

Date: Monday, October 22, 2012
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

V. Potter Director of Development Services (Chair)
K. Munro Assistant Director of Planning
D. McLellan Deputy City Manager
J. Dobrovlny Director of Transportation

Advisory Panel

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

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

J. Greer Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
R. The Engineering Services - Projects Branch
P. Cheng Development Planner
A. Molaro Development Planner
D. Autiero Project Facilitator
B. Jackson General Manager of Planning and Development

2118 WEST 15TH AVNEU - DE415745 - ZONE C-2
Applicant Team was present.

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. McLellan, and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on October 9, 2012.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 2118 WEST 15TH AVENUE - DE415745 - ZONE C-2
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Cressey Development

Request: To develop this site with a five storey mixed-use building containing commercial units on the ground floor with 52 residential units above all over three levels of underground parking have vehicle access from the lane.

Opening Comments by the Chair

Vicki Potter, Chair, gave an overview regarding the October 9th meeting and how this meeting was to proceed. At the October 9th meeting, staff gave an overview of the application and staff's recommendations and responded to questions from the Board and Advisory Panel members. The applicant then had an opportunity to speak about the project and the proposed staff recommendations and the Board and the Advisory Panel members had a chance to ask questions of the applicant. The Board and Advisory Panel heard from 55 members of the public who expressed their opinion. Some were asked questions from the Board and Advisory Panel members. The Board and Advisory Panel members then asked some follow-up questions to staff. The Advisory Panel members one by one provided their advice to the Development Permit Board.

The October 9th meeting concluded with an approved motion as follows: *"That the decision on development application DE415745 be deferred to the Development Permit Board meeting of October 22, 2012. Staff are instructed to provide the Development Permit Board further information regarding the heights and density of the other developments along Arbutus Street to allow the Board to further assess whether the application has earned the height and density for the site."*

Ms. Potter noted that the meeting would pick up where the last meeting left off, i.e. it is a continuation of the Development Permit Board's deliberations beginning with a report back from the staff team as requested. There would not be an opportunity for the applicant team, members of the public or the Advisory Panel to provide additional opinion to the Board unless the Board directed a specific question their way which the Board believed would aid in its decision making. The Board could make a decision to approve the application as recommended in the report, approve the application but change the recommendations or change the conditions of approval, refuse the application or potentially defer the application again. Once the Board made its decision, Ms. Potter said she would provide an overview of the process from that point on. For the benefit of those who were not at the last meeting, she took a moment to introduce the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel members. The Advisory Panel are members appointed by City Council for their expertise in design, development, heritage or who represent the general public. She thanked them for their thoughtful advice they provided on the application at the October 9th meeting.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Paul Cheng, Development Planner, responded to the instructions from the Board regarding further information with respect to current and allowable development along Arbutus Street, north and south of the site. He showed a stretch of Arbutus Street from West 18th Avenue to West Broadway and went over the zoning that has been placed along the corridor. He noted that the site of the application is zoned C-2 which is typically a 4-storey building although the C-2 regulations do talk about how for very large sites an extra storey in the form of a 5th storey can be looked at and actually considered. Across from the site is another zone called C-2B which mainly permits mixed-use developments with ground storey commercial elements along the sidewalk and three storeys of residential above.

South from the site there is a gas station built under the C-1 zone which is a smaller version of C-2 which allows for 3-storey building to be built with a lower FSR of approximately of 1.75. Further south along Arbutus Street and also across the street from the gas station is single family zoning otherwise known as RS-1 which is the basic single family zone. This zone allows a single family dwelling with a secondary suite or laneway housing which is permitted under certain conditions. North of the site for the first couple of blocks the zoning on the west side of Arbutus Street is not the same as the zoning on the east side. On the west side is RT-7 which is a zone that permits duplexes that looks to a heritage replication of the Kitsilano context. That would allow .6 FSR, which is a much lower density. On the east side the zoning is C-2 which is similar to the applicant's site. C-2 usually looks for 4-storey buildings and if the site is very large then a 5th storey can be considered. However since the lots are smaller along these blocks the zoning would only allow for a 4-storey building.

What is currently on these lots is much lower than four storeys. There are a couple of office buildings that are two storeys in height just north of the site. As you approach West Broadway, there is a slow transition of increasingly greater heights. Around West 13th Avenue the zoning is C-2 and C2-C1, which is again 4-storeys. North of that is the zone C-8 which is a mixed-use commercial zone that allows residential to be built on top of the commercial storey up to a height of 6-storeys. At this time there aren't any six storey buildings along this portion of Arbutus Street. There are a few 4-storey buildings that have also been built under CD-1 rezonings and those are all consistently four storeys on the west side of Arbutus Street. At West Broadway there is another zone, which is called C-3A that allows 3.0 FSR and maximum height of seven storeys. Mr. Cheng concluded that north of the site with the exception of the two blocks of RT-7 that are zoned for duplex, everything else is zoned for four storeys or more, however, presently there are no four storey buildings. However an owner could apply to build a 4-storey building under the zoning and get a development permit under a conditional allowance.

Mr. Cheng recapped his previous presentation at the October 9, 2012 Development Permit Board Meeting.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The other zones along Arbutus Street have similar discretion in the sense that there is an outright height that is permitted and then there is conditional height.
- Any more height on the site is only approvable under a conditional application.

- The sites with one or two storeys have yet to be developed under the zoning that is available.
- For some of the other zones the extra setback on the 4th storey is not required so they are able to land density within a lower building height.

Board Discussion

Mr. Munro thanked the speakers for all their efforts and passion that was shown at the last Development Permit Board meeting regarding the bowling alley. He said that the Board has a difficult decision as their mandate is to assess an application in terms of the existing zoning and although the existing zoning permits a bowling alley the Board cannot mandate a bowling alley. He also thanked the Advisory Panel. He added that he understands that people feel passionate about the bowling alley and that it has value in the community. He noted that the comments to the Board resonated to the point that Council put forth a motion to have the Parks Board look into a bowling as a potential recreational activity that might be incorporated with community centres.

Mr. Munro stated that in order to have the bowling alley there needs to be a property owner that wants to accommodate the use. He said he felt there was still a potential to explore other options. If the bowling alley was to be kept in the new proposal, it would mean a bigger building and would be a Council decision and not a Board decision. The Development Permit Board has the ability to allow uses but not compel uses. Although the bowling alley use is available the Board can't legally compel the owner to have a certain use. As well the Board does not have the authority to withhold the application if it conforms to the zoning. Mr. Munro noted that the application has sought some discretion regarding increased height. There are no other buildings along Arbutus Street that are 5-storeys at present. He questioned whether or not this was the right property for 5-storeys since it is a steeply sloping site. It will be higher at the back of the building than what would be on a flat site making it seem like six plus storeys.

Mr. Munro said that considering the site and the location and looking at the guidelines and other factors, he was not convinced that this was the appropriate site for a 5-storey building and needs to adhere to the C-1 guidelines.

Mr. Munro then moved a motion to approve the application, subject to a number of conditions including one that would bring the building to within the 45 foot height maximum. Mr. Munro provided the Board members with the written text of his proposed amendments to the staff recommendation. Mr. Munro's motion was seconded by Mr. McLellan.

Mr. McLellan thanked the Advisory Panel and the members of the public for their many emails and letters. He said there was a lot of interest in the bowling alley and it was a well-run service in the community. Being five pin it allows for people with limited physical means to enjoy the sport. He noted that he was unsure how this type of sport would get incorporated into future projects in the city considering land values. Perhaps it could be accommodated in the basement of a future community facility by reducing the number of parking spaces.

Mr. McLellan noted in the case of this site, any commercial to exist needs a willing owner and operator which hasn't happened. He said he would have been happy to accept the increased height if they had accommodated the bowling alley. He added that he didn't think the site needed to have a grocery store which would then require less parking. Mr. McLellan noted that the Board has limited authority and cannot compel the use in a building. As to the issue of neighbourliness, he said he agreed that is more than the relationship to the adjacent property

is how it fits into the neighbourhood. He added that he thought the building was not particularly neighbourly and he felt it hadn't earned any additional height.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted that at the last meeting the Board heard some concerns regarding height and increased density, but most of the comments were about the loss of the bowling alley and the community. Many described it as the heart and soul of the neighbourhood and he said he did not think the developer had done a good enough job to incorporate the community's wishes into the development. Mr. Dobrovolny added that it was unfortunate but it is not something that the Board can require. He said that he had taken the public's feedback into the decision and was not overly concerned with the height and density but was more concerned with the loss of the bowling alley. He added that he would be willing to look at the trade-offs with respect to additional height in order to have the bowling alley included in the project. As it stands, Mr. Dobrovolny said that he was happy to support the motion to not approve the additional height. He said he would also like to see more discussion between the community and developer which could result in a rezoning that would be a more creative opportunity. Mr. Dobrovolny added that he was disappointed that the community's wishes were not better reflected in the design.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE415745, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated September 26, 2012, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.1 to read as follows:

- 1.1 Significant design development of the overall building mass to conform to section 4.3.1 of the C-2 District Schedule, including the following:*
- a) a reduction of building height to a maximum 13.8 m (45 feet);*
 - b) a reduction in building height in the localized areas located at the rear of the building to conform with the height regulations of the C-2 District Schedule, as per 4.3.1. (a) and (b).*

Amend Condition 1.4 to read as follows:

- 1.4 design development to provide minimum side yard setbacks from the north and south property lines in conformance to 4.5.1. of the C-2 District Schedule.*

Amend Condition 1.5 to read as follows:

- 1.5 design development to reduce visual overlook into nearby properties located due west by providing the following:*
- a) vegetated planters or other screening devices, along the perimeter of west-facing roof decks and balconies, as per sections 1 (b), 2.9, 4.3, 4.6 and 8 in the C-2 Design Guidelines.*

Note to Applicant: Notwithstanding this design condition, landscaping element that screen potential overlook sightlines from the proposal to the properties located due west are expected, as per section 4.6 and section 8 of the C-2 Design Guidelines, and

only these elements may be exempted from building height regulation 4.3.1. in the C-2 District Schedule.

Retain 1.5 c), 3) and 3) and re-number to 1.5 b), c) and d).

3. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

4. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:43 PM

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

V. Potter
Chair