

Date: Monday, Sept 17, 2018
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

A. Law Director, Development Services, (Chair)
J. Dobrovolny General Manager of Engineering
P. Mochrie Deputy City Manager
G. Kelley General Manager of Planning, Urban Design & Sustainability

Advisory Panel

A. Brudar Representative of the Design Professionals (Urban Design Panel)
R. Chaster Representative of the General Public
B. Jarvis Representative of the Development Industry
R. Wittstock Representative of the Design Professions

Regrets

J. Greer Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
D. Neale Representative of the Design Professionals (Urban Design Panel)
M. Norfolk Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission
D. Pretto Representative of the General Public
R. Rohani Representative of the General Public
S. Allen Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

P. Cheng Development Planner
M. Au Assistant Director of Services Center - Development
D. Autiero Project Facilitator
C. Joseph Engineering

1261 Hornby St (Burrard Gateway Tower C) - DP-2018-00485-CD-1

J. Christianen IBI Group
N. Denerli NDA
J. Stovell Reliance Properties

Recording Secretary: D.Fung

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Mochrie and seconded by Mr. Dobrovolny and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on Sept 4, 2018.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 1261 Hornby St (Burrard Tower C) - DP-2018-00485-CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Reliance Properties Ltd.

Request: To develop a 35-storey mixed use building consisting of retail at grade, office and 233 dwelling units (206 market strata and 27 market rental), all over nine levels of underground parking.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mr. O'Sullivan, Development Planner, presented the proposal and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report. The recommendation was for support of the application, subject to the conditions noted.

Mr. O'Sullivan took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Applicant's Comments

The applicant thanked staff for the Staff Committee Report. The applicant is in general agreement with the report.

The applicant would like to request the following considerations to the report conditions:

1. Condition 1.1
 - a. This condition affects a very small area of one unit in 1261 Hornby St and one unit in 1238 Burrard St. which is an enclosed balcony.
 - b. In rezoning in 2013, there was a mixed message of 79ft in some areas and 80ft in others.
 - c. The applicant would like to ask for staff to be given discretion to work with them for using the 79ft criteria.
2. Correction to page 8 of the Staff Committee Report outlining High Density Housing for Families with Children Guidelines
 - a. Paragraph 2 specifies Level 2 to provide an outdoor common area. This should be level 6.
3. Clause A1.19 & A1.20
 - a. This clause seeks to develop an amenity room and adjacent outdoor space
 - b. The applicant asks for this clause to be reconsidered because in A.1.21, there is a Reciprocal Easement Agreement in place which would allow residents of

1261 Hornby to access the 30,000 sq. ft. of indoor and outdoor amenities space in the adjacent building.

4. Condition B1.2
 - a. This condition states that compliance is to be met 6 months after September 17, 2018.
 - b. The applicant requests an extension to this timeline.

The applicant commented on the unit mix. The applicant agrees to work with staff for develop some additional 3BR units in the rental housing portion of the project. 10% would be 3 3BR units. The applicant also clarified in this project, that the number of 2BR units is about 40%.

The applicant took questions from the Board and panel members.

Comments from other Speakers

Mr. Dobrovolny asked staff how far apart the applicant and the city are in terms of the conditions

Panel Opinion

Ms. Brudar reiterated that the Urban Design Panel felt the building was a welcome and well considered addition.

Ms. Brudar commented that this rezoning application provides a welcome addition to the street scape, providing variety to the street and adds to the finer grain of urban fabric.

Ms. Brudar commented on the condition referring to the interface of the podium between the building under construction and the current application. The applicants have done all the right things under consideration. The building steps back and provides the reveal.

Ms. Brudar noted that there is an abrupt cut in the building under construction and suggests that the corner of the other building be treated differently which that would mitigate the situation.

Ms. Brudar suggests more design development for the public realm on the ground plane to provide improvements since there is currently no tenant secured.

Mr. Jarvis agreed that there should be some work with the podium and the interface.

Mr. Jarvis acknowledged that the building separation is a tough situation.

Mr. Jarvis commented that it wouldn't set precedence to grant the applicant's request to use 79ft separation given the context with which the rezoning gave different numbers.

Mr. Jarvis urged the panel to go with the applicant's request to have a shared amenities space.

Mr. Jarvis noted that there are frequent requests for extensions to deadlines and that it should be looked at.

Mr. Wittstock commented that the applicant's project has nice composition and beautiful design.

Mr. Wittstock feels it is a good mix of uses with the retail, the office, the rental and the modest, mid-market, attainable condos along with the benefits of using the expensive amenities.

Mr. Wittstock commented that there appeared to be an overabundance of parking.

Ms. Chaster expressed that it was good to see the connection from Hornby to Burrard being completed through the pedestrian mews.

Ms. Chaster also noted that it was good to see that 3 BR units are being considered along with the next project coming on being a rental.

Ms. Chaster commented that it was good to see improvements to Hornby St public realm even though the tenant didn't work out. It is great to see the weather protection being implemented.

Ms. Chaster is happy to support the application.

Board Discussion

Mr. Dobrovolny commended the applicant and staff for their collaboration.

Mr. Dobrovolny also expressed support for the applicant to be able to design for 79ft rather than the zoning requirement of 80ft because of ambiguity of previous rezoning application.

Mr. Dobrovolny is happy to move staff recommendations with the amendments asked for by the applicants which would include omitting A.1.19 & A.1.20.

Mr. Mochrie is happy to support this development and how it fits with the existing construction. Mr. Mochrie commented that the changes to the conditions make sense and is happy to support those as well.

Mr. Kelley was pleased with the design work and the development of the project.

Mr. Kelley is confident that the staff and the applicant will continue to work out the design details and feels the adjustments to the conditions are appropriate.

Mr. Kelley is reluctant to reduce the 80 ft set back but the notation that there was prior numbers during rezoning suggests allowing some discretion.

Motion

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

THAT the Board **APPROVE** the Development Application No. DP-2018-00485, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated August 22, 2018, with the following amendments:

1. Condition 1.1
The applicant would like to ask for staff to be given discretion to work with them for using the 79ft criteria.

2. Correction to page 8 of the Staff Committee Report outlining High Density Housing for Families with Children Guidelines
 - Paragraph 2 specifies Level 2 to provide an outdoor common area. This should be level 6.
3. Clause A1.19 & A1.20
The applicant asks for this clause to be reconsidered due to the Reciprocal Easement Agreement in place in A.1.21 which would allow residents of 1261 Hornby to access the 30,000 sq. ft. of indoor and outdoor amenities space in the adjacent building. The board agrees to omit A.1.19.
4. Condition B1.2
The applicant request for an extension to the timeline that can be satisfied by the standard practice of a formal request for extension to the project facilitator within 2 weeks of the expiration of the target date.

5. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:41pm.