rush hour is not good and during the rezoning process the neighbours stated that local traffic impacts during and after construction are a major concern. While the applicant's initial preference was to segregate the Block C building from the other parkades, staff feels the interconnection is critical to give drivers a choice of road access and reduce congestion.

Mr. Black explained that staff are recommending a change that relates to concerns expressed by the Urban Design Panel and Vancouver Heritage Commission as to the appropriate visual expression of the new buildings in relation to the retained buildings. As well staff are asking for improvements to help to deal with road noise from Granville Street and to reduce overlook from the new Building C towards existing neighbours to the north.

Mr. Black said he wanted to thank the many people who worked on the project including the neighbours who have stayed throughout the process and offered thoughtful commentary as well as the applicant team and City Hall staff.

Mr. Black, reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated June 20, 2012. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarifications were provided by Mr. Black:

- The model before the Board reflects the original plans for the site but there is still further design development to be done.

Applicant's Comments

Rod Maas, Architect, said that they generally accept the conditions in the Staff Committee Report and will not have any trouble meeting them. He added that they will be coming back to staff with a minor amendment at a later date as they are planning to add a third story and roof top deck to Block B. Their intention is reduce the floor to floor height to add an additional storey. As well Mr. Maas noted that they are working to lower the frames to the parapet height to calm the elevations.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- There are two play areas on the ground plane and a number of buildings will also have play areas on the roof. As well a public park is planned for the site and some urban agriculture.
- Some of the heritage pieces that are no longer useful will be added into the play areas for children to play on.
- The applicant is proposing a heat pump system and a solar system for hot water in the project. The first phase will be plumbed in for the future district utility.
- There is an at-grade secured bicycle storage planned with access from the corridor at grade, as well as through the lobby and the vehicle ramp.
- The heritage wall is largely brick and stone and is in varying states of condition. They are planning to remove the ivy which is contributing to the destruction of the wall. The stone piers will be retained but some of the brick will be removed to allow people to see into the park and as well there will be two access points with iron gates and stone piers. The applicant is anticipating repairing the stone wall in Phase 2 but will start repairing the north wall in Phase 1 due to its condition.
- The energy utility will be for the Shannon Mews site only.
- Access to the parking will be from both access/entry points.
- Block B and C face the rose garden and the applicant will be reducing the mass of the frames. As well Block A will have less bulky frames. The redesign will have a more horizontal emphasis to the architecture.
- Signage will be clear as to what are the public routes through the site.
- The applicant has reduced the height of the building on Granville Street from eight to six storeys.
- Co-op cars will be provided to the residents and the bike parking requirements will exceed the bylaw requirements.

Comments from other Speakers

Gary Hewitt said he was concerned with the parking arrangement and wanted the applicant to ensure that all the parking was interconnected so that residents could use any of the access points. He also was concerned that construction would impact the neighbourhood and asked the Board to help expedite a traffic impact study as soon as possible.

Patricia Luk said she would have appreciated an earlier notice regarding the Development Permit Board meeting. She said she wanted to know what the commitment was from the developer regarding the amount of square footage planned for Phase 2. She noted that the number has changed since the rezoning and wanted to be assured that they would not change again. She also wanted to know if the co-op cars would be available for the rest of the neighbourhood and not just for the residents of Shannon Mews.

Gary Netcher said he thought it was an important project and hoped it would be successful for showing how density is added in the city. He asked the Board to consider that the construction management plan be done now and not at the permit stage.

Gunther Schrack wondered why the project was split into two phases and why the model showed Phase 2 as 2-storey buildings. He said he was concerned with the discussion regarding reducing the height of Building A as he felt the numbers were always changing. He wanted to know how the City ensures that the developer will abide by the conditions and the bylaws.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by staff and the applicant team:

- The applicant reduced the square footage and height of Block C so there is potential to transfer that excess density to Phase 2.
- The construction management plan would be finalized at the building permit stage.
- The construction management plan is required although there are City bylaws that control noise, dust, time of the day, etc. The plan is done at the building permit stage because it is not until then that the necessary trades have been hired for the project.
- Staff will look at ways to mitigate parking and traffic during construction. As well traffic calming can be used on a temporary basis during construction.
- Typically if staff conduct a survey regarding traffic in advance of the traffic generator being there, they will not have accurate information and the study will have to be redone.
- The applicant has chosen to let the Board know that they are adding another floor on Block B and when they come forward with a proposal, staff will consider their request at that time.
- If the applicant applies for an amendment for an extra floor to Block B it would still meet the requirements for zoning for height, setbacks and the density.
- The project is controlled by density for the entire site, however there are building specific conditions that limit the gross.
- About 6,000 square feet would be added with the 4th floor to Building B. This is a relatively small increase given that the building sits next to Granville Street and not residential.
- The applicant is sticking close to the form of development presented at rezoning.
- It is not unusual for large development to be done in phases.
- There is funding available if traffic calming is required.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Borowski noted that the application had been reviewed by the Urban Design Panel and had been supported. They found some key aspects that needed improvement. The Panel did not feel that the design reinforced the sense of mystery and that getting around the site was not as successful as it could be. However, he noted that the applicant plans to add signage on the site. The Panel also thought that Block B and C were not sensitive to the heritage aspects of the site. Mr. Borowski noted that the applicant has stated that they are responding to that comment by reducing the frames and lowering the profile of Block C. The Panel thought it was important to have information regarding the site available to the public and suggested using a

room or the gatehouse for that purpose. The Panel was also concerned with the access from Granville Street and thought a signal light might be necessary. The Panel thought the sustainable strategy was well handled. Mr. Borowski recommended approval for the application.

Mr. Stovell thought the applicant had a good design for the public realm but felt the architecture needed more work. He also thought that Block C could be a better building and particularly the façade that faces Granville Street. He noted that it is about the detailing and felt that the project would continue to evolve. Mr. Stovell recommended approval for the application.

Mr. Chandler thought the landscaping and attention to detail inside the project and with the ground plane was exceptional. He noted that the site is private largely because of the trees and fencing and thought it was gratifying to see the opening towards the Mansion. He said he had some concerns regarding the architecture and thought more work could be done on Block C. As well he said he wasn't sure what would happen if Block B's height was increased. Mr. Chandler said he appreciated the use of brick and the relationship of Block B to the Mansion. He also thought that the parking strategy should connect underground and that the wayfinding should be clear for the residents in terms of getting their cars in and out of the parkade. He added that there should be an allowance for guest parking as well. Mr. Chandler recommended approval for the application.

Mr. Keate said the Heritage Commission had several workshops regarding the project. He said he thought excellent work had been done regarding the heritage aspects of the site. The proposed materials are complimentary to the original buildings. Mr. Keate thought that Building C in particular didn't work well for the Commission and was concerned that the recreated rose garden might not thrive considering the amount of shade that is cast in that area. He suggested terracing the area to the south.

Mr. Wlodarczak recommended approval for the application. He said he was impressed with the high quality of the project and like that there was a small amount of commercial planned for the site. He commended the applicant on the quality of edible landscaping and said there was a lot of thought put into that aspect of the landscaping. As well Mr. Wlodarczak thought the project was a fine example of how to add density.

Ms. Busby said she recommended approval for the application. She said she particularly liked the sustainable measures that are planned for the site.

Board Discussion

Mr. Dobrovolny said he supported the project and thought the gardens and landscaping were truly spectacular and would create some amazing spaces. He said he was happy to see the preservation of the heritage buildings. He acknowledged the concerns from the community and said those would be addressed through the ongoing process.

Mr. Munro said he was happy to support the recommendations in the Staff Committee Report. They will continue to make the project better and better. He said he hoped through the questions and responses from the Board that the community had some level of comfort regarding their concerns. He thanked the applicants for their work with the community and for also letting the Board know that they plan to come back with a minor amendment. He said he thought that moving added density was actually a good thing because it addresses the fact that density will be used in the first phase. Mr. Munro added that the conditions are clear and address the concerns about connectivity for the parking. He said he supported the application.

Mr. Johnston thanked the public for the hundreds of hours of their time regarding this important project. He said he heard their concerns and staff will be moving the project to the next phase and the issues around construction that will impact the community will be addressed. He also thanked staff for their work noting that the heritage structures would not be lost. He said he was proud to see that they will be preserved and celebrated. In addition he thought the landscaping design was exciting and looked forward to being able to wander around the gardens. He added that the project is a model for green building features and was glad to see the neighbourhood utility included. Mr. Johnston agreed that there was still some work to be done regarding the architecture particularly on Block C but felt the applicant had done a good job so far. Mr. Johnston was in support of the application.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE415627, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated June 20, 2012.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

6. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:02 PM

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

V. Potter
Chair