

**Date:** May 2, 2022  
**Time:** 3:00 p.m.  
**Place:** VIRTUAL, WEBEX

---

**PRESENT:****Board**

C. Okell	Director, Permitting Services
Y. McNeill	Assistant Director, Rezoning
A. Law	General Manager, Development, Buildings & Licensing
L. LaClaire	General Manager, Engineering

**Advisory Panel**

B. Wakelin	Representative of the Urban Design Panel
K. Krangle	General Public

**Regrets**

D. Pretto	Representative of the Development Industry
M. Moore	General Public
M. Joko	General Public
M. Biazi	Representative of the Design Professional
C. Vannes	General Public
M. Gordon	Representative of the Heritage Commission

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

H. Shayan, Urban Design & Development Planning  
J. Olinek, Urban Design & Development Planning  
B. Clark, Urban Design & Development Planning  
J. Smallwood, Development Services  
T. Potter, Development Services

**1025 Dunsmuir St - DP-2021-00824 - (COMPLETE APPLICATION)**  
**2010 Balaclava St - DP-2021-00652 - (COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

**Recording Secretary:** K. Cermeno

**1. MINUTES APPROVED**

It was moved by Ms. Law and seconded by Mr. LaClaire and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting April 19, 2022.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

---

**3. 1025 Dunsmuir St – DP-2021-00824 - (COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Hudson Pacific Properties.

Request: To develop a 16-story office building (mass timber structure) a 1 storey retail pavilion, and a public plaza on 2 levels of below grade parking, including a connection to the existing retail concourse and Burrard Street Skytrain Station. The proposal also includes: the removal of an above-grade seven storey parking structure on the Bentall Centre; and a land purchase of a portion of Eveleigh Street, and overall site consolidation.

**Opening Comments**

Mr. Shayan, Development Planner, presented the proposal and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report.

**Applicant's Comments**

The applicant presented on the long-term goals and transformation of the Hudson Pacific Properties at the Bentall Center. The goal is to attract individuals spanning from office workers, tourists, and locals back into this area.

Some key focus areas are creating a halo affect on the rest of the campus, reducing carbon production, increasing the connectivity on the site, bringing the retail up to grade as possible and continuing the pivot of experiential retail.

The applicant presented on the architectural elements, redesign and sustainability elements of the project. Two guiding principles were the Dunsmuir porosity and maximizing the plaza.

The goal is to make this area walkable and bike-able a place where individuals will want to connect. The applicant noted they foresee this area attracting around 8-10 thousand new workers.

With its architectural design, this project will be an example of innovation and sustainability.

The applicant and staff took questions from the Board and Panel members.

**Comments from Speakers**

David Roche, speaker one, representing the two buildings across the proposed project at 1090 West Pender St & 1050 West Pender St. Mr. Roche noted his appreciation to the applicant and staff for working together with him. Mr. Roche noted the following requests to the staff and project team, a loading dock manager as a DP condition, and revisiting the proposed design for Eveleigh St. The current proposal of Eveleigh St is very narrow and this will create an unsafe condition and traffic backlog.

**Panel Opinion**

Mr. Wakelin, chair of the urban design panel, noted the panel was generally supportive of this project.

Mr. Wakelin recommended underlining the commentary about weather protection on the south side of the office portion. Now that there is a sunny plaza, further weather protection from the pavilion would be beneficial and achievable with different material strategy that does not create shadowing.

Mr. Wakelin noted his support for the project.

Ms. Krangle noted this is a clever infill project and the breezeway works successfully.

Ms. Krangle noted the building is sustainability minded. Increasing the amount of ground level retail is good to help animate the public realm.

Ms. Krangle recommended if the concerns from UDP could be fully addressed especially in regards to the pavilion and plaza, more works needs to be done to make this area more engaging. Consider more seating.

Ms. Krangle noted her support for the project.

### **Board Discussion**

Ms. McNeil noted the concerns from UDP have been manifested.

Ms. McNeil agreed the plaza and pavilion could be further improved however going in the right direction, continue working with City staff. This area should not just be a passage through but an area of rest. Consider some filtered light especially in warmer temperatures.

Ms. McNeil noted her support for the recommendations and project.

Ms. Law noted it is an attractive building in a prominent location.

Ms. Law supports the project in that it respects all of its applicable policies. There is a good approach to the public space, sustainability targets and incorporation of the retail.

Ms. Law noted her support for the project.

Mr. LaClaire noted his support for the project.

Mr. LaClaire noted the connections through the site are successful, the mass timber construction is successful, and the large plaza at the street entries will be transformative for the city.

Mr. LaClaire noted the street design could be further improved so that it works for everyone. The street should feel more like a street rather than an over sized service lane, work on making it more welcoming.

Mr. LaClaire noted regarding the loading conditions, the applicants has gone beyond what is required, and happy to see the commitment from the applicant.

All board members voted in favour of the application to move forward.

### **Motion**

The decision of the Board: THAT the Board APPROVE **Development Application DP-2021-00824** subject to the conditions in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated April 13, 2022.

**4. 2010 Balaclava St – DP-2021-00652 - (COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: B Side Developments Ltd.

Request: To develop this site, considered under the Moderate Income Rental Housing Pilot Program (MIRHPP), with a 6-storey multiple dwelling building containing thirty-five (35) dwelling units (20% of allocated to MIRHPP), all over one level of underground parking having vehicular access from the lane, subject to Council resolution of enactment to the CD-1 By-law the Form of Development.

**Opening Comments**

Ms. Clark, Development Planner, presented the proposal and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report.

**Applicant's Comments**

The applicant began by presenting on the history of the project and the initial proposal.

The applicant noted in July 2021 they spent a lot of time going over the council condition and resubmitted the revised proposal.

After the public notification period in Dec 2021/Jan 2022 and staff reviews, primary issues noted were:

- Architectural and Landscape response to Kitsilano context;
- Interface to existing residences to the South and East;
- Retention of grove of trees and City Boulevard;
- Landscaping.

The applicant continued to present on the architectural design, landscape and context of the immediate area.

The applicant noted they are confident they can meet all of the design requirements as noted in the report.

The applicant and staff took questions from the Board and Panel members.

**Comments from Speakers**

Cameron Zubko, speaker one, a neighbour south to the proposed development and founder of WELOVE KITS noted they collected numerous letters of opposition to this particular form of development.

Mr. Zubko noted this development is too aggressive for the small site. The building does not satisfy the conditions of the MHIRP project. Regarding the FSR and height would like to see a height of 4 storeys as 6 storeys is not contextually supported. The setbacks should be respected with the other buildings.

Mr. Zubko noted they would like to see the removal of balconies on the south side as the transition to the south side is problematic or recommend changing to Juliet balconies.

In regards to the trees to the south would like to see real trees to soften the transition, with the removal of balconies there is suffice room for large scale trees.

Brita Cloghesy-Devereux, speaker two, a neighbour and member of the strata council of the Santa Barbara located on the southwest corner directly adjacent to the development. Ms. Cloghesy-Devereux noted there are 4 areas of concern, height, façade, the south setback and the landscape.

Ms. Cloghesy-Devereux requested a maximum of 4 storey as 6 would impact shadowing and limit the amount of light. A lighter façade would be preferable as some reflection is important. Ms. Cloghesy-Devereux requested there be no setback. Also request increasing the landscaping in the south alley as this would help with noise and privacy. There is real concern with the older age trees. Ms. Cloghesy-Devereux noted there was no consulting done with the applicant and Santa Barbara council.

Christine DeMarco, speaker three, noted the MHIRP program was a well-intentioned pilot program created to address the City's housing crises. Ms. Demarco noted this project is aggressive on a small site creating shadowing over neighbouring sites.

Ms. DeMarco noted she was advised the development could not be approved if it does not follow the MHRIP guidelines. Ms. DeMarco noted this project does not follow the MHRIP guidelines and should be reassigned as a rezoning so that many issues such as negative impact on its neighbours and the need for rental units are addressed.

Sheryl Webster, speaker four, noted her opposition to the height and setback of this project. Ms. Webster noted surrounding proposed buildings in this area are proposed at four storey. This proposal does not fit in with the neighbourhood context. Do not agree this project warrants the amount of relaxations given.

Ms. Webster noted the building does not fall under the MHRIP program, there are not enough secured rentals units and majority of units are unaffordable to middle class. The mature cedar trees on the site are a great concern and hope they have been accounted for properly. The setbacks does not consider the light and privacy of the adjacent neighbours. Overall, this project is not providing for the middle-income rental.

Larry Bengé, speaker five, noted the design excellence of the Kitsilano area should be implemented on all new developments. Mr. Bengé noted concern with the small building units with balconies sticking out. The two-storey break base does not wrap around the corner, which is also a concern. There are no variations on the wall plain; the south is a major issue of concern.

Mr. Bengé supports the previous speaker comments of converting the balconies to Juliet balconies. The suggested implementation of landscaping on the upper fifth and sixth floor is missing. There are missing trees on the north and south property line. The bottom of the building is very heavy could be lighten with materiality. Mr. Bengé noted this project is a missed opportunity, this could have been a very amenable project for the community and a good opportunity to sample neighbourhood collaborative efforts.

#### **Panel Opinion**

Mr. Wakelin noted the panel was supportive of the project with recommendations that include issues with the stairs, and better integration of the landscape details.

Mr. Wakelin noted the comments made by UDP were details of refinement and improvements opposed to new directions. For this reason, Mr. Wakelin noted it is difficult to provide a motion of support/non-support and provide advisement with the new direction of the application.

Ms. Krangle echoed Mr. Wakelin's comments.

Ms. Krangle noted there have been some positive changes and appreciate the test fits completed however noted the project does have a long way to go to ensure success of the project in the neighbourhood context.

Ms. Krangle noted her disappointment with the lack of three bedroom units; the proposal barely meets the needs of a family oriented neighbourhood.

**Board Discussion**

Ms. Law noted council approved the form of development and the proposal respects the CD-1 bylaw.

Ms. Law noted it is not the role of the board to reverse council decision.

Ms. Law noted her optimism with the test fit and the applicant's cooperation in working with City Staff.

Ms. Law noted it is a challenging project however does comply with all the bylaws enacted.

Ms. McNeil noted her appreciation for the speaker's commitment to the neighbourhood.

Ms. McNeil noted the drawing submitted in the proposal do not comply with Council decisions however the test fit drawings are in the right direction.

Ms. McNeil noted her confidence the results of the test fit drawings will pick up the elements of the neighbourhood context.

Ms. McNeil noted her support for the recommendations and the project.

Mr. LaClaire noted his appreciation for the public speakers and advisory comments.

Mr. LaClaire noted his appreciation for the applicants and staff comments with the test fits.

Mr. LaClaire noted his support for the project subject all the conditions are met.

All board members voted in favour of the application to move forward.

**Motion**

The decision of the Board: THAT the Board APPROVE **Development Application DP-2021-00652** subject to the conditions in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated April 13, 2022.

Meeting adjourned at 5:22 pm.