

Date: Monday, December 4, 2006
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)
B. Toderian Director of Planning
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager
T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

M. Long Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
R. Acton Representative of the Design Professions
N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry
J. Scott Representative of the Development Industry
M. Braun Representative of the General Public
D. Chung Representative of the General Public
K. Hung Representative of the General Public
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public

Regrets

R. Keate Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

A. Molaro Development Planner
D. Wong Engineer, Rapid Transit Office
M. Thomson City Surveyor

WATERFRONT STATION - 439 GRANVILLE STREET - ZONE N/A

C. McCarthy InTransitBC
A. Parker InTransitBC
E. LeFlufy Canada Line Rapid Transit Inc. (CLCO)
G. McGarva VIA Architecture

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of November 20, 2006 were not available at the time of distribution.

2. WATERFRONT STATION - 439 GRANVILLE STREET - ZONE N/A (FOR ADVICE)

Applicant: InTransitBC

Request: To construct a rapid transit station with an at grade entry and below grade platforms and guideway.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ms. Molaro, Development Planner, presented this application for the Waterfront Station located within the street right-of-way of Granville Street in front of the United Kingdom Building. The station design is required to anticipate future interface with the existing Waterfront Station. Ms. Molaro briefly described the station design and reviewed the recommendations contained in the Development Permit Staff Committee report dated November 22, 2006, and advised they reflect the ongoing discussion between City staff and CLCO. The recommendation is for support of the proposal, with the advice and comments provided.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Timm wanted to know how Staff saw the applicant participating in the public realm as stated in Condition 1.3, since it will be looked after by the City. Ms. Molaro replied that the condition is a recommendation for the applicant to enhance the public realm.

Mr. Timm inquired as to how wide the sidewalk will be between the escalator/stair head-house and the United Kingdom Building and Ms. Molaro replied that it would be 3.5 metres. Mr. Timm noted that Granville Mall is to be straightened and wanted to know if there will be an addition to the street width and he also inquired as to the distance between the curb and the station house pavilion. Ms. Molaro replied that the road width would not be changed and the distance is 1.5 metres. Mr. Wong added that the detailed design for Granville Street hadn't been completed and that Council would be approving the width of the street.

Mr. Toderian inquired if Staff had received any written response from the applicant regarding the Development Permit Board comments on previous stations reviewed. Ms. Molaro replied that they hadn't received any responses to date and understood that the applicant was working on a response submission to advise how the Board's comments had been considered.

Mr. Toderian inquired as to whether the station would be built using sustainability principles or the LEED checklist. Ms. Molaro replied that the system didn't lend itself to the LEED checklist as the stations won't be heated and vented.

Mr. Shearing asked Ms. Molaro to explain the conflict between the elevator pavilion and escalator/stair head-house. He also inquired about public art and would it be incorporated into the redesign of Granville Street. Ms. Molaro replied that the sidewalk is heavily used and the applicant's design is to minimize the visual impact of the two pavilions. With regards to the public art, Ms. Molaro replied that the applicant was looking to incorporate public art into

the structure. She added that public art was included in the Access Agreement and is part of Council's principles.

Mr. MacGregor had concerns regarding the location of the elevator pavilion and asked if it could be moved closer to the sidewalk curb. Ms. Molaro asked the applicant to answer in their comments.

Ms. Long asked if the trees would be retained along Granville Street in the subject block and Ms. Molaro replied that the trees had been removed and the detailed street design work wouldn't be initiated by the City until next year, after which time trees would be put back into the sidewalk.

Mr. Scott inquired about the vents and wanted to know if there had been any discussion about the design and locations for the vents. Ms. Molaro replied that the design of the vents had been raised at the Urban Design Panel. The Panel had asked for the applicant to bring a more a sculptural character to them or to have them be part of the public art and as yet the applicant hadn't proposed any changes to the design of the vents.

Mr. Scott inquired as to the redesign of Granville Street. Mr. Timm replied that the City has gone through a conceptual design where the street will be straightened. The trees that have been removed will be replaced with new ones of a consistent type.

Ms. Nystedt inquired as to why the station was so far away from the current Waterfront Station and if the applicant would be providing moving sidewalks. Ms. Molaro replied that because of clearances underground with the railroad tracks and the parkade at 200 Granville the station couldn't be located any closer. Mr. Timm added that part of the consideration was for the ridership who will be people mostly going to/from their work places in the downtown area and won't be using the current Waterfront Station.

Mr. Scobie asked what Staff thought of the design of the station, referring to some posted images of other, rather bold, architectural forms, and Ms. Molaro stated that they thought it was a modest design and that there were opportunities for more exuberance and that was why Condition 1.1 was added to the report.

Mr. Scobie asked the applicant to address the distance between the end of the station and the current Waterfront Station in their comments.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. McGarva, VIA Architecture, gave an overview of the project. He noted that they had created a delicate, modest design as part of the terminus for the Canada Line. He added that about 60% of the patrons would be headed to/from the central business area in downtown Vancouver rather than to/from the existing Waterfront Station.

Responding to the recommendations in the report, Mr. Parker, InTransitBC, noted that with respect to Condition 1.1, the team was striving for a simple, transparent head-house. He noted that at some point in the future there were plans to have the station absorbed into the redevelopment of the United Kingdom Building. In addressing Condition 1.7 on Public Art, Mr. Parker stated that InTransitBC is looking at an art program for all the stations. He stated that on Friday, the United Kingdom Building people had a discussion with InTransitBC to say they were planning on revamping their entry and Mr. Parker couldn't predict what changes to the design of the elevator pavilion might occur as a result of that change.

Mr. Parker noted that they may be able to move the station head-house closer to the curb but there were some constraints. He added that the elevator pavilion will be difficult to move closer to the curb but that they would look to see if that could be possible. He added that they don't know what the new design will be for Granville Street but they are prepared to look at ideas to link the elevator pavilion with the escalator/stair head-house.

Mr. Parker, in reply to a question regarding the vents, stated that they can't reduce the number of vents and the design needs to be sturdy enough for vehicle traffic as in some locations they will be near commercial loading areas and trucks will invariably drive over them.

Mr. Parker stated that they are preparing to provide more information on the north entrance at a future date as requested in Condition 1.5. In regards to Condition 1.6, there will be two knock-out panels. One is for the south entry to the United Kingdom Building and the Sinclair Centre and the other is on the north end near Cordova Street for future connections to the Sinclair Centre and the Convention Centre area to the north west.

Mr. Parker stated that they will be reducing the length of the connection from the station to the West Coast Express/Sea Bus station and it should be about 15 metres from the end of the station platform to the CP Station.

Mr. Parker wanted to assure the Board that they are addressing its earlier comments and that they have meetings with City Staff every two weeks to discuss progress and thoughts in response to the comments. He noted, for example, that with the Broadway Station they are looking at reducing the size of the station and accommodating the double row of trees on Cambie Street, as requested by the Board.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Scobie inquired as to the number and location of the vents. Mr. Parker stated that there are different kinds of vents. Three are at the south end of the station and are for ventilation. Two are on the west side of the sidewalk and are for cooling. There are also vents designed for mechanical ventilation for possible retail use in the concourse and they will all be adjacent to the curb.

Mr. Toderian asked about the time frame for written and visual information in response to previous Board commentary. Mr. McCarthy replied that by the end of January they will have a number of design boards and context in terms of the advice from the Urban Design Panel and Development Permit Board on the previous stations.

Mr. Toderian inquired as to what type of philosophy the architect was using to design the station. Mr. McGarva stated that it was a general system of design to have an approach that is recognizable throughout the system, augmented by a somewhat abstract concept of using road, rail and the sea as a background to the design, and showing the modern optimism for Vancouver. Mr. McGarva also stated that although this station house and elevator pavilion will be temporary, they are trying to design for the long term with high-quality detailing. Mr. Parker added that the design calls for a zinc roof on the pavilions with an elegant detail to the glazing. Mr. Toderian noted that the drawings were of a poor quality which made it difficult to see the details. Regarding Condition 1.1, Mr. Toderian asked if there were still opportunities to look at the architectural approach to the station. Mr. McGarva replied that they are willing to do the refinements as asked for in the report. Mr. Toderian asked about the sustainability features of the Canada Line and Mr. Parker provided a handout of the principles they will be using to develop the line. Mr. McCarthy noted that sustainability is not part of the Concession Agreement.

Mr. Scobie asked if they were investing in high quality materials and Mr. McGarva replied that they were looking at the long term for the station.

Mr. Timm inquired as to whether or not the applicant would be receptive to having the station entry relocated in future as to not be off the street and Mr. LeFlufy replied that CLCO supports the City's plan to have the station entries integrated into other buildings. He noted that in the future the United Kingdom Building will be redeveloped and at that time the plan is to have the entry be incorporated into the design of the new building. Mr. Timm inquired about the location of the knock-out panels and if there would be a new ticket area required with a relocated concourse entry. Mr. Parker replied that a new ticketing area would be required on the north end of the concourse. Mr. Timm asked if the applicant had looked at having the vents in the roadway, noting the curb would assist in providing loading access by providing a rolled curb rather than a barrier curb. Mr. McCarthy replied that the code doesn't allow the vents to be in the portion of a street primarily intended for vehicular travel and the curb would be a rolled curb for only occasional and temporary vehicle access to the storefronts.

Mr. MacGregor asked if the United Kingdom Building owners had expressed concern about the development of the station in front of their building. Mr. LeFlufy replied that they hadn't expressed any and that they would be meeting with their architectural firm regarding the redesign of the front entry to the United Kingdom Building. With regards to Condition 1.5, Mr. MacGregor asked if the pedestrian tunnel would be operational when the line opened and Mr. Parker said it would be done at the same time as it is required for exiting purposes.

Mr. Scott was concerned about the discussion around the vent design as this was a recurring issue with all of the stations and suggested having an extra meeting to find a solution. Mr. Scobie suggested waiting until a written response was received from the applicant on this previously identified issue, to see what solutions they found for the design.

Mr. Scott also wanted to know if most of the money was being spent on underground aspects of the Canada Line. Mr. Parker noted that the Urban Design Panel had suggested that at this station all the money should be put underground and the head house could be small, using high-quality materials. He added that they were using spider connections on the glazing, a zinc roof and architectural concrete. Mr. McGarva added that it will be a desirable urban design approach using a simple and modest design.

Mr. Timm expressed concerns around the width of the sidewalk between the curb and head-house noting that people could walk there adjacent to traffic and there could be safety concerns. He suggested enlarging the station house if it can't be just moved over.

Mr. Toderian suggested doing a workshop around a number of the issues prior to the mid-January meeting of the Development Permit Board. Mr. McCarthy stated that there had been a number of positive responses already advanced by InTransitBC and believed they had made huge strides in taking the advice of the Board. Mr. Toderian said he would leave it to Staff and the applicant to hold a workshop to address consistently identified station design issues prior to the Boards consideration of the two final station designs in mid-January.

Ms. Nystedt asked the applicant if they had considered a moving sidewalk in the pedestrian connection between the new Waterfront Station and the old. Mr. Parker stated that they hadn't looked at that and Mr. LeFlufy added that it would be only a minute walk from the end of the platform to the CP Station.

Ms. Hung asked about Condition A.2.6 and if their position had changed any in providing a wheel ramp for bicycles. Mr. Parker replied that they had not changed their position as they are concerned about liability.

In a question from Mr. Scobie, Mr. McGarva stated that the connection to the existing Waterfront Station would be considered an emergency exit. It was also noted that the Canada Line is not a "building" in terms of normal Building By-law requirements and Code professionals are working with the design team to ensure applicable Code requirements are satisfied.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Ms. Long found it hard to comment on the design due to the quality of submitted materials regarding the public realm. She stated that the work in the drawings was not to a level that made it easy to comment on and that it was important to look at Granville Street in its entire context. She noted that the street should be a thoughtful landmark, connecting it to the sea and she didn't see that in the design of the station. She added that she felt a lot of design development still needed to happen to make this an important block. The architectural solution doesn't show "the rock" or "the sea" and she added that the applicant is not achieving the story they said they wanted to produce. Ms. Long stated that in Condition 1.2 the comments that the Staff are suggesting were supportable. She added that the corner was important and a fair amount of work still needed to happen. In Condition 1.3, Ms. Long stated that there isn't any public realm development. She agreed that there are a lot of technical challenges with the vents and suggested making them a component of a public art plan, perhaps making them different for each station by getting artists to look at them and tell the sustainability story.

Mr. Acton said he couldn't see the statements of the architectural philosophy provided by the applicant reflected in the design. He noted that the station needed to have an unassuming, timeless quality, modest but distinct. He stated that the concrete fin and the amount of concrete that came out of the ground would prevent the design of the station from "landing lightly on the ground". He suggested it was time for some editing and that perhaps the architect could design a glass building with glass on all the sides and a glass roof. He agreed that the elevator pavilion and the station house needed to be tied together in one building with the elevator facing inward, towards the station house entry. He also suggested that the building could have a thin flat roof system instead of the Glulam beams and proposed a simple steel structure with fritted or patterned glass to make the building more interesting. This roofing might be extended to physically connect the elevator pavilion and the station house. He stated that he didn't agree with Staff that there needed to be a gap between the pavilions but felt there needed to be a gap beside the United Kingdom Building. He agreed that the vents were an excellent opportunity for public art. Mr. Acton added that he supported Condition 1.5.

Mr. Shearing stated that it was a missed opportunity to not have the stations provide an architectural expression considering their locations, noting each station could be an individual "jewel". He stated that the station should be treated as a long term piece and could be a huge benefit for this part of Vancouver. He wondered why there wasn't a willingness to celebrate the station at ground level. He agreed that the elevator pavilion should stand alone but be pulled further away from the United Kingdom Building and in line with the head-house. He also agreed to a workshop to sort out the design of the vents. He noted that people are often reluctant to walk over them and suggested doing something creative to encourage

pedestrians to want to walk over them or at least to enjoy them as art. Mr. Shearing stated that he supported Conditions 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7. He added that there was a need for the incorporation of sustainable practices in the design of the station.

Mr. Scott said he recognized how difficult this project was and appreciated that the applicant wanted to resolve the issues. He noted that the glass head-house wasn't a lot of money when considering the scale of the project. Mr. Scott added that he couldn't see the proponent's stated architectural vision in the station design. With regards to Condition 1.2, Mr. Scott stated that it needs to be resolved and liked the idea of a glass structure adding that it didn't need a top heavy roof. He supported Condition 1.4 stating that good design can save money and added that Staff should work with the applicant to find a solution that would work for all the stations. Mr. Scott noted that Condition 1.5 could be included in the Granville Street upgrade, as well as possible United Kingdom Building redevelopment even though that might not happen for some time.

Ms. Nystedt agreed that the vision of the applicant had not been met. She added that the station didn't represent the stated terminus as it is not the end of the line. She would like to see a geographical design and a development that reflects the neighbourhood. Ms. Nystedt agreed that it would be a good idea to design the vents in a creative way.

Mr. Chung stated that Waterfront Station may be the wrong name for the station as the station is not connecting to the current Waterfront Station and is not the end of the line. He added that the alignment of the elevator pavilion and the station house entry was wrong and that they needed to line up with each other. He suggested turning them around so that they face each other to help pedestrians know that they are part of the Canada Line. He agreed that the elevator pavilion needed to be further away from the United Kingdom Building.

Ms. Hung stated that she felt the design was interesting but safe and low keyed. She agreed with the applicant that because of the site conditions the elevator pavilion and station house entry needed to be within the sidewalk. She added that the design is in keeping with the other stations and that a modest approach would be appropriate. Ms. Hung felt the concrete fin wall didn't work and would be used for graffiti. She added that signage could be more important than design to mark the station. Ms. Hung also agreed that she didn't see this as a terminus station. Ms. Hung supported Condition 1.2 agreeing that the width needs to be reduced to open up the main sidewalk area.

Mr. Braun agreed that the design of the station head-house needed to be as simple as possible. He noted that in Condition 1.2 it should be emphasized to move the head-house closer to the curb and if that was not possible to increase the space between it and the elevator pavilion. Mr. Braun thought the design of the station head-house had a modernist style that was reflected in the United Kingdom Building.

Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor stated that for the most part he agreed with the Advisory Panel's comments. He agreed that this station was not the terminus and that it should attract people into the line and reflect the buildings adjacent to the station. Mr. MacGregor was not in favour of moving the elevator pavilion out to the curb but that it should be flipped around to have the door facing the station house entry. He was encouraged by the applicant's sustainability principles. Mr. MacGregor would be in favour of doing a workshop to address the design of the vents. He agreed that it was a challenge. He moved approval, with some amendments to the conditions.

Mr. Toderian stated that he was disappointed with the application. He added that the applicant needed to consider the head-house as a permanent structure and to make it an example of good civic architecture. He felt that there needed to be a higher bar set because it would be in the public realm and should make the public realm better. He questioned if the proposal would be good enough if the City was building the station and suggested that it would not. He added that he was not comfortable with the design. While he would support the changes to the recommendations that Mr. MacGregor suggested he could still not support the proposal. He suggested adding a recommendation to encourage full design development around sustainability and to change the language in the report regarding "to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning" in Condition 1.0.

He noted his disappointment that the Board had not seen any response regarding comments made on previous stations reviewed by the Board and thus had little confidence in the ability of design development conditions to take the designs to a point where it would be acceptable.

Mr. Timm said he did not support the Marine Drive Station as it was not supportable in the form that was presented but he didn't have such strong feelings about this station. He added that although the station house entry and elevator pavilion are small they are located in a prominent location and the architecture needs to be revisited. He agreed that they needed to be lighter. Mr. Timm stated that he supported Mr. MacGregor's comments and amendments. He suggested adding a friendly amendment regarding the elevator pavilion and encouragement to have it moved off the street and across the property line to provide for better pedestrian circulation. He added that it was too much of an intrusion into the public realm.

Mr. MacGregor asked for Staff to meet with the applicant and the United Kingdom Building owners regarding the station entry and added that he had no objections to Mr. Timm's additional amendments.

Mr. Scobie added that it was the expectation of the Board that the applicant would respond in writing regarding Condition 1.5 and the response would return to the Development Permit Board.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. MacGregor and seconded by Mr. Timm with Mr. Toderian dissenting, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board SUPPORT Development Submission No. DE410873, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated November 22, 2006, with the following amendments:

Delete the following wording in 1.0 *to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, clearly indicating*

Amend 1.0 to read:

Prior to the construction of the rapid transit station, revised drawings and information shall be submitted *responding to the following advice and comments:*

Amend 1.1 by replacing *terminus* with entry, the amended condition to read: design development to the station entry pavilions to achieve a more distinctive, carefully considered expression while also providing a stronger architectural contribution to the public realm for this important station *entry;*

Amend 1.2 to read:

design development to reduce the *clearance between the station house and the curb so it is not useable by pedestrians and to increase the width of the sidewalk to the west;*

Delete Note to applicant and replace with the following:

Note to applicant: *Consider the relocation of the elevator entry to the south side of the pavilion and every effort should be made to relocate the elevator off the sidewalk.*

Delete 1.3;

Re-number conditions

Add 1.7 to read;

applicant to consider all opportunities to integrate sustainable approaches into the station design.

Delete *must* and replace with *should* in Appendix A, page 1 and *delete prior to issuance of the Development Permit*

Delete A.1.5

Re-number A.1.6 to A.1.5

Delete A.2.4

Re-number A.2.5 through A.2.11 to A.2.4 through A.2.10

Amend A.2.10 by deleting *and geometric changes to the street* to read:

all sidewalk treatments require the approval of the General Manager of Engineering Services;

Delete *if* in B.1.2

4. **OTHER BUSINESS**

In response to the discussion at the last meeting, Mr. Scobie circulated a revised proposal to amend the Board's procedures in response to Council's resolution of November 2, 2006.

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

To adopt the amendments to the Development Permit Board procedures.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:45 PM

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

F. Scobie
Chair