

Date: Monday, February 12, 2007
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)
 S. Tatomir Representative of the Design Professions
 J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry
 M. Braun Representative of the General Public
 D. Chung Representative of the General Public
 C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public
 K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

Regrets

N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry
 H. Hung Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

M. Thomson City Surveyor
 A. Molaro Development Planner (Item 3)
 D. Wong Engineer, Rapid Transit Office (Item 3)
 S. Hein Senior Urban Designer (Item 4 & 5)
 T. Osdoba Manager, Sustainability Group (Item 4 & 5)
 J. Greer Project Facilitator (Item 4 & 5)
 D. Robinson Project Facilitator (Item 4 & 5)
 V. Morris Social Planner (Item 4 & 5)
 C. Tapp Social Planner (Item 4 & 5)
 L. Beaulieu Landscape Development Specialist (Item 4 & 5)
 M. Williams Landscape Development Specialist (Item 4 & 5)
 K. Hiebert Central Area Planning, Major Development Group (Item 4 & 5)
 I. Smith Manager Development, SEFC & Olympic Village Project Office (Item 4 & 5)
 K. Robinson Project Planner, SEFC and Olympic Village Project Office (Item 4 & 5)
 J. Andrews Project Manager, SEFC and Olympic Village Project Office (Item 4 & 5)
 M. Naylor SEFC Planner, Major Development Group (Item 4 & 5)
 D. Naundorf Planner, Housing Centre (Item 4 & 5)

8430 CAMBIE STREET - MARINE DRIVE STATION - DE410683 - ZONE I-2 (FOR ADVICE)

C. McCarthy InTransitBC
 A. Parker InTransitBC
 G. McGarva VIA Architecture
 E. LeFlufy Canada Line Rapid Transit Inc. (CLCO)
 J. Harold TransLink - The Greater Vancouver Transit Authority
 J. Durante Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects

1685 ONTARIO STREET - PARCEL 9 (SEFC) - DE410876 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE)

S. Lyon GBL Architects Group Inc.
 R. Bayley Merrick Architecture
 H. Jasper Millennium SEFC Properties Ltd.

1631 ONTARIO STREET - PARCEL 10 (SEFC) - DE410878 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE)

G. Borowski Merrick Architecture
 R. Bayley Merrick Architecture
 H. Jasper Millennium SEFC Properties Ltd.
 J. Stamp Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of January 29, 2007 be approved with the following amendments:

Amend p. 7, under Board Discussion, first paragraph, to add the following as the third sentence:

He also commented that although the tower component design was well resolved and highly articulated, it seemed to read more as a residential tower similar to others in the downtown, and encouraged the applicant to reconsider further sensitive integration of light and colour and a generally more expressive "commercial" architecture. He added that commercial buildings represented an opportunity for further architectural exuberance and risk taking within a well conceived and well resolved program.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 8430 CAMBIE STREET - MARINE DRIVE STATION - DE410683 - ZONE I-2 (FOR ADVICE)

Applicant: InTransitBC

Request: To construct a rapid transit station (Marine Drive) on this site for the Canada Line.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced this application for the Marine Drive Canada Line Station at 8440 Cambie Street which received non-support from the Board when it was originally seen in October. The application is for the portal and station and now includes the bus terminal facility.

The principle issues identified within the staff report last October and by the Development Permit Board were the station design, station integration with the bus loop, access to the station and the portal design. The station is to be located primarily within the ICBC property. The surrounding property includes residential and mixed use with mostly single-family to the north. The portal will be located within the present east side lanes of Cambie Street and will shift over to the west coming out directly in front of the commercial mixed-use just south of West 64th Avenue. The bus loop will be located at the south end of the ICBC site adjacent to the industrial lands. The station facility will straddle both Cambie Street and the ICBC property. There will be several open areas associated with the station and the portal. This is to include: the bus loop plaza which provides the interface between the bus loop and the station; a temporary walk way over the north entry plaza connecting to the intersection of South West Marine Drive and Cambie Street; an open space under the guideway; and a linear pathway connecting Marine Drive to 64th Avenue which contains a sidewalk area and a bike path which will also need to function as a fire lane.

Ms. Molaro reviewed the recommendations contained in the Development Permit Staff Memorandum dated February 12, 2007, 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. Scobie noted a date change in Condition B.1.2 from April 10, 2007 to August 12, 2007.

Mr. Timm was concerned that there was a staircase in the sidewalk. Ms. Molaro stated that the sidewalk was continuous and suggested that the applicant would be better able to answer his concern.

Mr. Timm stated that they are getting started on a review of the Cambie Street public realm and thought it would be appropriate to deal with the plaza and walkways on private property as part of the application and deal with the design on the street through the public process. Ms. Molaro agreed that Condition 1.8 could be revised to add "on private property" after plazas and walkways in the first line.

Mr. Braun inquired as to the maximum height of the portal entry. Ms. Molaro using the context boards described the design of the portal entry.

Ms. Nystedt asked if the Urban Design Panel had seen the revised submission and if there would be any other Canada Line submissions. Ms. Molaro replied that the Urban Design Panel had not seen the revised submission and added that Waterfront North, the underground connection, will be seen by the Board at a later date. Ms. Nystedt asked if there were any current pedestrian pathways through the ICBC property. Mr. Wong replied that there were none.

Mr. Toderian inquired about the timing to provide a permanent walkway connection along the east side of the station as a result of the construction of the station and the construction on the adjacent property. Ms. Molaro replied that ICBC will begin the Station Area Planning Process in the spring. That process has a timeline of fifteen to eighteen months to complete. ICBC will be applying for a rezoning which will take another nine months. Ms. Molaro added that the best case scenario would be to have the construction finished by the time the line opens at the end of the 2009.

Mr. Scobie asked how the bus facilities are to function. Mr. Wong stated that a lot of work has been done to make the operations of the bus loop more efficient. The passenger drop-off and pick-up will occur on the north side of the loop which will avoid any bus passengers from having to cross the central island to get to/from the station. The majority of the buses will enter and exit from Yukon Street. The rectifier building which houses the electrical for the trolley system and washroom facilities for the bus drivers will be located under the station. Mr. Wong added that there will be a staging area for the buses just south of the central island. He noted that there will be signage at the pickup area indicating the bus route numbers. Mr. Scobie sought clarity on Condition 1.9. Mr. Wong stated that the condition is for greater clarity on the plantings that are being used for the landscaping.

Mr. Timm asked how many routes are anticipated to stop at the bus loop and if the waiting shelters were adequate for the number of passengers. Mr. Wong replied that there will be five different routes and that TransLink had designed the number of shelters required.

Ms. Long asked what the distance was between the station and the bus loop. Mr. Wong replied that it was about 160 feet.

Mr. MacGregor inquired as to the cost on the construction on the temporary walkway. Ms. Molaro replied that she did not have the answer and would ask Mr. LeFlufy to reply to the question.

Mr. MacGregor also inquired as to the width of the sidewalk along Cambie Street. Mr. Wong stated that it was 1.8 metres. Mr. MacGregor noted that the application showed a possible future staircase and asked for an explanation. Ms. Molaro replied that should the station be expanded in the future, the platform would be extended and a staircase added. In replying to a question from Mr. MacGregor, Ms. Molaro stated that the application included the station, portal and bus loop.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Parker stated that they have been working diligently with City staff and have made considerable progress in the station design and landscape concepts. There is a new concept for the bus loop which is an improvement over the previous submission. Mr. Parker added that they are comfortable with the advice in the report. Regarding Condition 1.3, Mr. Parker stated that it is a very difficult space and its use would be contingent on what happens on the ICBC property and the interface between that development and the bus loop. He added that they are reluctant to agree with the advice other than to say that the design of the station does not preclude using the space for retail at a future date. Regarding Condition A.2.7, he reiterated earlier comments that for legal reasons they won't be providing a wheel ramp for bicycles. Mr. Parker responded to Mr. Timm's question regarding the sidewalk and grades along Cambie Street. He stated that the landscape concept maintains the sidewalk crossing for the exit from the bus loop and there are to be no steps in that location. He added there will be a gradual ramp with a 5% grade.

Mr. McCarthy noted that there is a 2% slope in the loading area of the bus loop to meet the grade out to Cambie Street and Yukon Street.

Mr. LeFlufy stated that CLCO is looking to defer the decision to proceed with the temporary walkway for a few years until they are clear on the status of the ICBC site. ICBC intends to proceed as soon as the legal agreements are in place to market the site. He added that over the next year or so it will become clear as to who controls the site. Mr. LeFlufy stated that the capital costs for the temporary walkway would be around \$300,000 assuming they would have to purchase fill.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Timm asked if dedication of the widening area on South West Marine Drive had been discussed with ICBC. Mr. LeFlufy stated that ICBC is aware that a dedication will be required and CLCO is securing that as part of the negotiations.

Mr. Toderian inquired as to the potential approaches to the roof as stated in Condition 1.1. Mr. McGarva replied that they continue to focus on the wood soffit as viewed from the underside. The structural space and dimension relate to similar systems as employed in Richmond's #3 Road station. Mr. Parker added that the intent of the elevated stations was to detail them against a framework of modular design for the roof structure. The roof top is a fundamental piece and they designed this station to be different and distinguishable from the Richmond stations. Mr. McGarva added that this will be a sheltering roof that gives comfort with subliminal images relating to industrial uses. Mr. Parker stated that they are looking to provide more detailing and to demonstrate care in the development of the form. Mr. McGarva noted that the station has a more vehicular environment and they are looking for simple lines with an orthogonal treatment.

Mr. Toderian asked if there was another idea for using the retail space as noted in Condition 1.3 rather than for retail use. Mr. Parker replied that they would explore other opportunities to animate the wall.

Mr. Toderian inquired about the use of public art in the station. Mr. McCarthy replied that this was still under discussion.

Mr. Toderian asked if there were more opportunities for sustainability. Mr. McCarthy replied that there are opportunities around drainage from the roof and taking that into the landscaping. In terms of materials, they are considering the use of wood that is indigenous to BC and they have also considered using pine beetle wood. The glass module for the station was determined based on minimizing wastage of the glass in production.

Mr. Timm asked if there will be a down escalator. Mr. McCarthy replied that there will not, which is consistent with other stations in Vancouver. He added that the only station that has up and down escalators will be Richmond-Brighouse because of its single platform configuration.

Mr. Scobie asked if the plant materials would rely on rainwater rather than irrigation. Ms. Durante, Landscape Architect, replied that there are no plans to use irrigation on the site. She added that the landscaping still needs to be worked out under the guideway.

Ms. Nystedt inquired about the retail space as noted in Condition 1.3. Ms. Molaro stated staff would like to see a magazine/coffee shop in the area. Mr. Parker replied that without doing a retail analysis it would be hard to comment on the viability of the space.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Ms. Long stated that the Urban Design Panel had not seen the latest revision of the station. Ms. Long agreed that the design had improved and was supportive of most of the conditions. In terms of the roof structure, Ms. Long thought the form did not need to change but could use some design development to ensure the roof was well detailed. Regarding Condition 1.2, Ms. Long thought the area was constrained and suggested pulling back the building a few more feet. Ms. Long stated that the site was relying on the landscaping to make some of the places work and the landscaping needed to be irrigated to keep it well maintained. She added that there are lots of paved areas that could be a harsh environment without the landscaping.

Ms. Long thought it was a lost opportunity if there wasn't some retail in the lower bus plaza as stated in Condition 1.3. She added that animating the lower plaza will come down to the landscape development. She suggested having trees of a significant size and quality to have an impact.

Ms. Long agreed that a simple ramp is the best solution on the east side and the ramp could be minimized with landscaping.

Mr. Tatomir stated that he was in support of the conditions. He suggested having lots of greenery on the site to improve the neighbourhood. He also suggested making the signage more visible in the station. Regarding public art, Mr. Tatomir suggested that the station could be an expression of public art by the way it was designed and built.

Mr. Stovell agreed that the landscaping will be a crucial part of the project. Regarding Condition 1.6, Mr. Stovell stated that the landscaping would be important around the Cambie Street portal to soften the grade changes. Mr. Stovell said he was sensitive to the concerns of the applicant with regard to the viability of having retail on the plaza but suggested having licensed street merchants in the meantime to animate the space. He added that he liked the architecture with the industrial half-built skyscraper design.

Mr. Braun thought the applicant had integrated all the concerns the Board had with the original design. He liked the architecture and stated that as long as the materials are of a high quality it would be an attractive pavilion. Mr. Braun supported the conditions but suggested looking at the adequacy of the bus shelters considering the number of people who will be using the buses. Regarding the portal, he stated that he was disappointed with the wire mesh fence and thought it could be improved with landscaping. He would also like to see the fire lane and sidewalk improved to ensure the portal will be minimally intrusive on the neighbourhood.

Ms. Nystedt commended the applicant on the significant improvement of the design for this station since the last Board meeting. She supported the staff recommendations. She noted that Ms. Molaro described the station as the first point of entry to Vancouver and felt everything needs to be done to make the station an attractive landmark. In Condition 1.2, Ms. Nystedt suggested including CPTED principles as she thought the area might attract loitering and graffiti. Ms. Nystedt said she understood the applicants' concerns regarding retail but felt there were opportunities for retail development. Ms. Nystedt was concerned about the lack of a down escalator noting the aging of the population and thought it was poor planning to not provide one.

Board Discussion

Mr. Timm noted that the design had advanced significantly since last seen by the Board. He said he was impressed with the design for the bus loop. Mr. Timm had some concern with the west façade and the inadequate treatment of the boulevard with the narrowness of the sidewalk, however he recognized that not much could be done around increasing the width. Mr. Timm moved approval of the application with several amendments to the conditions.

Mr. MacGregor thought the design was much improved and shared the concerns regarding the treatment of the western façade. Mr. MacGregor thought the temporary walkway needed to be provided when the station opened. Mr. MacGregor seconded the motion for approval with a friendly amendment which was accepted by Mr. Timm.

Mr. Toderian agreed with the amendments noting that the Canada Line will be important to the city. Mr. Toderian encouraged the applicant to take every possible opportunity to embrace sustainable principles in the design. With regard to the public art, Mr. Toderian stated that he was disappointed that there had been no discussion on the placement and was concerned that it would become an after thought. He noted that the portal fencing which had been a challenge, offered an opportunity for public art to soften the treatment in the public realm. Regarding Condition 1.1, Mr. Toderian stated that he would like to see the roof add to the signature aspect of the building and that detailing could capture those opportunities. He added that he would like to encourage both Staff and the applicant to continue finding ways to bring lightness to the building. Mr. Toderian stressed that he would like to see some animated use of the lower bus plaza. Regarding Condition 1.5, Mr. Toderian encouraged the applicant to develop the unused space so that it doesn't become a negative from a building design prospective. He commended the applicant for the design evolution.

Motion

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

THAT the Board SUPPORT Development Submission No. DE410683, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Memorandum dated February 7, 2007, with the following amendments:

Amend Note to Applicant in Condition 1.1 by changing "highest" to *high*;

Amend Note to Applicant in Condition 1.4 by removing "and the Director of Legal Services", to read:

Note to Applicant: Arrangements to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services for pedestrian access across portion of Lot A, from SW Marine Drive to the bus loop. The proposed 3.0 m wide *temporary* walkway is to be provided when the station opens.

Amend Condition 1.8 by deleting "the area under the guideway north of Marine Drive, and the pedestrian/bikeway (fire access lane) along the Cambie Street frontage" to read;

design development to the open spaces, plazas and walkways *on private property* including the lower level bus loop, the area north of the station at the southeast corner of the intersection, to provide a high quality pedestrian experience with more variety and enhanced hard surface treatments throughout all these hard surface open spaces;

Amend Note to Applicant in Condition 1.8 by deleting "Consideration may be given for a system wide public realm treatment for the station and portal sites. Any special surface treatment in the public realm needs to meet city standards for safety and maintenance. Arrangements to be made to the satisfaction of General Manager of Engineering Services for special sidewalk treatments within street right-of-way will be required" and adding, *On-street hard surface treatments are to be referred to the Cambie Street public realm design process.*

Amend Note to Applicant in Condition A.2.4 to read;

Note to applicant: If an indented vehicle lay-by is proposed, arrangements to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and the Director of Legal Services will be required *to ensure public passage over any portion of the sidewalk on Lot A;*

Amend Condition B.1.2 by changing "April 10, 2007" to *August 12, 2007.*

4. 1685 ONTARIO STREET - PARCEL 9 (SEFC) - DE410876 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE)

Applicant: GBL

Request: To construct a 13 storey (106 units) market multiple dwelling building, a 7 storey (69 units) affordable multiple dwelling building, a 6 storey (50 units, including 6 live/work units) modest market multiple dwelling building, retail and a grocery store all over two levels of secured underground parking

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Scot Hein, Development Planner, thanked the applicant team and City staff for their hard work and input into the design of the project. He introduced the complete application for Parcel 9 at 1685 Ontario Street in the South East False Creek precinct. The Board and Panel convened around the model where Mr. Hein gave an overview of the site. He added that Parcels 3 and 6 will be coming to the Board on February 26th.

Mr. Hein noted that it was a decision of Council's for a low mid-rise form of development for this precinct and given the position of the site this has presented a number of challenges for the applicant. There are heights that constrain the development, aspirations for a precinct that has a strong pedestrian emphasize, and aspirations for sustainability to maximize double fronting or single loaded units for cross ventilation. The buildings will be constructed around a courtyard with minimal setbacks to the property line. The retail strategy is to activate the frontages that frame the Salt building and the plaza and brings street life to the precinct. There will be several anchor tenants including a liquor store, food store and drug store.

Mr. Hein reviewed the recommendations contained in the Development Permit Staff Team report dated February 12, 2007. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, with advice and comments provided.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Stovell inquired about the loading conditions. Mr. Hein described the loading requirements noting the entrance will be on Walter Hardwick Avenue.

Mr. Toderian asked how the design had been resolved since the Urban Design Panel meeting. Mr. Hein noted that the model was out of date and that the boards showed the current design development for the project. Mr. Lyon stated that the net-zero building had been pulled back around four to five feet on the podium and as well as the balconies on Walter Hardwick Avenue.

Mr. Toderian inquired about the "bookend buildings". Mr. Bell stated that the buildings will have a complementary relationship with each other which came from the set of design principles established for the overall design of the site. He added that applying those principles yielded a different architectural look for each building with all the pieces complementing each other.

Ms. Nystedt asked if having larger trucks delivering goods to the grocery store would reduce traffic. Mr. Lyon replied that it would substantially reduce traffic.

Mr. Tatomir inquired as to the future use of the Salt building. Mr. Hein replied that there will be a formal RFP through the Project Office. He noted that it will be a very public building with

interesting and complementary uses flanking the building. Also, the streetcar station will be at the front of the Salt building.

Mr. Tatomir wanted to know if the trees would be on both sides of the street. Mr. Hein stated that there won't be trees in front of the Salt building to keep the area open.

Mr. Tatomir also wanted to know why there was only one retail tenant instead of smaller retail units. Mr. Hein replied that due to the population anticipated in the area it was necessary to have a significant food store operation on site. He added that there will be one small retail space to the south of the grocery store, on the corner, as well as smaller retail units on other neighbouring sites to animate the plaza.

Ms. Nystedt inquired about the elevation of the site in relationship to Fairview Slopes. Mr. Hein replied that the rise in the landscape occurs around the base of the Cambie Bridge and West 2nd Avenue.

Mr. Braun noted that on level 6 of the rental building the suite entrances are open to the elements and asked if there could be liveability issues. Mr. Hein referred the question to the applicant to answer.

Mr. Stovell asked if the area on Walter Hardwick Avenue was adequate for truck access to the grocery store. Mr. Hein replied that the area might be reconfigured and staff are asking to reduce the opening from 80 feet to 50 feet but the plan still needs to be tested.

Ms. Nystedt inquired about the maximum height permitted on the site and the increase being proposed. Mr. Scobie replied that the table in the report is incorrect. Mr. Greer added that the building will be at the maximum allowable height.

Mr. Toderian inquired about the discussion regarding enclosed balconies. Mr. Hein replied that in some cases the enclosed balconies currently don't have a direct expression on the outside of the building and will need to be handled as per the guidelines.

Mr. Toderian asked if there was an opportunity through variations of signage and store front design that would break up the ground floor experience around the building. Mr. Hein replied that the intent will be for a variety of canopy types and an integration approach for weather protection, drainage, lighting as well as signage.

Mr. Toderian asked if the applicant was not required to provide LEED™ certification but only encouraged to provide LEED Silver. Mr. Bayley replied that they are committed to achieving LEED™ Silver, through the purchase agreement with the City. Mr. Scobie noted the applicant was also encouraged to attain the requirements for LEED™ Gold as a condition established by Council at Rezoning.

Mr. Toderian inquired about the percentage of exclusion regarding passive design. Mr. Hein replied that the project will exceed the 5% requirement set by Council. Mr. Osdoba added that the affordable housing building will be a demonstration project for a net-zero energy building and have made arrangements through CMHC to develop and design to the standards for net-zero. They will also be exploring with BC Housing about the life cycle performance of a net-zero energy building.

Mr. Scobie sought further clarity on the applicant seeking certification for LEED™. Mr. Jasper replied that the RPF required LEED™ Silver certification and in the process of the zoning the

applicant was requested to consider going to LEED™ Gold for the City's affordable housing and they are determined to go to LEED™ Gold on all the buildings except for the Community Centre which is going to LEED™ Platinum. Certification takes place post occupancy so it would mean that the points would be in place but completion of certification would not be a condition of occupancy.

Mr. Toderian asked if it was more expensive to achieve LEED™ Gold over LEED™ Silver. Mr. Bayley replied that there is more cost associated with achieving LEED™ Gold than in achieving LEED™ Silver but that the certification process is about the same.

Mr. Scobie inquired about the Green Roof Management Plan as mentioned in Condition 1.12 noting the condition was inconsistent with Appendix E, page 9 of 25, Item 10. Mr. Beaulieu replied that there is an overlap regarding the green roof requirements and there was a sense that there might be too much of a burden for the applicant to ask for all the technical requirements up front in the development permit. Mr. Scobie asked if Condition 1.2 was premature and is depended upon more details that would happen at the building permit stage. Mr. Hein added that there had been some recent issues regarding "green roofs" and the intent of moving it up front in the conditions was to have the applicant start working on a plan. Mr. Scobie asked if it was appropriate to refer to it as a Green Roof Management Plan when staff wanted more exploration. Mr. Hein suggested substituting the word "Strategy" for Plan.

Mr. Scobie suggested that Condition B.2.3 was unnecessary regarding phasing and could be deleted.

Mr. Scobie reminded the Board that the application was seeking a parking relaxation which will be subject to possible appeal to the Parking Variance Board.

Mr. Timm suggested deleting the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.1 stating that it was unnecessary. Mr. Hein agreed, adding that there may be other alternative solutions and that their aspiration is to remove the crossing entirely to normalize the streetscape.

Mr. Stovell stated that he was surprised that the plan was to subdivide the common courtyard between the moderate-market and the senior's building. Mr. Lyon replied that is likely that there would be a separation between the non-market housing use and the rental housing use. He added that it is not their intention that it be in the form of a hard wall or fence but only a suggested separation. Mr. Naundorf added that BC Housing will have issues with the use of their space by people not living in the building.

Mr. MacGregor referred to Page 10 stating that he would like to see the words "basic needs" removed from the report. He added that Council has set the policy and it is clear what the policy refers to regarding affordable housing.

Mr. MacGregor sought clarity regarding the turning swath of trucks and the width of the crossing. Mr. Hein stated that they are looking at the loading strategies now but the outcome will depend on the operator for the grocery store and the size of trucks being used for deliveries.

Mr. Timm said he was not sure Engineering had concluded that the exit onto West 1st Avenue should be eliminated even if smaller trucks were used for deliveries to the food store. He recommended reducing the size of the entrance on West 1st Avenue by combining the entrance off Walter Hardwick Avenue with the loading bay which would give a single entrance and reduce the width. He suggested deleting the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.1.

Mr. Toderian asked if the size of the food store would be similar to Urban Fair in False Creek and Coal Harbour and if they used smaller trucks for deliveries. Mr. Hein replied that the store size would be similar and that their loading requirements tend to get by with smaller trucks. He added that there are several strategies and want to support getting the right operator for the food store.

Mr. Scobie asked if it was more sustainable to have one large truck as opposed to having several smaller trucks doing deliveries. Mr. Osdoba said that it is not just the size of trucks but would also include changes in fuel types over time and the distance traveled between the distribution centre and the store. He added that all things being equal the larger truck could be more sustainable as there would be fewer deliveries.

Ms. Nystedt noted that there isn't anything mentioned in the report about economical sustainability of the development. Mr. Hein replied that they didn't want to speculate about this due to the rise in construction costs and suggested the applicant could answer the question.

Mr. Bayley sought clarification regarding the possible addition of dwelling units if the loading exit into West 1st Avenue was eliminated. He asked if the units were rental could they be added to the rental count and be dealt with under the general agreement regarding rental units. Mr. Hein said they wouldn't want that resolution to be punitive and would be willing to include them in the agreement.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Lyon stated that there had been extensive negotiations and discussion regarding the size of trucks coming into the project. With Engineering's consideration, the best route for the WB15 truck as well as the smaller trucks would be for them to come into Walter Hardwick Avenue and exit via West 1st Avenue which is reflected in the drawings. He added that he had recent discussions with a couple of potential food store operators and they would expect trailer type trucks for their operations. He noted that the food store will be in excess of 20,000 square feet which was a requirement of the Official Development Plan (ODP). It will be a full service store and they may require the trailer trucks to service that size of store. Mr. Lyon suggested keeping the options open as there are a number of operators already in or coming to the surrounding area resulting in a limited number of food stores available for the neighbourhood.

Regarding the penthouse floors in the market building, Mr. Lyon stated that on the north end of the two storey penthouse piece there is an opportunity for more work to the design. He added that a number of the conditions have already been dealt with in the last month and are in the package. They have added the trees back into the design along the east side of Salt Street, changed the canopy design along that edge and have pulled back the net-zero building on the north edge of the project to add more light down into the project. He noted that net-zero is a CMHC initiative and will be the first time it has been applied to a multi housing project. Net-zero means restoring as much plug power to the grid as is taken off the grid. There will be power generating sources on the building in the form of solar panels. Regarding the rental building where you will come outside on the corridor after leaving the elevator, Mr. Lyon stated that it was thought to be an interesting approach to the unit and would be a bit more like a house up in the air.

Mr. Lyon added that they could work with staff regarding all the conditions.

Mr. Jasper added that there had been discussions with food store operators for some time. He noted that there is a limited group as there are a number of food stores already along the Cambie corridor. He added that the site won't have lanes and will be important that the operator was not restricted as to the size of trucks being used for deliveries.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Toderian asked for an update on the "green roofs". Mr. Bayley stated that they have been asked by the warranty supplier (National Home Warranty) to prepare a technical document in dealing with building envelope systems and their approach to "green roofs". They have received tentative approval and expect to have the documentation necessary to give to them shortly. He added that Trish French, Assistant Director of Current Planning, will be putting forth the City's position to deal with the industry on a broader base.

Mr. Toderian sought clarity on the issue of colour in relationship to the Salt building. Mr. Lyon replied that it wasn't their intent to mimic the Salt building in the colour of the rental building as noted on the model.

Mr. Scobie inquired about the location and configuration of the store with regards to trucks accessing the loading bay. Mr. Lyon replied that the configuration of the store hadn't changed but there had been a refinement on the turning movements of the trucks. Issues have come up because of the raised curb for the streetcar and not wanting the trucks to mount the curb when turning. He added that it is common during design development to focus more on certain elements and it has now become more of a focus.

Mr. Scobie referred the applicant to Condition A.2.18 regarding vertical clearance stating that there needs to be sufficient clearance provided.

Mr. Scobie asked the applicant if they had any issues with Appendix C and drew the applicant's attention to the items with asterisks. Mr. Lyon stated that they did not have any problems with the items listed.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Ms. Long stated that the staff recommendations are supportable from the Urban Design Panel's perspective. She added that they appreciated the applicant coming back the UDP to report on the update in the design.

In terms of the loading issues, Ms. Long was supportive of the design development on those conditions relating to the size of the opening. She thought it was an improvement to have the building on Walter Hardwick be stepped back to open up the narrow area between the two buildings. There was support from the Urban Design Panel to have the street trees continue on Salt Street. The Panel was supportive of the changes including the integration of the net-zero building, the rental building and stepping back the penthouses on the bookend buildings.

Regarding Condition 1.12 and the Green Roof Management Plan, Ms. Long stated that she was in support of the condition as it could be an approach on how urban agriculture would be handled. She added that it was important that the roofs in SEFC deal with the ecology, amenities and social aspects.

Regarding Condition 1.16, Ms. Long encouraged the applicant to go for LEED™ Gold. The Panel assumed that the applicant would be applying for LEED™ Gold and it also needs to be clear for the public.

Ms. Long thought that having WB15 trucks in the neighbourhood was the wrong approach for a sustainable neighbourhood and that the residents would not expect to see large trucks in their small neighbourhood. She suggested working with a food store operator who can bring smaller trucks into the neighbourhood.

Mr. Tatomir stated that he was in support of the conditions. He thought that big trucks would be a problem in the neighbourhood and suggested having smaller retail units. Mr. Tatomir suggested giving the buildings actual names rather than referring to them by the type of building. He thought the elevated courtyard was a good idea which will give more sun into the area. However, he thought it was poor planning to not have the amenity shared by the residents in the three buildings. Mr. Tatomir thought the retail and grocery store were being allowed too much parking and suggested reducing the parking spaces to encourage car sharing and alternative transportation.

Mr. Stovell suggested not putting the applicant at a disadvantage by suggesting who the operator should be for the grocery store and restricting the type of truck used for deliveries. He would like to see the applicant and Engineering work out a compromise to minimize the impact. Regarding Condition 1.5, Mr. Stovell thought it was restrictive to not allow the building residents to share the courtyard.

Ms. Maust commended the applicant and staff for the way the Salt building had been handled. She noted that the building would be an important part of the development. She agreed that a strong anchor tenant would be important. Ms. Maust would like to see staff give some leeway to allowing larger trucks if that would allow fewer trips past the Salt building. Regarding the colour of the Salt building, Ms. Maust noted that the original Salt building renderings showed a roasted red pepper colour.

Ms. Nystedt advised approval of the staff recommendations.

Mr. Braun recommended approval of the conditions and commended the applicant regarding liveability and sustainability as they are continuing to set the bar for the community. Regarding the grocery store truck issue, Mr. Braun suggested giving the applicant some leeway to find the right operator for the grocery store. Mr. Braun was concerned about the courtyard being divided. He noted that if it could be figured out for the more complex Woodward's project with a disclosure statement there should be a solution for the courtyard on this site. Mr. Braun was concerned about not having corridor access to the townhouses as the distance from the elevator could cause a problem when people are moving into the units and they would end up parking on the street. He encouraged staff to ask the applicant to provide overhangs or coverings on the walkways that are open so as to minimize exposure to the weather.

Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor noted that economic sustainability was dealt with by Council from the City's perspective in the rezoning. Mr. MacGregor agreed that the food store was a challenge but that it needs to serve the future residents and accommodate the food store with a decent loading facility. He agreed that the architectural team had done a great job in integrating the Salt building into the design. He thought the roof design was intriguing with the athlete motive. Mr. MacGregor was concerned about the water feature noting that it could be a concern with children playing in the area. He added that staff should be able to address the

situation regarding different groups using the courtyard. Mr. MacGregor moved approval of the application with several amendments to the conditions.

Mr. Timm acknowledged the efforts of Staff and the applicant team noting that it has been an unusual process. Mr. Timm was concerned that the enclosed balconies would not meet the intent of the guideline and needs to be consistent with what has been approved in the past. He agreed that it was important that the food store be viable and if it becomes necessary to have the larger trucks then there are ways to minimize or reduce the impact on the neighbourhood. Mr. Timm seconded the motion for approval.

Mr. Toderian supported the recommendations and amendments. He commended both City staff and the applicant for a good job within a tight time frame. He added that he was pleased no one seems to be using the time frame as an excuse for anything but exceptional design. Mr. Toderian encouraged the applicant to capture every possible opportunity for sustainability especially the passive exclusions. Mr. Toderian commended GBL as an architectural team. He thought they were embracing sensitive and strategic integration of colour which adds to the liveliness of the buildings.

Mr. Toderian was pleased with the design resolution regarding the ground experience. He found it interesting that the applicant had modified the two storey podium townhouse approach by indenting it. He added that it was a different approach to the street edge and will be interesting to see how well it works.

Regarding enclosed balconies, Mr. Toderian was concerned as the enclosed balconies might be used as balconies or they might be used as bedrooms or computer and TV rooms and they would not embrace the guidelines and Council's intent. He added that he won't be raising it as a design development issue with the project as such an approach has been permitted on other projects, and this project shouldn't be held to a higher standard than anyone else. The issue needs to be reconsidered and applied to everyone at the same time.

Mr. Toderian encouraged the applicant and staff to come up with ways to break up the visual monotony of the retail. He would like to see individual character to the frontage.

Mr. Toderian supported the change to the conditions regarding the truck issue and had no doubt that any operator would strive to maximize their flexibility. He added that the consideration still needs to be taken seriously. If the larger truck is deemed to be necessary, Mr. Toderian saw this as a design challenge and suggested that loading facilities don't have to be unattractive. He challenged the applicant to design the most attractive loading facility ever.

Mr. Toderian suggested that the applicant was caught in a difficult place regarding the expectation of LEED™ Gold and a contractual obligation to achieve LEED™ Silver certification. It would be a major disappointment to everyone if the project didn't certify as LEED™ Gold.

Mr. Toderian was gratified that the applicant was not giving up on intensive green roofs and was confident that there are technical solutions to reduce any risks. He also encouraged staff and the applicant to consider a realistic way forward to integrate the public/shared spaces between the three buildings noting that it would be a shame in a sustainable community not to find a solution.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE410876, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Review Team report dated February 12, 2007, with the following amendments:

Delete "the elimination" and "while achieving two additional dwelling unit opportunities on the First Avenue frontage" in Condition 1.1 to read:
consideration of loading strategies for the grocery store tenancy that reduces the impact on the public realm, specifically crossing widths on Walter Hardwick Avenue and on First Avenue;

Delete Note to Applicant in Condition 1.1;

Amend Condition 1.12 by changing "Plan" to *Strategy* and adding *maintenance*, after usage, to read:
provision of a Green Roof Management *Strategy* to clarify requirements that will ensure usage, *maintenance*, longevity and the integrity of the building envelope;

Amend Condition A.2.29 to read:
consideration for charging of 3-vehicles and e-scooters;

Note to Applicant: The applicant shall consider provision for a minimum 3% of residential parking stalls with 120 V AC single phase outlets (per section 86 of the Canadian Electric Code) with provision for future expansion to 15% of all residential parking stalls. Applicant shall also consider appropriate access agreements for these stalls.

Re-number second A.2.30 to A.2.31;

Delete Condition B.2.3;

Re-number B.2.4 to B.2.3, B.2.5 to B.2.4, B.2.6 to B.2.5 and B.2.7 to B.2.6.

5. 1631 ONTARIO STREET - PARCEL 10 (SEFC) - DE410878 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE)

Applicant: Merrick Architecture

Request: To construct three multiple dwelling buildings of 11 storeys ("Bookend Building" fronting on Ontario Street), 9 storeys ("Plaza Building" fronting on Salt Street) & 5 storeys ("Courtyard Building" fronting on Athletes Way to the north and Walter Hardwick Avenue to the south) with 191 dwelling units and retail space on the ground floor including a drug store over 2 levels of underground parking.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Scot Hein, Development Planner, introduced the application for three residential buildings in South East False Creek on Parcel 10. The anchor commercial tenant will be a drug store. He noted that there are many similarities between Parcel 9 and Parcel 10.

Mr. Hein reviewed the recommendations contained in the Development Permit Staff Team report dated February 12, 2007. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, with advice and comments provided.

Mr. Hein and the applicant took questions at the model regarding design development since the application was before the Urban Design Panel on January 9, 2007.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Scobie asked if there would be any objection to amending Condition 1.10 to have the same wording as in the previous SEFC application regarding the Green Roof Management Strategy. He also noted that "towards the northeast corner" should be deleted in Condition 1.11 and Condition B.2.3 should be deleted.

Mr. Stovell sought clarity on the loading configuration. Mr. Hein replied that the applicant designed the most efficient loading configuration taking into consideration the needs for the drug store.

Mr. Tatomir inquired about the materials being used on the project. Mr. Borowski replied that there are samples and they will be using high quality materials including limestone.

Mr. Scobie provided an update that regarding Condition A.2.1, the subdivision plan was signed February 1, 2007 and was deposited in the Land Title Office for registration on Friday, February 9, 2007. Regarding Condition A.2.2, there is presently in place a blanket of statutory right-of-way which occurred at the time of the original subdivision and this is to be modified now with respect to producing the corner cuts. Condition A.2.3, regarding the at-grade and above statutory right-of-way over the westerly 1 metre, should now also be in hand as documentation was deposited in the Land Titles Office also on Friday for registration.

Mr. Toderian inquired about the state of enclosed balconies. Mr. Hein replied that more information is required on the suite layouts in order to answer the question.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Borowski thanked Staff for the handling of the application and the help from the Urban Design Panel. He stated that they are in support of the recommendations with a few revisions. He proposed revised wording in the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.1 which would seek to address the identity of the building and the way it manifests itself from the north side of False Creek. Mr. Borowski sought clarity on the intent of the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.7 regarding the grill design reflecting the Shipyards Precinct character. He was concerned that the grilles tie in with the building character. Mr. Borowski also sought clarity regarding the colour strategies as noted in Condition 1.12. Regarding Condition 1.13, Mr. Borowski asked that the Note to Applicant to be deleted or that further clarification be given. Under the Standard Engineering Condition A.2.2 regarding the corner cuts, Mr. Borowski asked that the word "column" be deleted and in Condition A.2.4 he proposed a change to the wording regarding the demountable canopies and being able to provide details to Engineering.

Regarding Condition 1.4, Mr. Bayley noted that there are a lot of balconies on the project developed in support of the passive design requirements and they haven't yet shown what parts of those balconies would be enclosed. He added that he was concerned that the approach towards passive design of the balconies might get lost in the concern that the City has for expressing enclosed balconies.

Regarding Condition A.1.1, Mr. Bayley noted that they are managing three different sites and there are potential area exchanges going on between the three sites at a small level. He added that the area requirements apply to the entire site.

Regarding Condition A.2.8 which is a comment about the geometry of Walter Hardwick Avenue, Mr. Bayley asked for some clarification as what was implied in the condition.

Condition A.2.22 regarding the utility connections, Mr. Bayley stated that they have asked for but have not yet received confirmation on some revised utility connection points in order to deal with drainage slopes within the site. He added that the connections could have significant implications on the height of the parking garage.

Condition A.5.6 regarding universal access, Mr. Bayley noted that they are going through a Safer Homes criteria evaluation and will bring that forward as an initiative on the site. He added 36" door widths for all doorways and is probably not achievable and asked for the note to be deleted.

Mr. Hein stated that the wording proposed by Mr. Borowski for Condition 1.1 was acceptable as it captures the intent. Regarding Condition 1.7, Mr. Hein suggested the applicant think beyond the more conventional approach to grill design and to think about the kind of character in the public realm. In Condition 1.12, Mr. Hein suggested the note could be more proactive in encouraging the applicant to add more colour to the project. He agreed that the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.13 could be deleted as Parcel 10 has resolved the penthouse massing on the easterly portion.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Timm asked if it would be appropriate to modify Condition A.1.12 to read "*clarification of colour strategies for the development;*" and by amending the Note to Applicant by adding at the end of the note "*Colour should not compromise the heritage setting for the Salt Building*". Mr. Hein supported the changes.

Mr. Thomson noted that with regards to Condition A.2.2, the placement of the column creates some difficulties with pedestrians and if the corner cuts were expanded in the arcade area, the column could remain. He suggested modifying the second sentence in the Note to Applicant by adding at the end of the sentence "*or an expanded right-of-way area achieved*".

In regards to Condition A.2.8, Mr. Thomson stated that the design work continues with Engineering and the Project Office on the geometrics for the street and the condition is ensuring that they are reflected on the drawings. He added that he didn't see any need to change the condition.

Regarding A.2.22, Mr. Thomson saw no need to make any change to the condition suggesting the applicant could talk to Karima Mulji in Engineering Services regarding any concerns the applicant might have regarding utility connections. Mr. Scobie suggested adding "*as currently proposed*" at the end of the Note to Applicant and Mr. Thomson had no objection to the addition.

In answer to a question from Mr. Scobie, Mr. Bayley noted that a "Vista box" is a significant hydro disconnect switch and this is the first time the hydro distribution system using Vista switches is being installed in Vancouver. He added that it is an innovative approach to the distribution of hydro and there are five or six switches on the project that need to be located in open areas which has caused a bit of a problem. Mr. Thomson suggested it be addressed in the standard landscaping conditions. Mr. Hein added that there will be a visual impact and these utility installations need to be relocated away from the pedestrian view. He suggested including them in Condition 1.7 in order to minimize their impact.

Regarding Condition A.2.4, Mr. Thomson recommended adding "*or make alternative arrangements to the satisfaction to the General Manager of Engineering Services*" at the end of the condition. He added that the applicant would then be able to make application that described how the sun shades were demountable, their specific locations and the amount of encroachment. Mr. Timm was concerned about the narrowness of the street and whether or not the street space would be overwhelmed by the closeness and height of the buildings. He asked Mr. Hein for his perspective on possible encroachments. Mr. Hein replied that with the low mid-rise approach the applicant is exploiting the use of passive design. The buildings are being pushed to the edges. He acknowledged that Walter Hardwick Avenue will be a tight street and that we haven't seen this approach before in Vancouver. Mr. Timm inquired as to where on the model he could see the sun shades. Mr. Borowski replied that they are on the south façade. Mr. Osdoba added that there are alternatives to the demountable sun shades but they would look different and would require people to operate the shades.

Ms. Long noted that all the balconies on the drawings and on the model are shown as open balconies and she asked for some clarification as that was a major change from what the Urban Design Panel was expecting on the project. Mr. Bayley replied that the balconies would not be built inside suites and the exterior expression would not change.

Mr. Scobie noted that Condition A.5.6 was the same condition as the Board imposed on Parcel 9 and that the Note to Applicant is asking the applicant to give consideration for the provision of 36" door width. Mr. Bayley restated that they will not be providing 36" door width through out the project.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Ms. Long noted that the Urban Design Panel was very supportive of the project. There was a lot of playfulness in the design at different levels. The biggest issue the Panel had was on the plaza side regarding the need for townhouse massing set back on the top of the building to see a seven story expression rather than a nine storey building. They were supportive of the changes being made by increasing the building set back at the pinch point and the building edge resolution as well as the reconfiguration of some of the units. The Panel did comment on the fact that it would be nice to have another layer of colour. Regarding Condition A.2.22 about the service utility locations, Ms. Long noted that these conditions need to be resolved so as not to impact the public realm. She added that there are huge expectations for the project and the issues should be resolved before the applicant goes back to the Urban Design Panel with their design update.

Mr. Tatomir recommended support of all the conditions. He was concerned about the western façade of the building facing the plaza noting that it looked a bit repetitive. The penthouse level lacks articulation and the appearance of separation which could be achieved by using a change in colour, specifically the brick. On the north elevation in the same building, Mr. Tatomir suggested adding a vertical element similar to the bookend building to give it a sense of symmetry.

Mr. Stovell recommended support for all the conditions and added that he wouldn't change the design of the penthouse.

Ms. Maust was pleased to see the strong anchor of the drug store as well as the smaller commercial/retail with the live/work units along Salt Street. She thought this would provide a lot of animation on the plaza as well as multiple signage opportunities. She added that she would support the amended staff recommendation in Condition 1.2 acknowledging that colour will add to the plaza experience as long as the Salt building colour is not duplicated.

Ms. Nystedt recommended support of staff's recommendations as amended. She thanked the architect for a fabulous design especially the north side façade. She also thanked the applicant for putting in three bedroom units so that there will be opportunities for families.

Mr. Braun expressed his appreciation to the applicant for integrating some unique features to open up the building such as the trees in the courtyard and the water feature on the east façade. He would like to see the retail be open and animated along Salt Street. He thought careful consideration should be given to operational concerns in regards to loading for the individual residential units. He was concerned about the liveability on Walter Hardwick Avenue noting that it could become a service alley. He added that it was another excellent project for the neighbourhood.

Board Discussion

In commenting on this application, Mr. Toderian reiterated the comments provided on Parcel 9 regarding sustainability, passive opportunities, risk, enclosed balconies, the potential monotony of retail frontages, green roofs, and the importance of LEED™ Gold certification.

Mr. Toderian commended the applicant on a building design that was evolving in a very positive way. He noted the architectural risk taking and in particular the integration of green features, the trees in the courtyard and the carrying through of the water feature to be viewable from the street. Mr. Toderian thought the various facades were well articulated but were

opportunities to evolve it even further. Mr. Toderian re-emphasized the importance of colour stating the project still needed more colour evolution. He added that colour would add to the importance of the building. He thought it read as a large project instead of a series of connected projects and was concerned about the street edge. Mr. Toderian would like to see the integration of colour and additional material types breaking up the massing. He encouraged staff and the applicant to look for opportunities on all of the retail frontages to ensure visual permeability through the windows. Mr. Toderian expressed a general concern about Walter Hardwick Avenue regarding the possible encroachments and hoped the impacts would be minimal. He worried about going too far and creating an environment that is not welcoming. Mr. Toderian moved approval of the application with several amendments to the conditions.

Mr. Timm seconded the motion for approval. He noted that this will be a very important building right on the water front and across the street from the community centre. He expressed concern about Walter Hardwick Avenue and hoped that it will all work out in the end. Mr. Timm thought the relationship with the buildings on the plaza was making for a pleasant setting for the Salt building.

Mr. MacGregor thought the units were particularly attractive on the north side and having three bedroom units was an excellent idea. In terms of Walter Hardwick Avenue, Mr. MacGregor expressed concern that about how the street will work and hoped that a solution could be found.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE410878, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Review Team report dated February 12, 2007, with the following amendments:

Amend Note to Applicant in Condition 1.1 to read:

Note to Applicant: *The introduction of distinct roof top units expressing individual modulation is required.*

Amend Condition 1.7 to read:

design development to minimize the size, carefully integrate and screen all mechanical equipment *including Vista boxes*, and related aspects such as intake/exhaust grills, that do not visually convey sustainable principles into the overall massing, form and architectural response for each building;

Amend Condition 1.10 by changing "Plan" to *Strategy* and adding *maintenance*, after "usage", to read:

provision of a Green Roof Management *Strategy* to clarify requirements that will ensure usage, *maintenance*, longevity and the integrity of the building envelope;

Delete "towards the northwest corner" in the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.11;

Amend Condition 1.12 to read:

clarification of colour strategies for the development;

Note to Applicant: Site specific consideration, in the context of precinct design intent for colour as a strategy to enliven, differentiate and contribute visually to a high quality public realm, is anticipated. *Colour should not compromise the heritage setting for the Salt Building.*

Delete the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.13;

Amend the Note to Applicant in Condition A.2.2 to read:

Note to Applicant: No soft landscaping, street furniture, columns or other building encroachments will be permitted in these volumetric areas. The column shown within the proposed corner-cut area in the southwest corner of the site is to be deleted *or an expanded right-of-way area achieved*. Please clearly mark the corner cuts and the 1 meter right of way on the plans. (Some sections/elevations are not clear and the corner cuts are not marked on the plans);

Amend Condition A.2.4 to read:

delete all encroaching items other than the demountable canopies for the commercial entry and the smaller canopies for the townhomes on Walter Hardwick Avenue *or make alternative arrangements to the satisfaction to the General Manager of Engineering Services*;

Amend Note to Applicant in Condition A.2.22 by adding *as currently proposed* after "the following services";

Delete Condition B.2.3;

Re-number B.2.4 to B.2.3, B.2.5 to B.2.4, B.2.6 to B.2.5 and B.2.7 to B.2.6.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:25 PM

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

F. Scobie
Chair