

Date: Monday, July 30, 2012
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT:

Board

K. McNaney Assistant Director of Planning (Chair)
K. Munro Director of Planning (Acting)
D. McLellan Deputy City Manager
P. Judd General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

G. Borowski Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
F. Rafii Representative of the Design Professions
J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry
S. Chandler Representative of the Development Industry
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission
K. Busby Representative of the General Public
J. Miletic-Prelovac Representative of the General Public
D. Wlodarczak Representative of the General Public

Regrets

K. Chen 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
D. Jung Project Facilitator
M. D'Agostini Heritage Planner
A. Bond Assistant Director of Housing Policy

1155 HORNBY STREET - DE412314 - ZONE DD

R. Henriquez Henriquez Partners Architects
S. Best Henriquez Partners Architects

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Munro seconded by Mr. Judd, and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on July 16, 2012 with the following amendments:

Amend Mr. Wlodarczak's comments on page 6, second sentence to read:
Also, he felt that there should not be minimum parking requirements for vehicles considering the development is on a major transit node.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 1155 HORNBY STREET - DE412314 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Henriquez Partners Architects

Request: To develop this site with a 20 storey multiple dwelling and 3 storey townhouses containing a total of 164 dwelling units over 4 levels of underground parking; to rehabilitate the façade of the existing heritage 'B' listed building (The Murray Hotel); and retention of the existing 108 units in the existing Single Room Accommodation (SRA) at 1119 Hornby Street.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the application for a building located midblock on the westerly side of Hornby Street between Davie and Helmcken Streets. The site also includes the Murray Hotel, a 4-storey heritage B building containing 108 SRA units. Ms. Molaro described the context for the area noting the other towers in the area.

The application sought additional density for the façade restoration of the Murray Hotel which will result in a proposed overall density of 6.09 FSR which under the Downtown ODP, the Board can consider the density bonus compensation for the extent of the heritage rehabilitation of the Murray Hotel. Pursuant to the Board's decision, Council approval will be sought to designate the retained portions of the Murray Hotel as protected heritage features.

With respect to height the Downtown ODP allows a height of 300 feet however the height is restricted by Council adopted view cones which limit the buildable height to approximately 184 feet. The application has some very minor incursions into the view cone of 3.8 feet at the top of the elevator mechanical parapet wall. Staff are recommending acceptance of this incursion as it is minor and would result in a "not perceived reduction" of the mountain view from the origin of the view point.

Ms. Molaro noted that the primary issue identified with the application is the proposed building proximity with adjacent buildings. The site is challenged by a number of existing building adjacencies that include the on-site Murray Hotel, the adjacent London Place and the recently approved social housing development across the lane. A number of massing options were explored including various street wall massing forms with and without a tower form. The proposed tower and podium massing was considered to have the most merit as it generally

conforms with the application guidelines and includes the retention of the Murray Hotel. This approach was also considered to be the least impactful than the other massing scenarios.

The tower has a floor plate of 6678 square feet and is slightly more than the guideline recommendations of a floor plate of 6500 square feet. The tower has been shaped as well with its narrowest dimension of 74 feet and a length of 102 feet with a narrowing of the façade down to 75 feet for the primary portion of the façade facing London Place

To address neighbourliness the guidelines call for tower separations of 80 feet. This is achieved through each development site providing a 40 foot setback for towers on each site. The proposed tower has provided a 60 feet setback (20 feet more than recommended in the guidelines) however, London Place which was originally built as an office building and converted to residential in 1994 only provides a 11.5 foot setback resulting in an overall tower separation of 71.5 feet; not quite the 80 feet separation.

A further limiting factor to tower placement on the site is the built form relationship to the existing Murray Hotel and its SRA units. As stated in the guidelines the intent is to preserve access to light and air for the residential units within the Murray Hotel. Staff are satisfied that this relationship has been appropriately accommodated.

Ms. Molaro stated that with respect to tower siting with the social housing project across the street, the social housing unit layout was configured to be oriented east and west at the time that these two proposals were still in the early design stage and not across the lane. The unit layouts in the proposed building have been configured to allow for those primary views from the living room windows away from the social housing building. So while the tower separation of 80 feet has not been provided staff are satisfied that the privacy and livability for the residents of these two future buildings has been achieved. Ms. Molaro added that considering the view impacts from these residential units, with the less than 80 foot separation, the resultant view impacts from the two corner units of London Place is a reduction of approximately 5% of their view aperture and within acceptable limits.

Ms. Molaro indicated that the recommendations in the report are to support the additional density and to move forward to Council for the heritage designation of the Murray Hotel. Along with the provision of a signed tenant relocation/mitigation plan for the improvements being provided to the Murray Hotel, which include the façade upgrades along with upgrades to the bathroom facilities. As well there is a recommended condition to provide further detailed information of the at grade townhouse interface and a condition to provide more opportunities for social activity as part of the podium landscape treatment.

Ms. Molaro stated that there were several concerns raised through the notification process which included tower and podium proximity and view impacts as well as traffic impacts in the lane. Staff believe that the aspects associated with view impacts have been adequately addressed, noting that the tower placement on the site is being done to provide as much separation as possible and that the site given the Heritage asset and view cone limitations that variation from the guidelines may be considered. Parking access was also reviewed by Engineering staff and it is appropriate to have parking access for the site serviced from the lane.

In conclusion, Ms. Molaro stated that staff note that the application presents difficult choices in balancing impacts on specific neighbours however staff believes that this proposal generally meets the intent of the provisions of the zoning and guidelines and recommend approval,

subject to Council designation of the Murray Hotel and the other conditions contained in the appendices of the Staff Committee Report dated July 4, 2012.

Questions/Discussion

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

- Upgrades to the Murray Hotel are cosmetic and no changes are planned for the interior.
- There are no additional dollars available for upgrades to the Murray Hotel.
- The applicant will be improving the livability of the units as they become vacant.
- The existing hotel does not have any parking allocated however the application will provide spaces for staff.
- The application went to the Urban Design Panel in 2008 and then the project was put on hold. However, there aren't any substantive changes since that review.
- London Place has a larger floor plate as it was originally built as an office building.

Applicant's Comments

Richard Henriquez, Architect, noted that the project was important for the city as it will provide 113 SRA units. He stated that there won't be any evictions in the hotel as the upgrades to the units will be done as people move out. He noted that originally they had a row of townhouses across the front of the project. As well there were three other schemes explored before they settled on the current one. Mr. Henriquez stated that they had no concerns with the conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

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

- There will be some repairing of damage to the façade of the Murray Hotel including repairing and repointing the brick facade.
- The tenants have not been notified by the City however there is a sign on the site.
- The tower is a contrasting piece to the Murray Hotel using a streetwall type of design.
- There is a bit of solar shading on the south side because of the overhang but none planned for the north side.

Comments from other Speakers

David Erhart lives in London Place. He noted that 20 units have a northern outlook and this project will have a large impact on their livability. He wanted the Board to uphold existing By-laws limiting the size of the floor plates and recommended an 80 foot separation between the buildings. Mr. Erhart was concerned that the suites would not receive any sunshine.

Holly Mills also lives in London Place. She said she is directly across from the proposed building and will be looking into someone's unit. As well she will lose the ability to see any street activity and her sunlight will be compromised.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The difference between 71 feet and 80 feet of separation could result in more sunlight in the mornings to the suites in London Place.

- The site would be one strata and residents of the Murray Hotel will have access to the amenities.
- The Murray Hotel residents will not have access to the parking garage through the tower.
- Early massing designs were for a double loaded corridor but that would put the building up against London Place and was not a realistic proposal.
- If density had been added to the podium to make a thinner tower that would have impacted the lower units in London Place (approximately 7 floors).
- It is not possible to develop parking under the Murray Hotel.
- The applicant has stepped the last unit on the podium to address the concerns of the lower units in London Place.
- The view cone limits the height of the tower.
- The plan was to save the SRAs and get as close to 80 feet from London Place as possible.
- In order to achieve an 80 foot separation each site has to have a setback of 40 feet from the building to the property line.
- The tower is slightly intruding into the view cone by about three feet and staff are not prepared to allow for any more height.
- Staff would like to have seen the tower further away from London Place but that would have compromised the SRAs. The development was a compromise so that there would be a degree of livability for both London Place and the SRAs.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Borowski noted that the application was reviewed by the Urban Design Panel in 2008 and was supported. He commended the applicant for the project and thought it was a challenging urban infill site. The Panel noted that the applicant had balanced out the objectives for developing the site. Although they noted that there were other options some would mean the loss of the Murray Hotel and they thought saving the hotel was a benefit for the city. Mr. Borowski said the Panel liked the light well between the hotel and the new building. As well the Panel supported the proposed materials however they did request simplifying the landscaping. The Panel thought there might be some CPTED issues on the blank wall along the lane. They also asked the applicant to consider improving views from London Place while they noted that the applicant had tried to address the adjacency issues. Mr. Borowski recommended approval for the application.

Mr. Stovell said he thought it was a great project and appreciated the heritage restoration. He added that he thought there were a number of design issues with respect to the neighbours although he agreed that there wasn't much more the applicant could do to improve that relationship. As well he thought the applicant had done a good job considering the constraints and recommended approval for the application.

Mr. Chandler thought that of the four design options the applicant tried, this one was the best choice. He thought that it seemed to achieve the height, separation and size on the site that worked. He also thought that the applicant had tried to have as much setback as possible and thought the project would be impacted if that separation was increased. Mr. Chandler thought the neighbourliness was well handled and the pedestrian realm with the townhouse expression was well achieved. Mr. Chandler recommended approval for the application.

Mr. Rafii thought the biggest complaint was the distance between the project and London Place but noted that each site should have a setback of 40 feet and it was unfortunate that London Place was built so close the property line. Mr. Rafii recommended approval for the application.

Ms. Maust stated that the Heritage Commission reviewed the application in 2008 and supported it. She noted that there were economic challenges in maintaining the uses and supported the conditions in the Staff Committee Report. Ms. Maust recommended approval for the application.

Ms. Busby said she would like to have seen a more resolved tower but recommended approval for the application.

Ms. Miletic-Prelovac thought the applicant had successfully addressed the many issues created by the existing buildings and appreciated that the applicant had put all their massing options in the Board package. She agreed that the applicant had done the best job they could with the massing and thought the landscaping treatments in the courtyard with the green towers were well done. Ms. Miletic-Prelovac recommended approval for the application.

Mr. Wlodarczak thought it was a challenging project considering the non-compliance with the setbacks on the London Place property. He said he would like to see the parking reduced and the savings put into the hotel renovations. Mr. Wlodarczak recommended approval for the application.

Board Discussion

Mr. McLellan said that because the Murray Hotel is tied to the tower he thought some of the benefits should go back to the SRAs. As well he also thought there should be some relief with the parking and the costs saved could go to the Murray Hotel. He suggested there could be a consideration for up to 20 parking spaces for further internal improvements in the Murray Hotel. Mr. McLellan said that he has been in London Place and even considered buying in the building at one time. He noted that the proponent had gone to extraordinary lengths to get the best design response possible. He added that they have exceeded that in terms of the separation between the two buildings. He also thought that a 71 foot separation was substantial and thought there would be reasonable light access into the London Place units. Mr. McLellan made a couple of amendments to the conditions.

Mr. Judd seconded the motion. He agreed that the parking was generous and is double the minimum allowed under the zoning. He thought there might be some room for adjustment considering the costs associated per parking space. This would add more funds to the upgrading of the Murray Hotel given that the tower can be built as a result of the hotel being included. Regarding the separation between the new tower and London Place, Mr. Judd thought the applicant had done a lot to make it work and thought it wouldn't make much difference to the impact on the adjacent building.

Mr. Munro thanked the residents from London Place for attending the meeting and for making their concerns heard. He thought the separation between the two buildings was a reasonable response and the best alternative. Mr. Munro said he was in support of the amendments to the conditions.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. McLellan and seconded by Mr. Judd, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE412314, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated July 4, 2012, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition A.2.3. by removing the second sentence in the Note to Applicant.

Amend Condition A.2.4. by adding *and storage facilities* after garbage facilities.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:30 PM

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

K. McNaney
Chair