

Date: Monday, February 2, 2004  
Time: 3.00 p.m.  
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

---

**PRESENT:****Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)  
L. Beasley Co-Director of Planning  
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager  
D. Rudberg General Manager of Engineering Services

**Advisory Panel**

S. Lyon Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions  
P. Kavanagh Representative of the Development Industry  
G. Chung Representative of the General Public  
C. Henschel Representative of the General Public  
K. McNaney Representative of the General Public

**Regrets**

E. Mah Representative of the Development Industry  
D. Chung Representative of the General Public

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

J. Barrett Development Planner  
S. Hein Development Planner  
V. Potter Project Facilitator  
M. Thomson City Surveyor

**628 Kinghorne Mews**

P. Busby Busby & Associates  
F. Roman Concord Pacific Group  
B. Hemstock PWL Partnership

**111 Alexander Street**

S. Smyth Greater Vancouver Regional District  
P. Archibald Greater Vancouver Regional District  
P. Dafoe Associated Engineering

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

---

**1. MINUTES**

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of January 19, 2004 be approved.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

**3. 628 KINGHORNE MEWS - DE408001 - ZONE CD-1  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Busby & Associates

Request: To construct a nine storey mixed residential/commercial building, with a total of 28 apartment units. Parking and loading are provided on the adjacent northerly site (600 Beach Crescent) with pedestrian access provided below grade. A marina facility including showers and laundry are provided on a mezzanine level below grade.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

The Development Planner, Jonathan Barrett, presented this application in the Beach Neighbourhood, for the site immediately adjacent to the sea wall and to the east of the Granville Bridge. The Beach Neighbourhood was zoned CD-1 in 1996 and this is the penultimate market housing site to be developed. Parking for this development is provided on the two adjacent sites, accessed by a below grade pedestrian crossing. Mr. Barrett noted the proposal substantially complies with all aspects of the Beach Neighbourhood CD-1 Guidelines. Staff are seeking two design conditions, as outlined in the Staff Committee Report dated January 7, 2004. In summary, the overall building design is as envisaged at the rezoning stage and its nautical character is very appropriate for this location at the False Creek edge. The Staff Committee recommendation is for approval.

**Questions/Discussion**

In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg regarding provision of a children's play area, Mr. Barrett noted that while such an amenity is typically sought, staff concluded that it was not required on this site because there is no suitable location at grade and it is in close proximity to George Wainborn Park which has extensive children's play areas.

Mr. Scobie sought clarification with respect to the setback from the townhouse entries, which is proposed at less than the normally recommended 1 m grade difference. Mr. Barrett noted the 1 m separation is achieved for the units along the water front and confirmed the proposal for the two townhouse entries on Kinghorne Mews is supported by staff because they are set back 5 m across the water garden, accessed by a bridge, rather than with the more typical patio.

With respect to some of the rooms which do not have access to daylight, Mr. Barrett explained this is usually a concern with smaller units where residents have no choice. However, in this

case, the units are fairly large and it is thought that a room without daylight will be welcomed for use as a media room.

Mr. Scobie raised a question with respect to the below ground, pedestrian parking access, which is across the primary sea walk and bike route. Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, said the likelihood of the crossing being disturbed for service access is low. There is a legal agreement, put in place as a rezoning condition, which will need some minor adjustments to reflect the final design.

Mr. Thomson confirmed that condition B.2.5, dealing with street trees, is a standard condition. It is intended to ensure the trees are in place within six months of building occupancy. While this is outside the control of the applicant, it prompts Park Board and Engineering staff to ensure the work is appropriately scheduled.

With respect to the marina washroom and laundry facilities (condition A.1.7), Mr. Barrett explained that these facilities are not required for this building but may be necessary to support the marina activity in the adjacent water lot. If satisfactory arrangements between Concord Pacific and the False Creek Yacht Club are not made to determine how the marina will be serviced, this site will provide the facilities.

#### **Applicant's Comments**

Peter Busby, Architect, confirmed they have no objections to the recommended conditions of approval. Fred Roman advised it has not yet been determined whether the marina facilities will be required and the intent is to build the facilities, unfinished to the level of roughing in for the plumbing. He noted the requirements may not be determined for nine years and it is not yet known how it will be used in the interim period.

#### **Comments from other Speakers**

None.

#### **Panel Opinion**

Mr. Lyon reported that this project was very strongly supported by the Urban Design Panel. The Panel had only two concerns, which have been addressed in the conditions. With respect to the restaurant space, the Panel recommended opening it up more on the north side to provide greater visibility, and to eliminate the significant bicycle storage next to the restaurant.

Mr. Hancock said it is quite an elegant and very supportable scheme. He said he had no objection to the restaurant as proposed and recommended leaving it to the applicant to decide the best solution.

Mr. Kavanagh also supported the application and said it is a fine response to the site.

Mr. Henschel said he had some concerns about the north elevation but noted it is handled very well, in particular the water feature along the base of the building. Mr. Henschel strongly supported the original proposal for the bicycle storage at ground level because of its ease of access for residents. He supported the application.

Mr. McNaney agreed with Mr. Henschel about the location of the bicycle storage, noting a ground level location is very convenient for bicycle commuters. He commented it is refreshing to see the initial design had a conscious approach to bicycle use and he hoped it would be continued. With respect to the design, Mr. McNaney said he particularly liked the wooden accents on the building, which give an organic feel to the building. Regarding sustainability,

Mr. McNaney urged the applicant to seek the LEED silver standard and provide a sustainable green roof. He said he believed the proposed restaurant location could be viable because there are currently limited waterfront dining opportunities and the demand will increase once the buildings behind are completed.

Ms. Chung concurred with the previous comments. She also expressed appreciation for the recommended CPTED conditions.

#### Board Discussion

Mr. Rudberg noted the proposal is very appropriate for this site and is consistent with the zoning and guidelines. He said while he appreciated the Advisory Panel's comments regarding the bicycle storage he was not sufficiently persuaded to change the staff recommendation given the importance of the visibility and viability of the restaurant. In the redesign of this area he hoped an alternative location could be found which is equally accessible and convenient for the residents. He agreed a children's play area is not necessary, either at ground level or on the rooftop, given the site's proximity to George Wainborn Park. He moved approval of the application, with the deletion of "underground" from condition 1.1.

Mr. MacGregor commented he did not feel as strongly on the issue of the bicycle storage, but he supported Mr. Rudberg's motion. With respect to condition A.1.7 regarding the marina facilities, Mr. MacGregor stressed it is important that this matter is resolved and the clarification sought from the applicant will need to be very specific, noting it was a fundamental issue at the rezoning stage. He said the proposal is an excellent scheme for this very difficult site.

Mr. Beasley supported the motion of approval. He said it needs to be emphasized that the proposal is an exemplary design, which is very important on this high profile site. He said he was very pleased there has been no loss of pedestrian circulation around the south side of the building. With respect to the units on Kinghorne Mews, Mr. Beasley said he normally would not support the relationship of the front doors to the street but in this case the alternative separation is a very handy way of dealing with the privacy issues. He supported deletion of the word "underground" with respect to the bicycle storage location but said he believes the condition is important because blank walls are detrimental on a very actively used pedestrian route. However, the advice of the Advisory Panel regarding convenient access to the bicycle storage should be taken into consideration in the resolution of the design. With respect to sustainability, Mr. Beasley noted the Board is not a policy making body and LEED certification cannot be a requirement without specific Council policy on the matter. However, he commended the applicant team for pursuing buildings that are more compatible with the environment.

#### 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. 408001, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated January 7, 2004, with the following amendment:

Delete the word "underground" from condition 1.1.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. 111 ALEXANDER STREET - DE407706 - ZONE HA-2  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Greater Vancouver Regional District

Request: To construct a new building which upgrades the existing sewage pumping station, with two above-grade storeys and two below grade storeys.

Mr. Rudberg said he had considered the question of whether he was in conflict of interest on this application. He noted the role of the GVRD is entirely separate from the role of the City Engineer, and the property is not under his care and control. Nor has he been involved in any consideration of the site options or building design. Mr. Rudberg therefore concluded that he is not in a conflict of interest in this matter.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

The Development Planner, Scot Hein, presented this application and briefly reviewed the site context, including the Port lands and rail yards directly to the north and the Four Sisters Housing Cooperative opposite. As well, this site is at the terminus of the historic CPR right-of-way. Referring to the Staff Committee Report dated January 7, 2004, Mr. Hein briefly reviewed the technical analysis, noting there is a minimum height requirement in the HA-2 zone of 4.2 m (40 ft.). The proposed building is just below 22 ft., up to 26.4 ft. in places with mechanical appurtenances. Given the neighbours' concerns about view blockage staff support a reduction in the minimum height requirement. Staff also support a relaxation of parking because no parking demand is anticipated.

With respect to the design, Mr. Hein noted it has been a challenging project in many respects because of its position in the city. The Heritage Commission had suggested a fairly literal reference to Gastown heritage but the initial design was strongly opposed by the Urban Design Panel as being inappropriate in a new building. The Panel also strongly recommended that the technical function of the building should be portrayed in a more obvious manner, as well as providing better pedestrian amenity. The revised scheme, the subject of this application, was supported by the Urban Design Panel and is also supported by staff. High quality materials and detailing are anticipated.

Mr. Hein briefly reviewed the response to notification and staff's response to the concerns raised by neighbours. He then briefly described the recommended conditions of approval contained in the Staff Committee Report.

**Questions/Discussion**

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning view impact on the Four Sisters Cooperative, Mr. Hein referred to view diagrams comparing the view impact of the current single storey facility and the proposed new building. There are presently two units which look directly onto the building; the new building will impact five ground floor units. For units on the second floor, views over the building will be maintained, with the exception of the rooftop vents which protrude above the parapet. Level three units will not be affected. With respect to the trains directly to the north, Mr. Hein said while there is some movement of trains, it is generally a fairly static condition. The rail cars are the equivalent of a single storey building, although they are occasionally stacked two high.

Mr. Beasley raised a question about the orientation of the vents at the top of the building and requested clarification in the applicant's presentation.

With respect to the impact of light, noise and smell, Mr. Hein said acoustics and odour will be managed, but further clarification is sought from the applicant in the requested Operations Management Plan. With respect to light, the intent is to improve pedestrian safety at night with the addition of some ambient light, at the same time minimizing glare for the neighbours across the street. Specific details are sought from the applicant in condition 1.2.

Mr. Beasley noted a major concern of the neighbours was the appropriateness of this site for the facility and whether other locations had been considered. The applicant was requested to respond to this matter in his presentation.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley as to the benefits of this proposal for the neighbours, Mr. Hein noted there have been no discussions with the neighbours about the revised design. However, there is clearly opportunity to acknowledge local interests through an interpretation program and for the neighbours to participate in such a program. As well, the introduction of lighting improves the safety of the sidewalk. The open space on the project is challenging because there are some demanding functional requirements for below ground access. As well, some neighbours have expressed concern that the project includes places where people can loiter. Because of the significant encroachment below grade that is being sought, the number of street trees will be limited.

Mr. Beasley commented that the letter from The Four Sisters Cooperative to the Board is dated September 17, 2003. Vicki Potter, Project Facilitator, advised there have been no meetings with the co-op since that time. There was a meeting to discuss the initial design, and the neighbours were notified of the revised submission. Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding the public consultation process, and in particular why there was no conversation with the Four Sisters Cooperative about the community use aspects of the building and the open space. Ms. Potter explained there were three public meetings held after submission of the original design, and the co-op specifically requested that the discussion be limited to the issue of whether this is an appropriate site for the sewage pump facility.

With respect to view blockage, Mr. MacGregor noted the proposal is below the minimum required height in this zone. Mr. Hein confirmed the Gastown Historical Area Planning Committee supported the subject application.

In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg, Mr. Hein agreed it would be appropriate to include a condition dealing with graffiti. At the suggestion of Mr. Beasley, he also agreed that a community representative should be included in the condition dealing with community liaison.

#### **Applicant's Comments**

Sean Smyth, GVRD, said this is a significant infrastructure upgrade project, noting there has been a pump station on the site for thirty-one years, operating continuously. The new facility will: increase the station's operational reliability, provide a safe working environment for operations maintenance workers, decrease operational problems currently experienced at the existing station, allow for increase in pumping station capacity, and allow a reduction of overflows of raw sewage into the harbour. Mr. Smyth said they have worked hard to incorporate many of the suggestions received from residents and various committees. The GVRD is very excited about the design; it is a "new look" for the GVRD. Mr. Smyth said they understand the conditions of approval recommended in the report, and he confirmed that they

will do everything possible to minimize construction and operational impacts on the community.

Paul Archibald, GVRD, explained that the location of this facility has been dictated by history because it was originally decided that an outfall would be built to handle the sewage from this part of the city. This outfall still exists and runs under CRAB Park into Burrard Inlet. Before the pump station was built in the early 1970's all the raw sewage from this part of the city went directly into the inlet. To avoid excessive pumping, sewage systems are constructed to run downhill to the low points, and this site is the low point to which all the sewage drained en route to the inlet. The pump station was built on the site in 1973. It intercepts all the sewage and directs it to the sewage treatment plant on Iona Island. The pump station was built as a temporary facility and it is there because that location is the confluence of many sewage pipes within the city. To move it elsewhere would double and possibly triple the cost of this installation. Mr. Archibald agreed it could be moved further north, requiring installation of a large piping system to the north, possibly in CRAB Park. It also could be moved elsewhere in the city but the fact is the confluence of the underground pipes, which are very valuable to the health and safety of the region, is at the subject site.

Mr. Smyth added that other locations were considered and this site was considered the only viable location with sufficient footprint for the proposed station. It could be moved a little to the east or west, or to the north towards the water.

Paul Dafoe, Associated Engineering, described the purpose of the vents, noting those on the roof are set back on the building and are directed downwards. The location of the vents is for ease of servicing and safety of maintenance workers. He stressed that pedestrians walking by the building will experience no draft. He advised the building has been reduced in size as much possible and the length of the building is dictated by the size of the pumps. With respect to the glazing at the ends of the building, Mr. Dafoe explained it is spandrel glass and there are no openings.

With respect to odours, Mr. Smyth said they consider the odour at this station will be as good as or better than at the existing station. The amount of sewage remains the same and there have been no complaints about odour. If there is an odour problem, there is a room in the basement where odour control equipment could be retrofitted at a later date. With respect to lighting, Mr. Smyth explained that only minimal lighting is needed in the station and the intent is to provide a minimum amount of lighting for pedestrians on the sidewalk. With respect to street trees, Mr. Smyth noted there is a wet well which encroaches under the street in the front of the station which prevents the construction of tree wells. Trees are proposed at the ends to frame the building. The only open space on the site is the small plaza to the left of the building, where the existing pump station is located. This will be converted to a holding tank, which will require access via ground level hatches. The landscaping is limited to a few ornamental trees and some benches. There have been no noise complaints about the existing station which has the same type of equipment as the new station, with the exception of an emergency generator which will meet GVRD acoustical standards. The noisy equipment is located well below grade. Hours of operation in the new station will be the same or less than the existing station. Mr. Archibald noted that an advantage is that all the equipment is located inside and off-site equipment will not be required for servicing the pumps.

In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg with respect to the construction program and its value, Mr. Smyth said the budget is \$4 million and it is anticipated that the construction program will be up to 50 weeks in duration. The existing pump station has to remain in operation while the new pump station is being built. It is anticipated that the excavation,

shoring and the underground portion of the station will be about six months, the above ground portion another six months. The greatest noise impact will be during the excavation stage. It was also noted the West Coast Express will limit the hours of work during this stage.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, Mr. Archibald confirmed they have no difficulty with the condition to provide an Operations Management Plan. With respect to the construction stage, Mr. Beasley noted that most developers are proactive in dealing with construction impacts on the neighbours by offering to clean their windows. Mr. Archibald confirmed they would also be prepared to do this. Mr. Smyth added, the GVRD typically has a full-time inspector on site who would act in a liaison capacity. The facility is managed from the GVRD office at 4330 Kingsway, Burnaby. Staff are on call full time to handle emergencies and are able to respond within the hour. Mr. Archibald confirmed they would have no problem with including neighbours in the formulation of the Operational and Construction Plans. With respect to the Interpretative Program, Mr. Smyth said they would welcome feedback from the neighbours.

Responding to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning sustainability, Mr. Smyth confirmed that the primary objective of this facility is to reduce the number and volume of overflows. Currently, the station is subject to flooding, resulting in raw sewage being discharged into the inlet.

Mr. Smyth confirmed the GVRD would have no problem with liaising with the neighbours on the details of the small open space on the site.

Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding the typical GVRD practice for liaising with neighbours on construction projects such as this. Mr. Archibald advised it varies depending on the level of interest expressed by neighbours. In this case, he said his understanding was that location was the primary concern with the neighbours and he confirmed they would be pleased to have a much more proactive relationship with the community on the details. With respect to location, Mr. Archibald advised that an alternative site would involve not only a new pump station but also pipelines and tunnels. Mr. Smyth added there are technical difficulties and property issues with locating the station to the north. With respect to the rooftop vents, Mr. Dafoe agreed they could re-examine the possibility of relocating them and turning them around.

The meeting adjourned for five minutes prior to hearing the public delegations.

#### **Comments from other Speakers**

The following residents spoke in opposition to the application and recommended its deferral:

Ian McRae, Correspondence Secretary of the Four Sisters Cooperative  
Owen Hurley, 133 Alexander Street (Mr. Hurley also read a letter from Sandy Hirshen of 141 Alexander Street, with comments on the design)  
Don Howel, Four Sisters Cooperative  
Suze Kilgour, 289 Alexander Street  
Laura Ardangeli, Four Sisters Cooperative  
Carl McDonald, Four Sisters Cooperative  
Kathy Leroux, Four Sisters Cooperative  
Janice Corrado, Four Sisters Cooperative  
Kammy Robinson, Four Sisters Cooperative  
Paul Ardot, 189 Alexander Street

The presentations included the following points:



- concern about the absence of process;
- question the appropriateness of a canopy and benches in this location;
- concern about impacts during the excavation stage;
- approval of the application is premature at this time;
- concern about the loss of parking spaces;
- the project should be sustainable, green building;
- the building should be more transparent;
- concerns about future expansion of the facility and noise impacts;
- this is an industrial use in a residential neighbourhood;
- concerns about the community consultation; the meetings have been one-way presentations;
- relocating to the north should be explored with the Port Authority;
- all units in the Four Sisters Cooperative will be impacted;
- the design does not reflect the historical aspects of the community;
- the trains to the north are constantly moving and are not static;
- concerns about the length of the construction, including weekend construction work;
- it is incumbent on the City to look at alternative sites;
- the project will have a huge economic impact on a community which is already challenged;
- the residents should be compensated;
- the current submission is an improvement over the first design;
- concern about the amount of glazing - security measures should be included from the outset;
- suggest installation of the Gastown lights;
- this project provides no benefit to the local community;
- some of the savings derived from this facility should be directed back to the community, e.g., under grounding the unsightly electrical lines on Alexander Street.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, the delegations confirmed their willingness to engage with City and GVRD staff on all the matters relating to design and construction.

#### **Panel Opinion**

Mr. Lyon said the Urban Design Panel considers the sewage system is an intrinsic part of the city fabric, and where a small building is required it is a potential opportunity for citizens to gain a glimpse of this underground network. The Panel accepted the rationale of the GVRD and felt it had a compelling argument for locating the facility on this site. The Panel also thought it was important that this facility would prevent future overflows into the harbour. Mr. Lyon noted the initial design was not supported by the Panel and had suggested a number of ways of opening up the building more. The revised submission was strongly supported and some Panel members thought the response could have gone further in its modern expression. Mr. Lyon noted that the GVRD did not provide any comparative study with respect to the location of the facility.

Mr. Hancock said there are two major issues: the appropriateness of the structure on this site and any community benefits may or may not accrue from it; and the public consultation process. With respect to the location, Mr. Hancock said there are compelling arguments from a cost perspective but there are also questions about whether it is an appropriate facility adjacent to a high-density residential neighbourhood. He said the building is generally well designed and the GVRD has put forward fairly comprehensive mitigation measures. Mr. Hancock said that his discomfort was with the process and the level of dialogue, noting

there is quite a disparity between the two parties at present. He therefore suggested it might be appropriate to defer the application until more dialogue occurs.

Mr. Kavanagh commented that most people see this facility as a community benefit, although there are differences of opinion with respect to its location, its form, and the impacts during construction. He said what is apparent is that there has been no meaningful dialogue with the neighbours and for this reason he recommended deferral.

Mr. Henschel said there are compelling arguments in favour of this site and the GVRD has done its best with the design. However, community involvement seems to have been missing in the design process. That involvement would change the design somewhat, or result in relocation to another site, although this would be unlikely. Mr. Henschel said he was concerned that the project had progressed to this stage without that conversation with the community. With respect to the north façade of the building, Mr. Henschel recommended that fire shutters be considered.

Mr. McNaney noted this is a use that no one likes to live beside. It has also been a difficult process for everyone involved. Given the existing facility was intended to be temporary, some of the issues will be addressed in the reconstruction. Mr. McNaney said he was not convinced about the current design of the structure; its adaptation of crime prevention techniques, and that the engineering envelope has been pushed far enough to make this a structure that can provide some amenity to the community. These amenities can be fleshed out in a community involvement process. There is a real opportunity to make this something interesting that could be a destination within the neighbourhood and bring some life to the street. The construction will be problematic, regardless, and an appropriate plan must be devised with the community. Mr. McNaney said he agreed with his Advisory Panel colleagues that it does need a deferral to understand what amenities are needed and what aspects of the Operations and Construction Plans need to be addressed.

Ms. Chung noted that many relevant points had been made. She said she believed that, before any final decision is made there should be an integrated, inclusive and more participatory decision making process with all the stakeholders involved.

#### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Beasley stated he had some discomfort with the level of public consultation and public interaction that has occurred on this application *in regard to the applicant's efforts - not related to staff work*. In most cases, even if the first round of discussion is not fruitful because of positions that people take, further discussion still needs to occur. There needs to be further discussion now, and a dialogue rather than a presentation, and this will likely need a facilitator. The discussion should include information so that people can understand the limitations of the project and the cost of alternatives. There clearly needs to be some reconciliation of a variety of issues.

Mr. Beasley said he believed, however, that deferring the application first would not be honourable, noting there is confidence in the basic need for the facility and its location. He stressed that there are very good environmental reasons for the facility; outflow pollution is a serious problem that must be resolved. Mr. Beasley said he was convinced that this location is valid given the pattern of the underground infrastructure in the city, and that there is need to proceed with the project now. Nevertheless, this building must be compatible with the community. The design team has gone a long way in this regard, noting the marked improvement since the initial design and that the basic shape and scale of the structure has been minimized. He said it is for the architect to make the final judgment about its

expression, having had input from the heritage community and others. He added, it is important that we not be advocates of our personal taste but honour the architect's judgment about architectural response. Nevertheless, more design refinement is needed in a variety of areas, and this needs to occur with the involvement of the community. Graffiti clearly needs to be addressed, and there needs to be more design work on the plaza given the concerns that have been expressed. Work also needs to be done on the roof vents, and further consideration of the canopy, possibly allowing for its future installation if conditions in the area improve. The east façade needs to be redesigned because the glazing is not helpful in this location. Mr. Beasley added, he did not believe glazing was required where there is a property line and a rail yard on the other side. The security aspects of the glazing will need to be addressed at the outset, and there are very elegant ways to do this. The north façade also needs some design response.

Mr. Beasley moved approval of the application, with a number of amendments and additions to the conditions. With respect to the consultation with the neighbours, Mr. Beasley added his assumption is that this approval would be followed up in a coherent public consultation process with the community, on the basis of an agenda based on the conditions, noting it could very well involve *an independent facilitator, under the direction of the Project Facilitator, a facilitator* who is trusted by all parties.

At the suggestion of Mr. Rudberg, Mr. Beasley added a further condition with respect to lighting. At the suggestion of Mr. MacGregor, reference to GHAPC was added to conditions 1.1 and 1.2 as well as reference to landscape and sidewalk areas in 1.2.

In seconding the motion, Mr. MacGregor said he did not believe a deferral would be appropriate noting that many of the conditions will capture the issues raised and deal with them in a more appropriate manner with the community. He agreed with the Urban Design Panel that the station is an intrinsic part of the city fabric and noted there are sewer pump stations in the heart of, and immediately beside high-density residential areas throughout the city. Mr. MacGregor said the Board is guided by the zoning and HA-2 has a minimum height requirement that this proposal does not meet, thus going a long way to minimizing view impacts. He noted the original pump station was installed in the early 1970's to begin to deal with some of the environmental issues and this is an ongoing process in the city. Mr. MacGregor agreed there are no specific benefits to the immediate neighbourhood beyond the benefits it provides to all residents of the city, and the overall benefit is substantial in terms of reduced risk of flooding. These types of facilities are needed, and they should be designed to the best environmental standards.

With respect to the design, Mr. MacGregor agreed with Mr. Beasley's comments and he said he supported the current design. With respect to the impacts on the neighbourhood, Mr. MacGregor said he believes the process will help to define what is reasonable and to work better with the community, and the issues will be addressed in the Operations Management Plan and the Construction Management Plan. Noting that many residents have expressed concern about construction delays, Mr. MacGregor agreed it is not clear when the delays will occur during the long construction period and this needs to be better articulated to the residents. In response to a delegate's question regarding compensation, Mr. MacGregor noted there are multi million dollar infrastructure projects throughout the city for which the City does not pay compensation. The City is providing a service for which there will be disruptions from time to time. During these projects, the City's focus is on keeping the streets and sidewalks clean. He therefore did not want the residents to have the expectation that the City or the GVRD would agree to window cleaning.

Mr. MacGregor said he agreed with the amendments put forward by Mr. Beasley, with the exception of the condition dealing with parking. In discussion, it was agreed to add reference to the public realm.

Mr. Rudberg noted the City has worked extensively with neighbouring municipalities and the Regional District to eliminate or significantly reduce combined sewer overflows. This area contributes to the combined sewer overflows at Clark Drive where about 75 percent of the city's combined sewer overflows occurs, with resulting impacts. This has been recognized in the Liquid Waste Management Plan noting the City has been severely criticized by environmental groups in this regard. There have also been directives from the Provincial Ministry of the Environment and Federal Fisheries to clean up the overflows at Clark Drive, and the City's Capital Plan includes extensive work to reduce these impacts. Therefore, the upgrading of this station is a key component of the strategy to reduce the amount of overflows at this location and is essential. It is not discretionary and it needs to be done. Mr. Rudberg agreed the pump station could be moved if the City was prepared to spend a lot of money to do it. However, a great deal of money would be required to begin to relocate gravity feeds from the low point to some other location. He commented that he would rather see money put back into further efforts to reduce the amount of raw sewage that is being discharged into the area's water bodies. Mr. Rudberg said he believes the location and basic building massing are appropriate. However, he said he was disappointed that there was not further consultation with the neighbourhood on the design, suggesting it was likely the discussion around siting and need that frustrated more meaningful dialogue in terms of improving the design.

Mr. Rudberg said he supported the recommendations to ensure that dialogue does occur with respect to the design, the operations plan, and the construction plan. He added, he also supported the motion while acknowledging that the construction will be disruptive and said everything should be done to minimize these construction impacts. With regard to parking, Mr. Rudberg noted the City has made a significant investment in off-street parking in the Gastown area. While opportunities for additional on-street parking should be explored, people should be made aware that these facilities are available.

Mr. Beasley stressed that, notwithstanding the approval of the application, the community discussion needs to continue and good information needs to be provided. He noted that his experience with this community, and with the Four Sisters Co-op in particular, is that they are very reasonable, practical people, but they have not been given the information regarding alternative locations for this facility, including the cost and environmental objectives. He also stressed that details regarding the construction program are not a given at this stage and are issues that can be discussed. With respect to window cleaning, Mr. Beasley agreed with Mr. MacGregor that this should not be provided in perpetuity; however, during the construction period it is not unusual for residents to be offered this service by developers. Given the concerns that have been expressed with respect to the construction phase, Mr. Beasley urged that a facilitator be appointed to offer some confidence to the residents, and this appointment can occur through the process outlined in the conditions.

#### **Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 407706, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated January 7, 2004, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1 to read:  
design development to enhance pedestrian interest through an interpretive *and information* program, and public art, in consultation with Engineering, Heritage, Planning, Cultural Affairs staff, *Gastown Historic Area Planning Committee and the nearby residents*;

Amend 1.2 to read:  
provision of an *Operations Management Plan framed in consultation with the local residents*, *and* to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and the Director of Planning;

**Note to Applicant:** The plan should address hours of operation, parking and loading requirements, acoustical considerations and mitigation, on-going maintenance protocols, *including for landscape and sidewalk areas*, interpretive program aspects, odour and lighting standards to ensure that glare for nearby residents is minimized. Identification of a community liaison contact who will administer on-going communication with local residents and merchants is required.

Amend 1.3 to read:  
provision of a *Construction Management Plan framed in consultation with the local residents*, *and* to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and the Director of Planning;

Add 1.6:  
*provision of an anti graffiti strategy to address exposed walls, consultation with CPTED staff and the Anti Graffiti Coordinator*;

Add 1.7:  
*further design development to the open space plaza, in consultation with the local residents*;

Add 1.8:  
*further design development for the purpose, if possible, of reorienting the roof vents away from the residents*;

Add 1.9:  
*further design development to redesign the canopy so as not to create any safety or security problems, in consultation with the local residents*;

Add 1.10:  
*further design development to remove the glazing from the east façade*;

Add 1.11:  
*further design development for refinement of security related to the glazed surfaces*;

Add 1.12:  
*further consideration of alternatives to resolve the loss of the parking spaces in the public realm that will occur through this development*;

Add 1.13:  
*further design development to achieve a satisfactory level and orientation of lighting, in consultation with the local residents.*

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. OTHER BUSINESS

The Board and Advisory Panel reviewed comparative data on the numbers of Preliminary and Complete Development Applications dealt with by the Board in previous years.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7.10 p.m.

---

C. Hubbard  
Clerk to the Board

---

F. Scobie  
Chair