

## **ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Tuesday, June 20, 2017 at 6:30 pm**  
**Council Chambers**

### **MINUTES**

#### **VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Peter Hall	- Chair, Community Member
Christa MacArthur	- Vice-Chair, Community Member
Darlene Carty	- Community Member
Laura Cornish	- Community Member
Margaret Fairweather	- Community Member
Andrew Hull	- Community Member
Tobi May	- Community Member
Alex Sweezey	- Community Member

#### **REGRETS:**

Richard Carswell	- Community Member
------------------	--------------------

#### **GUESTS:**

Larry Kerr	- Urban West Projects Inc. (Item 4.1)
Stu Lyon	- GBL Architects (Item 4.1)
Jason Wegman	- PWL Landscape Architects (Item 4.1)

#### **STAFF:**

Rupinder Basi	- Senior Planner
Lauren Klose	- Planner
Lynn Roxburgh	- Senior Planner
Mike Watson	- Planner
Heather Corbett	- Committee Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 6:32 p.m.

### **1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA**

#### **1.1 There were no additions.**



## **2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

### **2.1 Adoption of the minutes of Tuesday, May 9, 2017**

#### **MOVED AND SECONDED**

*THAT the minutes of the May 9, 2017 Advisory Planning Commission minutes be amended as follows:*

- *On Page 7, bullet 6; federal be revised to “provincial”; and, THAT the minutes be adopted as amended.*

**CARRIED.**

All members of the Commission present voted in favour of the motion.

### **2.2 Adoption of the minutes of Tuesday, May 16, 2017**

#### **MOVED AND SECONDED**

*THAT the May 16, 2017 Advisory Planning Commission minutes be adopted, as presented.*

**CARRIED.**

All members of the Commission present voted in favour of the motion.

## **3.0 INFORMATION PRESENTATIONS**

### **3.1 There were no items.**

## **4.0 REZONING**

### **4.1 628, 616, 612, 618 Carnarvon; 50, 36 Sixth Street, 615 and 637 Clarkson: Proposed Rezoning Application**

Mr. Mike Watson Planner, summarized the report dated June 20, 2017, regarding the Rezoning and Special Development Permit Applications for a 33 storey mixed use high-rise development at 618 Carnarvon Street, with an accompanying pocket park at the southeast corner of the site and encapsulation of the SkyTrain guideway.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Mike Watson provided the following information:

- The McLeod Block is not a designated heritage building;
- The City’s rezoning process allows each individual application to be evaluated on its own merits, so this development would not necessarily set precedent for height of other buildings in the neighbourhood;
- The unique circumstances that have been referenced by the applicant for consideration of additional density include the amenities provided, such as:

- The pocket park at 6th and Clarkson;
- Encapsulation of the SkyTrain tracks, which has acoustic benefits and is a unique and costly benefit;
- A \$2.9 million cash contribution towards public serving amenities;
- Provision of a townhouse development in the downtown;
- Greenspaces to be looked upon by surrounding towers; and,
- Improvements to the streetscape;
- The voluntary amenity contribution amount is equivalent to recent projects and is consistent with density bonus rates within the Phase 2 Density Bonus program;
- A traffic impact study has been conducted for the proposed development, and the City's Engineering department is satisfied with the results;
- Information about the development has been circulated to all possible stakeholders, including:
  - The Superintendent of District 40 Schools;
  - The Chair of the Board of Education;
  - The Residents' Associations;
  - The Heritage Preservation Society;
  - The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority; and,
  - Owners and occupants within 100 metres of the subject site.;
- The Applicant is coordinating all matters of the encapsulation of the SkyTrain guideway and subsequent responsibilities for the safety of the track with TransLink, who have an approval process to be followed; and,
- In the cases of two other recent developments which exceeded the density bonus phase 2 policy, the amenity contributions were requested by the City (800 Block of Agnes) and were proposed by the developer (813 Carnarvon Street).

Mr. Larry Kerr, project proponent, Urban West Projects Inc., addressed the Commission and discussed the design and planning process that had been undertaken thus far and clarified decisions and concessions made to date, as follows:

- The developers had re-planned the site to incorporate the SkyTrain guideway and enclosed the tracks to mitigate noise;
- Relocated tower to the West of the site to improve views of neighbouring buildings;
- Incorporated townhouses to increase alternatives for families;
- Provision of a privately owned, publically accessible pocket park;
- Made design changes to contrast the historical rather than mimic it and meet the iconic guidelines; and,
- Engaged the community in the development process.

Mr. Stu Lyon, GBL Architecture, provided a presentation (with visual boards) summarizing details of the project, as outlined in the agenda package dated June 20, 2017.

Mr. Jason Wegman, PWL Landscape Architects, provided a presentation summarizing details of the landscaping for the project and the pocket park, as outlined in the agenda package dated June 20, 2017.

Mr. Lyon further demonstrated the massing of the planned building against other density options, and provided comparatives of density and shadows.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Lyon and Mr. Wegman provided the following information:

- The Floor Space Ratios for the neighbouring Quantum and Point buildings are 5.2 and 6.4, respectively;
- The dog facility on the Carnarvon side of the building would be accessible from the street, however, as it would be within the building's entry plaza, it would be meant primarily for residents and likely be uncommon for the public to use the facility;
- It is possible to grow mature trees in containers on podiums with appropriate selection of species type and size;
- The species of tree will be chosen by the Landscape Architect, and the Strata would be responsible for maintenance;
- It is normal for the price point of units to increase with the height of the building, however it is difficult to control pricing in terms of investors
- The fence at the pocket park has been designed to be eight feet tall and is intended to aid in dealing with CPTED issues, however there may be further changes made to the fence in the design development phase;
- The fencing materials are likely to be black, powder-coated steel in order to remain durable, with small pickets and winding planting through the fencing to minimize appearance;
- The materials being used on the building are as follows:
  - Lower section is brick cladding;
  - Middle section is metal panel; and,
  - Upper section is window wall;
- The brick wall on Clarkson Street is approximately 17 feet at its highest point and the parapet is another 6 feet up after the break line;
- The team of professionals who will be involved in the SkyTrain encapsulation have prior experience with these types of projects, having completed similar projects over the SkyTrain in both New Westminster and downtown Vancouver;
- There will be 252 units in this development, therefore approximately 500 people inhabiting the building (at an average of about two people per unit);

- There will be approximately 400 bike parking spaces provided for the building's residents;
- The requirements for both commercial and visitor parking (approx. 1 space per 50 sq. metres, as per Bylaw) have been met and will be provided below grade; and,
- As Clarkson Street is a one-way street going west, all vehicles would have to turn right out of the building's parking driveway.

Mr. Kerr further elaborated about his firm's dedication to building for the community and the concessions they have made to the City and the community, including:

- Enhancing the downtown pedestrian experience;
- Restoring viability in the downtown;
- Addressing heritage with design;
- Dealing with height and restrictions of neighbouring views in a sincere and conscious way;
- Working collaboratively with the City and listening to the neighbourhood's concerns;
- Building with concern for sustainability – including installing a window wall which meets ASHRAE guidelines;
- Re-designing the building to meet the City's iconic guidelines; and,
- Providing a community garden at the base of the tower.

In response to further questions from the Commission, Mr. Watson provided the following information:

- No previous discussion was held on the provision of rental or affordable housing with this development in place of a cash contribution;
- The cash contributions from developments such as this are allocated to specific City funds;
- The proposed development would sit in the school catchment areas of École Qayqayt Elementary and Fraser River Middle School;
- The City has reached out to School District 40 to advise them of anticipated growth well ahead of actual growth;
- The City accepts community contributions based on a prescribed sq. ft. amount per density; and,
- TransLink's process for encapsulation of the tracks requires different phases of approval, which have occurred, and ultimately the Applicant must have full approval before the Public Hearing.

**Adam Finlayson**, Resident, made a number of comments on the proposed development:

- The proposed 17 ft. brick wall that forms part of this development would create a terminal vista at the top of McKenzie Street, which will have an

influence on how the space is perceived at the pedestrian level when looking up McKenzie Street;

- The track encapsulation is a great addition to reduce noise, however there is no mention of what effect this will have on residents living to the west of the tunnel. Perhaps a study should be conducted to consider this noise perspective; and,
- It would be worth ensuring that the minimum amount of soil allocated to the trees on the podium adheres to the BC Society of Landscape Architecture standards.

**Vince Taylor**, Resident and former business owner in New Westminster, supports this development, commenting that the densification that this project will provide is long overdue and will attract new families. He applauded the planning department on pushing for family sized housing and reiterated that no matter how tall the building is proposed to be, there should be no hesitation to build, citing that traffic improves with density.

**Gerard McMahon**, Resident, expressed his disappointment that no consideration was given to keeping the proposed tower on par with the 24 storeys of The Point and noted that moving the tower West did put it in front of his current residence.

**Grant Smith**, Resident voiced his support for this development, noting that he and his wife had recently been contemplating downsizing into something like a unit within this building and they were therefore excited to see this opportunity. He also noted appreciation for the concessions that have been made to the community.

The Chair called a second and third time for any additional speakers.

The Commission thanked the Applicants for the information and presentations and noted the following comments:

- There is a sense that the process has been frustrating for the developers, however it is evident that they have listened and molded the proposed project with consideration of the neighbourhood's concerns;
- Concern was expressed that the amenities being provided may be more beneficial to the future residents than to the community;
- There may be an opportunity to put the amenity contribution towards a possible non-profit partnership;
- The Pocket Park presents a number of concerns, including:
  - It is questionable whether the retail/café space would be successful in the park space with the fence as proposed;
  - The Police station will be kitty corner and will increase the security of the park and therefore the proposed fencing may not be necessary;

- The wall on Clarkson Street garnered several comments:
  - It is not very empathetic to neighbours to South – including the Union Gospel Mission.
  - The concerns raised by Mr. Finlayson about the Mackenzie Street view are valid;
  - The wall is perhaps an improvement upon the current view of the tracks; and,
  - Perhaps landscaping could be used to make a green wall over time, as it would not require much irrigation, and would take away the starkness;
- The developer has done well to make concessions for the neighbours' views, however it should be noted that views are continually evolving and there is a good chance that a purchased view could be lost;
- The 33 storeys may be a bit shocking, however towers have been designated in the OCP for a long time and may be expected;
- Appreciation was expressed for the design of the development, including:
  - The inclusion of brick and metal panels at the bottom of the tower, so that the entire tower is not glass;
  - Incorporation of townhouses to diversify housing types in the Downtown;
  - Consideration of ASHRAE guidelines for the windows, from both greenhouse gases and hydro standpoints;
  - The play spaces and greenspaces that have been included as amenities; and,
  - The SkyTrain encapsulation and subsequent reduction of noise for residents and other buildings in the area;
- The design of the tree boxes should be thoroughly considered for suitability of tree growth;
- The square footage of the 2-3 bedroom units is quite small, but suitable;
- The development appears to be a good fit for the Downtown community plan;
- There is significant concern about the capacity of local schools, however the Commission concedes that this issue is not under the City's control;
- Traffic congestion does not appear to be a major concern, as there is plenty of opportunity for walking and transit use in the neighbouring area;
- Density is a necessity for businesses to be successful, and it will be important to work with the current commercial tenants to ensure they are not lost to the City's business scene;
- It is interesting to note that the City approved The Point at a greater FSR than this proposal;
- Despite the increase in FSR, this project presents unique characteristics such as the SkyTrain encapsulation and will benefit future owners;
- Overall, the proposed development outweighs the negatives.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Advisory Planning Commission recommend acceptance of the proposed Special Development Permit and Rezoning applications; and,  
THAT the Advisory Planning Commission receive the June 20, 2017 report for information.*

**CARRIED**

Christa MacArthur voted in opposition of the motion.

**5.0 NEW BUSINESS**

**5.1 There were no items.**

**6.0 REPORTS AND INFORMATION****6.1 OUR CITY 2041: Official Community Plan Adoption Bylaw and Associated Amendments to the Zoning Bylaw**

Lynn Roxburgh, Senior Policy Planner, and Lauren Klose, Planner, summarized the report dated June 20, 2017, regarding the final draft of the 2017 Official Community Plan (OCP) and associated amendments to the Zoning Bylaw. Ms. Roxburgh further discussed the engagement process and communications that have gone out to the public.

Ms. Klose gave a presentation, covering the following information:

- The vision, policy areas and 12 goals being accomplished by the OCP;
- The land use designations and the associated information contained in the OCP documentation;
- The land uses in the 22<sup>nd</sup> St Station area; and
- The Schedules to the OCP containing the Queen's Park HCA, Development Permit Areas and Community Plans for the Downtown and Queensborough.

Ms. Roxburgh further presented the infill housing implementation strategy that was developed at the same time as the OCP, including information on:

- The new forms of infill housing and the proposed approaches and FSRs of each;
- The design guidelines and approval process for infill housing; and,
- The next steps for implementation of the OCP.

Ms. Roxburgh summarized the 21 pieces of communication received from the Public, as included in the Commission's package:

- One (1) concern about the design of infill housing;

- One (1) opinion stating that there should be more infill housing accommodated;
- Two (2) requests for specific zoning changes (for an increase in entitlements);
- Four (4) requests for specific land use designation changes (for an increase in density);
- Eleven (11) letters in support of the OCP;
- Two (2) petitions
  - One (1) about fast tracking applications; and,
  - One (1) about specific land use designation changes (for an increase in density).

In response to questions from the Commission, Ms. Roxburgh provided the following information:

- Laneway and carriage houses are permitted in the peach and yellow areas, labeled RGO and RD, on the OCP map;
- The City has recently passed a stormwater management plan which looks to achieve a maximum of 70% impermeable surfaces for single detached dwellings;
- Energy emissions are addressed in the OCP policy sections;
- Although there was much consideration and consultation about the 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue corridor, how the density appears on the current land use designation map was set with Council's approval and is the version that will be brought forward for public hearing and three readings;
- Carriage houses and coach houses are defined as the same type of infill housing;
- The distinction between RGO (Ground Oriented Housing) and RT (Infill Townhouse) land use designations is as follows:
  - RT – allows townhouses and rowhouses;
  - RGO – allows a mix of ground oriented infill housing, including duplexes, townhouses, rowhouses and other similar types of dwellings;
- The enhanced transit corridor may not be officially recognized by TransLink, however it is included in the City's Master Transportation Plan, and is intended to communicate to TransLink where enhanced service may be expected;
- Pre-zoning is a method that could be applied to the RT land use designation in order to facilitate the development of townhouses, but this is not what the bylaw amendment proposes; and,
- Fast-tracking is a method used to review and streamline the development process. It is separate from pre-zoning.

In addition, the following comments were made by members of the APC:

- Consideration should be given to permeability and the types of materials used for paving, especially with the width of pathways that are detailed in the design guidelines;

- Appreciation was given of the design guidelines for lighting, however consideration should be given to the trend of soffit lighting and the amount of encroachment onto neighbouring properties;

**Mr. Rahul Chander and Mr. Jung Hun Kim**, Residents, made a presentation showing the location of their (and one other neighbour's) houses and discussed their request to designate their houses as RGO on the 2017 Official Community Plan in order for there to be a gradual transition from the density of the low rise housing across the street to the single family dwellings to the rear of their properties. They also discussed the OCP process from the resident's point of view, expressing a lack of clarity about the types of housing and classifications.

**Ms. Sukhi Puri**, Resident, agreed with the previous speakers, expressing her opinion that there had been a lack of clarity of housing types during the OCP process. Ms. Puri discussed a petition that she and her husband had put together asking that 25 properties east of Colborne Street be changed (back) to Residential-Ground Oriented Infill Housing (RGO), from Single-family dwelling.

**Ms. Glenda Suffrone**, Resident, thanked the City for all of the work that had been put into the OCP thus far. She expressed concern about light pollution from soffits, as had been brought up earlier by a Commission member. Ms. Suffrone asked for more information about how the City expects the sets of three properties on the West side of Eighth St, across from the high school, to move forward and be turned into infill townhouses.

In response to comments raised by the speaker, Ms. Roxburgh responded that it is expected that the three properties in each set work together. The townhouses would only move forward if all three properties worked together. She further explained that the intention would be for the infill townhouses to be turned in to face the east-west street, not Eighth Street.

**Mr. Ron Suffrone**, Resident, expressed concern about the parking that would be available if and when the intended density increases in the area of the City north of Moody Park. He suggested that consideration be given to allowing laneway housing above parking in order to get vehicles off the street. He stressed that increased density equals increased people, and despite best intentions, more people equals more vehicles, and therefore more parking demand. Mr. Suffrone also discussed the much required amelioration of lanes if they are to be used as walkways for laneway houses, citing his own as one that is in disrepair.

The Chair called a second and third time for any additional speakers.

In response to questions from the Commission, Ms. Roxburgh provided the following clarifications:

- A property owner would be required to apply for an OCP amendment and a re-zoning application if they wish to change their property to a land use that is different than what has been proposed in the OCP at the end of this process; and,
- The difference between the RT and RGO designations, re-iterating that RGO allows for a broad scope of development, with the intention to encourage creative opportunities for infill housing, and allow many types of configurations and housing on properties.

The Commission thanked Ms. Roxburgh and City Staff for the work that has gone into this final draft of the OCP and made the following comments:

- The definition of a detached accessory dwelling unit is not included in the package containing the zoning regulations;
- Zoning Bylaw 300.16 seems unclear as written;
- In the section referring to accessory dwelling units, clarification is needed to define what they can't be sold separately from;
- It was suggested that staff review the proposed Zoning Bylaw for consistency and accuracy. For example, in the cases of singular vs plural language, percentages being expressed in words vs figures, and general cleaning up of the wording ;
- In particular instances of properties, gentle rather than drastic stepping of density may be appropriate;
- Implementing the OCP may be an opportunity to influence building standards;
- It may be thoughtful for City staff to examine re-zoning applications on a case by case basis and take into consideration the neighbouring properties;
- It is important to see this process as an ongoing project that can be reconsidered in future years;
- It was noted that the end result of the OCP process appears to have delivered a “very yellow map”, with a great deal of single-family detached, and at the low-end of possible density, and with higher density largely in areas that are loud and busy;
- It was suggested that the final land use designation map is indicative that feedback has been anti-density and it appears as though the density is unequitable;
- It was noted that weighing community feedback on density with a social equity lens would have given an interesting viewpoint;
- The move towards incorporation of infill housing was appreciated and deemed ambitious;
- It was noted that the residential corridors along 6<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> avenues (that would have been ideal for increased density) did not end up as high density as had been desired; and,

- It was suggested that a more equitable distribution of housing for all income types, in all neighbourhoods would have delivered a more equitable OCP.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Advisory Planning Commission recommend approval of the general direction that the 2017 Official Community Plan has taken, but express concern that the 2017 Official Community Plan be more ambitious in terms of increased density.*

**CARRIED**

Christa MacArthur voted in opposition of the motion.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Advisory Planning Commission express concern over how little housing choice has been afforded within the current draft of the 2017 Official Community Plan.*

**MOTION DEFEATED**

Darlene Carty, Margaret Fairweather, Andrew Hull, and Alex Sweezey voted in opposition of the motion

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Advisory Planning Commission recommend that the proposed amendments to Official Community Plan Zoning Bylaws be presented to Council for first and second readings.*

**CARRIED**

All members of the Commission present voted in favour of the motion.

## **7.0 CORRESPONDENCE**

### **7.1 Correspondence re: OUR CITY 2041**

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Advisory Planning Commission receive the report and correspondence associated with the Official Community Plan Adoption Bylaw for information.*

**CARRIED**

All members of the Commission present voted in favour of the motion.

## **8.0 NEXT MEETING**

The next Advisory Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2017 in Council Chamber, City Hall.

**9.0 ADJOURNMENT**

**ON MOTION**, the meeting adjourned at 10:25 p.m.

Certified Correct,

**ORIGINAL SIGNED**

**Peter Hall**  
**Chair**

**ORIGINAL SIGNED**

**Heather Corbett**  
**Committee Clerk**