

Meeting: No. 486
Date: Tuesday, August 22, 2000
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: No. 1 Committee Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services [Chair]
L. Beasley Co-Director of Planning
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager
D. Rudberg City Engineer

Advisory Panel

P. Grant Representative of the Design Professions [Urban Design Panel]
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions
A. Gjernes Representative of Development Industry
M. Mortenson Representative of General Public
R. Roodenburg Representative of General Public

Absent

P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry
J. Leduc Representative of General Public
R. Mingay Representative of General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

R. Segal Development Planner
E. Fiss Development Planner
S. Hein Development Planner
M. Thomson Assistant City Surveyor
P. Pinsker Parking & Development Engineer

Item 3 - 3200 East 54th Avenue - DE405181 Zone CD-1

W. T. Leung W.T. Leung Architect Inc.
J. Durante Durante & Krueke, Landscape Architects

Item 4 - 1098 Station Street - DE405088 Zone I-3

M. Whitehead Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
F. Musson Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
R. Schroeder Schroeder Properties Ltd.

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Beasley, seconded by Mr. Rudberg, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of August 21, 2000 be approved, with the deletion of names of persons present for Item 4, on p.1.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 3200 EAST 54TH AVENUE - DE405181 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE AFTER PRELIMINARY)**

Applicant: W. T. Leung Architect Inc.

Request: To develop the southeast portion (Phase 2) of this overall Champlain Mall redevelopment (Parcels C, D, and E) for residential use consisting of 96 two-storey-plus-basement market townhouse units, including a central open space of approximately one-half acre.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Eric Fiss, presented this application. The preliminary proposal for the residential development and the neighbourhood-serving commercial was approved in principle by the Board in February 1999. Council approved the form of development in July 1999. The complete application for the rehabilitation of part of the Champlain Mall and some additional retail buildings was approved by the Board in January 2000. Following a brief description of the local context, Mr. Fiss focussed on the issues raised in this submission, noting that the use, density and preliminary form of development were approved by the Board at the preliminary stage. Staff consider the current application is a significant improvement over what was already an outstanding scheme for this site. The main issue relates to the ownership and maintenance of the central open green space within the development. Condition 1.5 calls for a maintenance plan and legal agreements to address this concern. The Staff Committee recommends approval of the application, subject to the conditions outlined in its report dated July 26 & August 9, 2000. Mr. Fiss briefly reviewed the five main conditions, and tabled a minor clarification amendment to condition 1.3.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. W.T. Leung, Architect, provided his response to the major conditions recommended in the Staff Committee Report. In condition 1.1, he requested the addition of "or stamped concrete", noting they favour some surface treatment of the visitor parking but would like some flexibility in how it is achieved. With respect to 1.3, Mr. Leung advised the 20 ft. utility right-of-way generally applies to the 10 ft. to the south and for Parcels C and D only. The 20 ft. utility right-of-way referenced at the preliminary stage was a holdover from the original Champlain Mall development some twenty years ago. Their latest discussions with BC Hydro indicate 10 ft. to the west of the public walkway. Mr. Leung said he does not object to the reference to "approximately 20 ft.", noting it may subsequently be reduced to 10 ft., although their preference would be to amend this condition. Regarding the request for design development to interior end townhouse units (Condition 1.4), Mr. Leung said the Building By-law is not an issue, rather they were trying to avoid overlook between units. While windows can be inserted, they would likely remain covered by drapes or blinds. Their preference would be for the yards fronting the public pathway to provide surveillance.

Ms. Jane Durant, Landscape Architect, spoke to condition 1.5. She thought the reference should be to "detention" rather than "retention", noting a detention pond slows down the surcharge on the storm system as

opposed to holding the water. She explained the intent is that the top 1.5 ft. will be like a sports field which drains very quickly. She stressed the space will always be very usable. In discussion, Senior Development Planner, Ralph Segal, confirmed that the Staff Committee would support Ms. Durante's proposal provided it does not compromise usability of the space.

With respect to the right-of-way referenced in condition 1.3, Mr. Rudberg pointed out that it may not be solely for hydro; the City may wish to use it for other purposes in the future, which may require approximately 20 ft. across the entire southern boundary of the site. Mr. Mike Thompson, Assistant City Surveyor, added the issue of the 20 ft. is important, noting a commitment has been made to preserve the trees and landscaping on the southern edge. At 10 ft., the trees would be at risk. It is anticipated that the present "blanket" right-of-way over the entire site will be modified at the completion of the development, to deal with the location of utilities as they are installed. The critical issue is that there should be no structures on the right-of-way. Mr. Leung said their concern relates to the rear yards which front onto the right-of-way because the marketability of the affected units may be compromised. In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg, Mr. Fiss confirmed the 20 ft. right-of-way was a condition at the preliminary stage. Mr. Thompson added, Engineering Services was particularly concerned about the potential storm drainage on this low point on the site. He agreed there may ultimately be the opportunity to reduce the right-of-way to less than 20 ft. In discussion, Mr. Thompson said he was satisfied that condition A.1.2, which calls for a minimum setback from the south property line, will ensure the site will be adequately serviced with utilities. Responding to a question from Mr. Beasley, Mr. Leung said he would prefer condition A.1.2 to be amended to allow 16 ft.-6 in. setback because it allows for a nicer end unit elevation.

With respect to bicycle access in the tandem parking garages (condition A.2.6), Mr. Leung explained that in the locations where 9 ft.-6 in. width is provided the intent is that there would be small car parking stalls which would still allow for bicycle access. Mr. Paul Pinsker, Parking & Development Engineer, advised that anything less than the 10 ft. width being sought results in an aisle approximately 2 ft. wide which is considered inadequate for manoeuvring a bicycle. He noted the Parking By-law requires 4 ft. access aisle width, so considerable latitude is already being provided in this condition.

Regarding the October 16, 2000 deadline for compliance with the conditions (B.1.4), Mr. Leung requested an extension to allow sufficient time for completion of subdivision registration, being a "prior-to" condition.

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Grant said the Urban Design Panel enthusiastically supported this application and especially liked its scale and the landscape plan. There was a recommendation that the massing/scale of Building 1 of Group D respond to the end of the formal landscape a little more emphatically than shown. The Panel strongly recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Hancock noted this project has made considerable strides forward in its evolution. The scale feels very nice and the overall site planning has been well resolved. As well, the level of detail on the façades and the expression is excellent. It is a very supportable project.

Mr. Gjernes also recommended approval, with amendment to conditions 1.1, 1.3, 1.5 and A.1.2 as discussed. With respect to A.2.6, the minimum width in the parking garage should be not be reduced in favour of wider ground floor entries. Mr. Gjernes said it is a great project that will be a great asset to the area.

Mr. Roodenburg also thought the project was very nice. Regarding 1.1, he concurred with giving the applicant greater flexibility on the paving material details. He declined commenting on 1.3 because he felt it was a legal issue. With respect to condition 1.5, Mr. Roodenburg recommended deleting the last sentence of the Note to Applicant because the issue is that the green space is maintained to City standards and kept free from standing water. How this is achieved should be left to the applicant. He recommended amending A.1.2 to allow for an adjustment if the 20 ft. is not required. He recommended the 10 ft. width be maintained in A.2.6, and that B.1.6 be amended to extend the completion date to the end of the year.

Mr. Mortenson supported the project and commended the inclusion of environmental sustainability features. He supported a variety of paving surfaces (condition 1.1), and agreed with staff that the entrance to the community should be harmonized with the existing public road system, to avoid the appearance of exclusivity. He supported the rights-of-way across the site. He also supported the 10 ft. wide aisles called for in A.2.6, noting there is likely to be a lot of bicycle use in this community.

Board Discussion

Mr. Rudberg said he was pleased to approve this application. It is highly supportable and consistent with the preliminary submission.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Rudberg and seconded by Mr. MacGregor, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 405181, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated July 26 & August 9, 2000, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1:

design development to the pavement for the private roadways in Parcels C and E to provide concrete banding within the northerly driveways and to provide unit pavers *or stamped concrete* on the surface visitor parking spaces, generally as illustrated on the presentation model;

Amend 1.3:

provision of legal agreements for continuous public rights-of-way across the site for the purpose of providing continuity for pedestrian access from adjacent sites to the east, south, and west, consisting of approximately 28 feet along the north edges of Parcels C and E, and of approximately 10 feet along the east edge of Parcel D within the roadway, ~~and of approximately 20 feet along the south edges of Parcels C, D, and E,~~ to the satisfaction of the Directors of Legal Services and Engineering Services;

Amend Note to Applicant after 1.4:

These end units should take on more of a corner character and incorporate additional windows at the main floor level, where appropriate *and consistent with the Vancouver Building By-law*.

Amend the Note to Applicant after 1.5 to delete the first sentence;

Amend A.1.2:

provision of a minimum setback from the south property line of 20' for Buildings 2 and 3 of Parcel D, *to the satisfaction of the City Engineer but not to exceed 20 ft.* ~~in accordance with the approved form of development and approval in principle granted for the overall project under DE403146;~~

Amend the date for compliance in B.1.4 to *March 31, 2001*.

Mr. Beasley also supported the motion. He added that this was a very problematic design and project at the beginning. It has gone through considerable refinement, and the materials and the treatment - particularly the treatment of the landscape and public realm - will make it an excellent project. He commended the applicants and the design team.

4. 1098 STATION STREET - DE405088 - ZONE I-3
(PRELIMINARY APPLICATION)

Applicant: Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership

Request: To construct a phased high technology office park comprising approximately 13 buildings with private internal streets and courtyards to serve approximately 10,000 employees.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Scot Hein, presented this preliminary application, noting it is the second application to seek a high-tech, campus-like development in an industrial zone. It is a 19-acre site on which 2.2 million square feet of floor area is being sought, with the number of potential employees projected at 10,000. Board and Panel members convened around the models for Mr. Hein's review of the proposal.

There have been several meetings with the applicant since December 1999. As well, because of the nature of the zoning and the significance of the site, there were two workshops with the Urban Design Panel. The major issues relate to the number of roads, their configuration and orientation, and pedestrian movement throughout the site, noting also that the Planning Department has recently embarked on a local area planning exercise for the False Creek Flats. There are no design guidelines associated with the I-3 zone.

The proposed information technology use is permitted outright in I-3. The proposed density is also within the allowable maximum of 3.0 FSR. Outright permitted height is 60 ft., relaxable to 100 ft. With this particular market, floor-to-floor heights of 14 ft. are proposed, with approximately 90 percent of the proposal seeking height relaxation to the 100 ft. maximum. Relaxations are also being sought with respect to rear yard requirements. Mr. Hein also noted that the applicant wishes to secure and close off part of Prior Street, and seeks some adjustments through land swaps to enlarge the Thornton Park annex. There are some aspects of the proposal which are not within the jurisdiction of the Development Permit Board and would involve a rezoning process, namely increasing the amount of retail use on the site, as well as issues relating to the park.

Mr. Hein reviewed the principal issues identified by staff, as outlined in the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated August 9, 2000. These concerns are addressed in the recommended conditions of approval. Mr. Hein tabled a minor amendment to the conditions, to move the Note to Applicant in condition 1.8 to 1.1. A brief question period followed.

Discussion

With respect to traffic, Mr. Pinsker advised a detailed traffic study was conducted, looking at thirteen intersections surrounding the site. The analysis assumes 20 percent transit use. Mr. Pinsker noted a False Creek Flats area-wide study is also underway to consider what strategic road and transit improvements will be needed to handle the ultimate development in this area. In general, Engineering supports the recommendations in the traffic report on this site, noting that more improvements will be needed in the longer term. In discussion, Mr. Rudberg noted a very aggressive transit strategy will be necessary to service this site at the intended modal split. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, Mr. Pinsker advised a transportation management plan will be required at the complete application stage.

Mr. Rudberg expressed some concern that the east-west road and north-south extension of Gore Avenue are not dedicated as public streets. Assistant City Surveyor, Mr. Mike Thompson, said staff's preferred option is dedication of these roads and staff have indicated that in any subdivision, rezoning or reconfiguration of the property, dedications would be sought. The applicant's proposal includes two levels of underground parking which extends fully under these roads. Since the City has no interest in owning the parking, a major redesign of the parking structure would be necessary if the roads are dedicated. Staff Committee is recommending a number of dedications around the site, and that the north-south and east-west roads be secured by right-of-way.

With respect to the zoning on this site, Mr. Scobie noted that Council has permitted the proposed high-tech use to a maximum FSR of 3.0 and up to a height of 60 ft. with the possibility of going higher. Relaxations are being sought with respect to height and setback. Other issues relate to the closure of Prior Street, negotiations around the Thornton Park annex, and the sewer line which traverses the property. In response to a question about the viability of development within the 60 ft. height limit for the outright uses, Mr. Hein referred to a massing model of an "outright" scheme, noting the limitations imposed by the 14 ft. floor-to-ceiling height required by this use, and the desirability of modulating height on such a large site. Mr. Scobie requested that the applicants include in their presentation an indication of why they believe it is unavoidable to seek any special approvals from the City. In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor regarding the impact on density if the streets are dedicated, Mr. Hein said it would likely be well above 3.0 FSR, although this would only affect subsequent redevelopment.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Mark Whitehead, Architect, briefly described the lengthy and positive process that has taken place to date, including meetings with City staff, the Urban Design Panel and local interest groups. The project has not been designed in isolation but has evolved with input from all parties. The I-3 Zone was established by the City to attract high technology businesses. By establishing I-3 as an outright zone, the large parcels involved would have a quicker and less encumbered development permit process, but without any relaxation of height it is impossible to achieve the full density allowed on any of the sites. More density could be achieved within the 60 ft. by employing 12 ft. floor-to-floor heights. While this would be substandard high-tech space, it would be suitable for standard 'D' office space which can make up one third of the uses. The benefits of allowing this project to go to 100 ft. include: more variety in massing (better Urban Design), a strong green link between Strathcona and False Creek, more green space for the tenants and the public, a vibrant public realm, and viable high-tech space. Mr. Whitehead said, if these benefits cannot be achieved, I-3 will fail. Responding to Mr. Scobie's question about the necessity of seeking relaxations, Mr. Whitehead said it was more a matter of better choice than being unavoidable.

Referring to the conditions in the Staff Committee Report, Mr. Whitehead stressed they support design guidelines but have concerns about reducing façade lengths to no more than 200 ft., as called for in condition 1.1. He noted that earlier schemes with individual buildings with significant breaks were reviewed and rejected by the Urban Design Panel in favour of a more European model that has 2-storey wings marked by

breaks in the architecture. Buildings will have individual expressions but they will also be interrelated, providing continuity with diversity. Breaking the buildings at 200 ft. intervals will limit the floorplate size and flexibility for expansion which is inherent to this scheme and its marketability. Mr. Whitehead pointed out that this condition seems to be at odds with one of the reasons Council created the I-3 zone which is to provide larger floorplates not available elsewhere in the city. He stressed the advantage of flexibility in floorplate size for high-tech tenants, noting that such users typically seek a minimum of 20,000 sq.ft.

With respect to 1.2, Mr. Whitehead said they endorse the design development sought; however, they object to the request to reduce density in relation to height. He explained they have completed a shadow analysis and view study which proves the scheme works at the proposed height and density. He requested an amendment to the condition.

With respect to 1.3, Mr. Whitehead said they believe Block B already provides the relationships described in this condition. They will continue to work with staff to address the concerns. On 1.4, Mr. Whitehead said trees are important to the context of this development. They are looking for substantial soil area above the parking to support mature trees. They are waiting for response from the Park Board and will continue to work with staff.

Mr. Whitehead confirmed the security plan called for in 1.5 will be provided. Mr. Rod Schroeder described the proposed security arrangements, and confirmed they will donate space for a community police station. In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg concerning the City's position with respect to community policing, Mr. Ralph Segal, Senior Development Planner, advised the resourcing of community police stations is sometimes a problem; however, staff believe there is a need for such a facility in this location.

Mr. Whitehead said they have concerns about condition 1.10, to increase the setback along the easterly edge of the site adjacent the future park. He explained they see this as an opportunity for the park to have an urban edge. They believe the 10 ft. difference will have no perceptible impact on the park but it will have a major impact on the application. He urged the Board to delete this requirement. They will endeavour to locate a lane down the easterly edge to separate the park from the development.

With respect to 1.11, Mr. Whitehead said they will continue to work with staff and the Park Board on the design options for the park. He noted condition A.2.2 (i) is tied to this condition. With respect to 1.13, Mr. Whitehead said they sought the Prior Street closure in the interests of traffic movement. They also saw it as an opportunity to make a more interesting pedestrian area, with solutions to provide security and police and fire access. They would like to pursue this issue with staff.

Regarding 1.14, to provide an Employment Strategy, Mr. Whitehead said this is an unusual request for a conditional development permit. He noted they have had discussions with the neighbours and they recognize that job opportunities will exist both in construction of the development and potentially with the tenants. However, they believe this should be a consideration item. Mr Schroeder added, there will be an employment office on site, 5 days a week. The complex will employ a very large number of people, in addition to the eventual approx. 12,000 people employed by the tenants. With respect to the request to provide funding for training programs, Mr. Schroeder pointed out that one prospective tenant is the University of B.C. seeking 200,000 sq.ft. for its downtown campus, for which Schroeder Properties will provide a \$10 million allowance. In addition, Schroeder will make a \$15 million cash donation to assist the university in operating the facility.

Referring to the Standard Conditions in Appendix A, Mr. Whitehead questioned the inclusion of roof decks in floor space calculations and recommended this policy be reconsidered. Mr. Hein acknowledged there may need to be some discussion around a future text amendment, noting the City wants to encourage these kinds of employee amenities. Pending a text amendment, the by-law requires roof decks to be counted in FSR calculations. Mr. Beasley noted the project is still below the maximum density, even with the inclusion of the roof decks.

Mr. Whitehead requested A.1.17 be amended to a consideration item because there may be other ways to approach security. He requested deletion of the Note to Applicant in A.1.19 because they believe closure of Prior Street should be part of a larger discussion and linked to condition 1.13. With respect to condition A.2.2 (e), Mr. Whitehead noted they have anticipated the dedication of a 39 ft. right-of-way. He requested that Engineering reconsider this condition and limit the dedication to 39 ft. Condition A.2.2 (g) should also be tied to the resolution of 1.13, and condition A.2.2 (i) should be tied to 1.11. Mr. Whitehead said they have no problem with the dedications and rights-of-way requested in A.2.2 (i) but have concerns that the actual width of the right-of-way will depend on the final location of the curb along Station Street. He requested deletion of the last sentence of the Note to Applicant. Mr. Whitehead said they believe condition A.2.2 (k) is too general and open-ended. He asked that this condition be limited to signalization upgrades, adding these issues can be discussed during the complete application process.

With respect to the matter of dedication of the internal roadways, Mr. Whitehead said this would be a serious setback to their concept of the scheme. The reason the developer wants to own the streets is to upgrade them beyond City standards. It would also take away from the idea that they are trying to develop a "sense of place", which contributes in large part to attracting high-tech tenants who can identify with the location. It will take away dramatically from the character of the project if they cannot do the upgrades. As well, to make parking economically viable on this site, given the poor soil quality, the ownership of the streets is very important. Mr. Whitehead stressed that dedication of the internal roads would be a major setback to the project, forcing reconfiguration of the parking and at least a partial third parking level. Mr. Schroeder added, dedication would not allow them to have one common parking area beneath the complex, forcing them to split it into four separate quadrants acting independently, contrary to the overall plan. He stressed that the streets will never be closed off to the public.

Mr. Rudberg noted the roadways in question are not driving aisles but extensions of the city street system. There is also the issue of utilities through the site. If the streets are not dedicated they would have to be routed around the site, at greater public cost in terms of maintenance and future replacement. There is also a sewer line traversing the site which would need to be relocated. Mr. Rudberg said he was also concerned about the notion of creating "private space", different from other city streets. Issues around design can be dealt with very easily, but for all intents and purposes they would be city streets.

In summary, Mr. Whitehead said they are in agreement with about 90 percent of the conditions but there remain some significant issues that jeopardize the viability of the project. He distributed copies of suggested rewording of the conditions for the Board's consideration, and briefly reiterated their areas of concern.

In the discussion which followed concerning condition A.2.2, the Board agreed that these matters will need to be dealt with by Council. Responding to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning the very large oak tree located at the proposed intersection of Station Street and the proposed east-west road, Mr. Whitehead said the central avenue (east-west road) can be realigned sufficiently to preserve the tree and they will make every effort to do so.

Comments from Other Speakers

Mr. Mark Budgen and Ms. Linda Ruiz, Strathcona Area Safety Society, spoke in favour of the application. Mr. Budgen said they are very grateful for Schroeder Properties' generous donation of a community policing centre. To date, they have been unable to apply themselves to the southern part of their neighbourhood which has been looked after by the Chinatown centre. However, with a community policing centre at this location they can address issues related to Citygate, tourists arriving at the station as well as general problems in the area. Mr. Budgen noted there will be a report to Council concerning the funding of community policing centres. Ms. Ruiz added, the Strathcona Residents' Association is also in favour of the project. They have some concerns about the height along the park and do not want the building heights to exceed what is currently proposed.

Extending the road through to Malkin Avenue is also a concern. They believe it would be very strongly opposed by the neighbourhood because it would compromise their greenways strategy. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning the optimum location for the community policing centre, Mr. Budgen said this would need to be reviewed with the Police and Schroeder Properties. They want it to be accessible from all parts of the neighbourhood.

Mr. Frank Came, Executive Director, Vancouver Economic Development Commission, said one of their objectives is to comment on some of the economic implications of government decisions. He noted there has been emphasis on the need for flexibility, as well as recognition of the importance of the high-tech industry as a spark for the development of a new economy. They have received numerous, serious inquiries from organizations outside the city who are looking for places to set up business in Vancouver. Their needs include large floor plates, secure surroundings, the ability to work seven days a week, 24 hours a day, and access to transportation, etc. Unfortunately, these requirements are not yet available in Vancouver, and opportunities have been lost to other municipalities. Mr. Came said they recognize there are some serious issues that need to be dealt with in terms of traffic, design, integration with the community, employment opportunities, etc. The City has to take the risk and, where possible, "cut some slack" to approve the project. It is very important that we send a signal that we are ready to proceed on this major development. With respect to employment opportunities, Mr. Came noted they have undertaken to work with the applicant and any of the businesses that come to the site to help provide the job opportunities and training for residents of local communities.

Ms. Ellen Swares, Rocky Mountaineer Rail Tours, explained they are the major tenants at Pacific Central Station. They have some concerns about the traffic study that was completed, in particular the reference to intersections operating adequately in the p.m. hours. Mr. Pinsker advised the study was done in early spring on week days, and Mr. Trevor Ward, Ward Consulting Group, provided some additional information on the traffic study his firm conducted. Ms. Swares noted there is a serious lack of parking spaces in the area so any parking that would be available from this development would be welcomed by tenants of the station.

Mr. Rudberg tabled and briefly reviewed an additional condition with respect to road dedication, to enable the Advisory Panel to comment.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Grant noted the Urban Design Panel reviewed this proposal several times. The Panel regarded the evolution of the project to be a good master plan, and expects to see the individual components in greater detail at the complete stage. It is not a homogeneous development; it needs to allow the urban fabric to creep into it. These are very large blocks and there needs to be flexibility in terms of how it proceeds. Mr. Grant said he believes it will take a number of years for the project to be completed and things will change, both in the marketplace and in the development needs as it goes forward. The master plan therefore must allow for flexibility. The Panel supported the project, the massing, the overlapping of grids, and the geometry as it has evolved. It was recognized that the Thornton Park "Annex" needs more design development but in principle it was supported. The most difficult aspect for the Panel was the south end of Gore Street where the mass is seven storeys high, resulting in a very canyon-like street. With respect to condition 1.1, Mr. Grant said the reference to individual buildings should be retained but that there should be no restriction on the length of the façades since there are a number of ways of dealing with it. With respect to the matter of dedication, Mr. Grant said that, given the nature of the project, there should be a solution developed through a process of air rights rather than dedication, noting the Panel emphasized the need to ensure the public can fully utilize the streetscape in perpetuity. Mr. Grant noted the amount of retail space was raised by the Panel. The Panel would support allowing a larger amount of retail in the development.

Mr. Hancock commented this project is a huge opportunity for a vast amount of space and it is definitely needed in this city. The general planning seems to be going in the right direction. Mr. Hancock said he would

not wish to see the requirement for 200 ft. façade lengths rigidly applied, rather there should be flexibility for evolution over time. Similarly, the restriction on floor plate sizes would be a concern, given the need for size and flexibility. The concept of framing Thornton Park with four buildings is worth pursuing. With respect to the conditions, Mr. Hancock said he thought most of the applicant's suggested amendments were reasonable.

With respect to the suggested amendments tabled by the City Engineer, Mr. Hancock thought a way should be found to achieve the applicant's objectives for a higher standard of street development and continuity of the parking while also achieving the City's dedication. He concurred with the requirement for undergrounding of all services. Mr. Hancock added, it is generally a very supportable scheme and he looks forward to its next iteration.

Mr. Gjernes recommended approval in principle. He stressed the density is not discretionary in this zone. Given the applicant is only seeking relaxation on height, which will result in a much better project overall, Mr. Gjernes felt the conditions were very onerous. He commended the applicant for what he considered to be a bold move to take on this project in this area. He said he appreciated the applicant's approach to the high-tech park being like a private enclave, noting it will also save the City some money. With respect to the public road, Mr. Gjernes recommended the City allow the applicant to have the private streets with universal right of access. Alternatively, to take the approach used on the Trade & Convention Centre with dedication of air space parcels. With respect to the conditions, Mr. Gjernes agreed with the need for design guidelines. However, as long as there is articulation and interest at the street level, the length of the façades is not important. With respect to 1.2, Mr. Gjernes said it may not be necessary to reduce the density. He agreed the reference to 30 ft. in 1.10 was too definitive. He expressed surprise at the request for a comprehensive traffic and parking analysis because it has already been provided. Rather, he suggested that condition 1.12 call for further traffic, parking and transit management to be satisfied. With respect to the closure of Prior Street, Mr. Gjernes recommended greater flexibility to accommodate the needs of the development without disrupting existing users. He felt the Employment Strategy called for in 1.14 was asking too much of the applicant and recommended the condition be deleted. He also recommended deletion of the Note to Applicant in A.1.17, and that A.2.2 be more flexible to reflect what does happen with the park. With respect to the off-site roadworks, Mr. Gjernes commented that upgrading of signalization is not particularly onerous and will probably need to be done to benefit the development and should be worked out with the City. In summary, Mr. Gjernes recommended the City allow this complex project to proceed with some flexibility.

Mr. Mortenson said he was strongly in favour of the project. One of the key issues for the local community will be vehicular traffic and transit and an aggressive transit plan should be a condition of approval. This project will be creating an entirely new business district that will have a big impact on city streets. With respect to access to the future park, Mr. Mortenson said linear greenway connections should be considered. With respect to the issue of road dedication, Mr. Mortenson said he would wish to be assured of 100 percent right-of-way for the public. He strongly supported condition 1.6 because the amount of mixed use will be very important for a community of 10,000 people. Regarding the Employment Strategy, Mr. Mortenson felt the residents of Strathcona would support a community-based approach to encouraging and facilitating employment on the site. While it should not be a strict requirement, such an approach will generate enormous good will.

Mr. Roodenburg said he was very excited about this project. He commented the submission is at a level of detail of a complete application and most of the conditions relate to details. He felt the architect and staff could resolve the issues of façades at the complete stage. He recommended deletion of reference to 30 ft. in condition 1.10, preferring the 20 ft. setback to be maintained. With respect to B.1.2, Mr. Roodenburg questioned whether the December 29, 2000 deadline for submission of a complete application was achievable.

Board Discussion

The Chair advised that the Board members requested a brief recess in order to discuss their approach for putting together a suitable motion for this complex proposal. Mr. Scobie commented that the recommended conditions are very significant, noting this is not a rezoning application and it does, to a great extent, reflect Council's intent for an outright project in terms of use and density. While the application does seek relaxation of height, staff agree that increased height would be beneficial to the project. Therefore, the volume of the conditions suggests there are some fundamental issues that perhaps should have been addressed before the zoning was put in place. Mr. Scobie suggested there may need to be negotiations somewhat apart from the development application, noting this is a most unusual project which goes beyond the normal scope of zoning considerations in terms of the other discretionary approvals required.

There was a recess from 7.55 to 8.30 pm while members of the Board convened for in camera discussions.

Mr. MacGregor stressed that the Board supports high-tech development and the I-3 zoning. He agreed with the Urban Design Panel that this proposal represents a good master plan. He said he had concerns, however, with this very large 19-acre site in that it has to knit with the community, both that which will emerge to the south and that existing to the north. The impact of 10,000 employees will be considerable given there are many residents in the area. The need for the development to have an independent personality is acknowledged, but it does have to relate to its neighbours. There are many issues outlined in the Staff Committee Report which will require Council approval. The street-related issues are very important and more work needs to be done in this area. With respect to the matter of street dedication, Mr. MacGregor said this will require further discussion with the developer, noting there are ways to meet the needs of the development and the City's needs, both now and in the future.

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor regarding the complete submission deadline, Mr. Whitehead said December 29, 2000 is acceptable provided it is understood that it will be a phased application.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. MacGregor and seconded by Mr. Beasley, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE IN PRINCIPLE Development Application No. 405088, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated August 9, 2000, with the following amendments:

Amend the Note to Applicant in 1.1:

Note to Applicant: The guidelines should follow the standard City format and clearly describe the quality of proposed architecture and the public realm, including streets, soft and hard landscape elements, "green" qualities, lighting, signage, CPTED provisions and public art intentions. The guidelines should demonstrate architectural methods to improve building scale, reduce the impact of massing and create distinguished buildings with façades of lengths ~~no greater than 200 ft.~~ that provide intermittent significant "breaks". The guidelines should also address landscape requirements including provision of early maturing and appropriately scaled street trees as well as historical references to the rail yard, previous shoreline or archeological potential. Primary engineering systems and related details, including refuse, recycling and special disposal requirements, should also be addressed. Final approved Design Guidelines ~~will~~ *may* reduce proposed floor areas of related complete applications.

The Design Guidelines should address how individual buildings, clusters and phases manage the storage and disposal of sensitive materials resulting from any noxious, or potentially dangerous by-products, to ensure that workers and pedestrians are not adversely affected.

Amend the Note to Applicant in 1.2:

Note to Applicant: A significant reduction in upper floor massing, especially ~~at the centre of the project and~~ along the southerly portion of the Gore Avenue extension is recommended. Elimination of the proposed colonnade and provision of continuous weather protection to improve pedestrian route quality and CPTED performance is also recommended.

Amend the Note to Applicant in 1.3:

Note to Applicant: A more direct relationship to the height of the Station in addition to high quality contemporary architectural expression that distinguishes the historical quality of the station from the proposed development is recommended. A more pronounced approach to massing adjacent to the forecourt fronting Thornton Park is also recommended *as well as an appropriate edging for the park.*

Amend 1.5:

provide a security plan that confirms on-site surveillance operations, monitoring systems and other necessary measures, including *consideration of a Community Policing Centre (CPC) to be constructed by the developer if approved by Council*, for both above-grade and structured parking areas to ensure a 24-hour safe environment for on-site workers and pedestrians;

Delete the Note to Applicant in 1.8 (moved to 1.1);

Amend 1.10:

complete design development to the buildings, and related landscape, along the site's easterly edge adjacent to the future park *so that the proposed setback is a minimum of 20 ft.* ~~to increase the proposed setback to 30 ft.~~ for all portions of buildings;

Amend 1.11:

provide a range of design options for the Thornton Park Annex for staff evaluation *and report for approval of City Council and Park Board*;

Note to Applicant: Staff acknowledge a design opportunity to improve both the urban design performance of this precinct as well as the traffic flow and related safety of existing and proposed new streets. Further analysis of options that examine longer term pedestrian linkages, existing utility corridors and tree retention, *especially saving the large Red Oak trees* is recommended. Refer to related Engineering conditions in Appendix A.

Delete Amend 1.12:

provide a comprehensive *transportation plan* ~~traffic~~ and parking analysis, *including a program to facilitate transit use*, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and Director of Planning;

Note to Applicant: Refer to Engineering conditions in Appendix A for additional requirements beyond the information and analysis presented in Appendix F. *Also, consideration of moving towards the minimum parking standard.*

Amend 1.13:

provide a comprehensive analysis and rationale for the proposed closure of Prior Street between Station Street and Gore Avenue *for report to Council*;

Delete the Note to Applicant in 1.14;

Delete the Note to Applicant in A.1.17;

Delete the Note to Applicant in A.1.19;

Amend A.2.2:

make arrangements, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and Director of Legal Services, for the following, *subject to decisions by City Council as required*:

Amend A.2.2 d):

provision of utility servicing for the site (B.C. Hydro, Telus, etc.) *including undergrounding of all new site servicing and all existing servicing immediately adjacent to the site along its perimeter roads*;

Delete A.2.2 j) and replace with the following:

arrangements to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and Director of Legal Services for the dedication of the roads along the two major internal axes, being the southerly projection of Gore Street (66 ft. width) and the central east-west street (100 ft. width);

Note to Applicant: *This condition will require a redesign of the parking structure. The City requires dedication to allow for the installation of underground utilities and street trees along the new roads. The City Engineer will consider an application to provide connections between the parking quadrants, as well as parking, below the dedicated roads and at a depth that does not interfere with utilities and street trees. All new streets in the application must be referred to the Street Naming Committee.*

Delete the last paragraph in A.2.3;

Amend A.2.13:

make arrangements, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and the Subdivision Approving Officer, for the approval and registration of a subdivision plan to complete the road dedications ~~detailed in condition A.2.2 (e), (g) and (h)~~, as well as to consolidate the parcels comprising the development site into a single parcel;

In seconding the motion, Mr. Beasley commented it needs to be emphasized that the Board fully supports the high-tech use and the density (to the extent that the density can be achieved on the site), and the variations in height that have been discussed. At the same time, quality is essential. From the public's perspective, the dedication of the streets is very important. The breaking down of the buildings more than the architectural

solution is also important, without restriction to a particular dimension. Regarding the conditions, Mr. Beasley said he will be pleased to see greater attention given to configuration of the Thornton Park extension and the street system around it, noting he was not comfortable with the scenarios shown in the submission. The adjacency of the building to the streetwall in Site B is also an area of concern to be addressed. However, overall, these are fairly minor changes to a scheme that is moving in the right direction. With good will on the part of the applicant working with staff, Mr. Beasley said he has confidence a good solution will be found for the development of this area.

Mr. Rudberg supported the motion and said the amendments made will be very helpful. He reiterated that it will be a real challenge to service this site. It is more than two million square feet of development with as many as 10,000 employees in an area which is difficult to service today from a traffic point of view. It will require very aggressive actions on the part of City staff and especially the developer to ensure that this development does not impact the adjoining neighbourhoods. Mr. Rudberg stressed that City staff are here to work with the developer to try to make it work in a way that is satisfactory not only to the neighbourhood but to the City.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8.50 pm.

C. Hubbard
Clerk to the Board

F. Scobie
Chair

/ch

Q:\Clerical\DPB\MINUTES\2000\August22.wpd