

Date: Monday, February 27, 2006
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F. Scobie Co-Director of Development Services (Chair)
T. French Assistant Director of Current Planning
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager
T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

R. Lea Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
R. Acton Representative of the Design Professions
J. McLean Representative of the Development Industry
J. Scott Representative of the Development Industry
K. Hung Representative of the General Public
C. Henschel Representative of the General Public
M. Braun Representative of the General Public
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

Regrets

A. Endall Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
G. Chung Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

S. Hein Development Planner
A. Higginson Project Facilitator
M. Thomson City Surveyor
P. Pinsker Parking Engineer
M. Flanigan Deputy Director of Real Estate Services
V. Morris Social Planner
K. Magnusson Projects Engineer

100 West Cordova Street

G. Henriquez Henriquez Partners
I. Gillespe Westbank

Recording Secretary: D. Kempton

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of January 30, 2006 be approved with the following amendment:

Amend p.10, sixth paragraph, last line to delete ", approximately 200 ft."

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of February 13, 2005 be approved with the following amendments:

Amend p.1, to reflect P. Judd as *Deputy City Engineer* rather than "General Manager of Engineering Services";

Amend p.8, fifth paragraph, to delete the word "the transfer" and replace with a *heritage density transfer*.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 100 WEST CORDOVA STREET - DE409942 - ZONE DD (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Henriquez Partners Architects

Request: To develop the "Woodward's site", including the original department store site and the adjacent "Holborn Lands", with a mixed-use residential, retail, office and institutional use project comprising four buildings framing a central atrium, all over two levels of underground parking and loading facilities.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Scot Hein, Development Planner, introduced this significant, and strategically important, application that has been anticipated for many years for the Woodward's site. Mr. Hein said this is an expansive complete application that proposes four distinct buildings. There are no substantive issues with the proposed form of development.

Mr. Hein noted a few minor corrections to the body of the Development Permit Staff Committee Report as per the memo that was distributed by Alison Higginson, Project Facilitator. He provided a brief summary of the history of the site and the competition process. Mr. Hein said that inclusion of the Holborn Lands in this application has allowed the project to respond to Council aspirations for open space.

Referring to the model, Mr. Hein highlighted three specific design strategies which included: the redistribution of density into four distinct buildings to avoid the appearance of a "superblock"; the introduction of a second tower form to allow for greater distribution or

modulation of density within the site; and, pushing the four buildings to the street edge with adequate breaks to allow for the inclusion of a meaningful public open space.

Mr. Hein said there were challenges to achieve privacy and separation on this site. He said that the proposal was unanimously supported by the Urban Design Panel and that the heritage retention meets Council's intent from the competition process. Mr. Hein said that the design has evolved through ongoing discussions with staff, the City's steering committee and the Community Advisory Committee. He also noted that Council endorsed the form of development including the tower and floor plate size and height; subject to Development Permit Board approval. The additional height, which intrudes on the view cone, has no private view implications since the origin of the view cone is 10th Avenue & Cambie Street.

In terms of loading, staff support a relaxation and are seeking a Loading Management Plan to address the shortfall. Mr. Hein said the applicant has proposed in-suite bike storage in the non-market units which the Parking By-law does not permit, however staff support the proposal. Mr. Hein clarified the unit count and size and noted that Housing Centre staff support the efficient singles unit design and respective floor area for each.

Mr. Hein said the design guideline compliance is generally very good with no substantive form of development issues other than the view cone compliance. Mr. Hein reviewed the conditions and emphasized several specific conditions and provided more detail for each.

In conclusion Mr. Hein said that the Staff Committee recommendation is for approval of the application, subject to the conditions outlined in the report dated February 15, 2006.

Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor regarding relaxations being sought, Mr. Timm and Mr. Hein identified loading and suite size as specific relaxations that are requested. Mr. Scobie stated that the decision of whether or not to grant the suite size relaxation rests with the Director of Planning.

Mr. Henschel sought clarification as to what portions of the existing building would remain and which parts will be new. Mr. Hein said only the 1903-1908 portion of the building is being retained and rehabilitated and the balance of the building will be demolished.

In response to a question from Mr. Henschel about the decision-making authority of the Board versus Council with respect to this particular application Mr. Scobie said that Council has been very supportive of this application and provided some direction which the proponent has responded to; however the Board has the decision-making authority on development applications. He said that Council will be considering two by-law amendments that will affect this project. The first amendment is to allow an increase in the permitted density because the project, as presented, is in excess of what the current sub-area of the Downtown District permits. The second amendment is for parking in order to establish a different parking requirement than what currently exists on this site.

Mr. Henschel questioned whether there would be a glare issue from the W sign to the residences located 60 ft. away. Mr. Hein responded that there will be an agreement that will address specific operational requirements of the sign, taking into account glare and noise.

Mr. Timm commented that he found the height of this proposal, relative to the surroundings, and the size of the tower in terms of floor plates and dimensions along the longest side, challenging. He said that any views of the water from towers further south will be obscured by

the widest aspect of the proposed tower. Mr. Hein responded that the height and breadth of the tower creates some view impediment of the water, however staff felt that was acceptable given the other aspects of this development.

Mr. Timm noted that a lot of the storefronts and windows in the area are barred and wondered whether there could be a condition to prevent the glass storefronts in this project from being barred. Mr. Hein said that is a valid comment; however it is not addressed in the report.

With respect to the proposed mid-block crossing, Mr. Timm felt it was counter to the goal of animating the street and sought further explanation from staff. Mr. Hein said there is a relationship with the Storeyeum entries and there is an existing condition for a mid-block crossing on Hastings Street. Staff have taken into account the SFU movement through the building, peripheral points of entry, and wanted the ability to allow that street level activity to percolate through. Paul Pinsker, Parking Engineer, responded that the intent behind the condition is that if a mid-block crossing was provided it would be attributable to this project. He noted that a stop of the Downtown Historic Streetcar is anticipated on the north side of the street. Mr. Pinsker said that the situation could be monitored to see if the demand for a mid-block crossing develops and then, at that point, the applicant would be obligated to provide a signal.

Mr. MacGregor sought clarification with regard to the table at the bottom of page 11 of the report which describes the program breakdown. He questioned if the space allotted as City Parcel for Non-Profit Community Space was in fact office space. Michael Flanigan, Deputy Director of Real Estate Services, responded that Council decided on September 13, 2005 that all of the 31,500 sq.ft. of City space in the 1903-1908 building would be used to accommodate non-profit tenants. In terms of the Zoning By-law, Mr. Flanigan confirmed that the space would be approved as office space.

Mr. Scott asked if the public plaza would be open all night. Mr. Hein responded that staff want maximum openness; however that is still being explored in the preparation of the management plan. Staff want some flexibility regarding the condition of the sliding screen and some of those issues will be worked out between the developer and Real Estate Services, etc. Mr. Gregory Henriquez, Henriquez Partners, said that it may be challenging to have indoor space open 24 hours a day.

Mr. MacGregor sought clarification regarding the difference between conditions 1.2, A.1.24 and A.2.4. Vicki Morris, Social Planner, responded that the conditions could be combined into one. Following up on a suggestion from Mr. MacGregor to delete condition A.1.24, Mr. Timm made a further suggestion that the words "and community use agreement" be added to condition 1.2.

Mr. Henschel expressed concern that the interior pathways of the project will end up closed for security reasons and asked if the City was relying on the pathways to be open. Mr. Henriquez said that the 1,200 people living in the project as well as the students at SFU and the grocery store staff and patrons will provide "eyes on the street" security. He said that the whole space has been orchestrated to bring people through it and there has been a focus to make this space a place where people want to be and have to go.

Ms. Hung expressed concern for future owners on this site in terms of the cost to maintain the green wall system on the proposed "W" tower. Mr. Henriquez said that it could be economical if the maintenance is done twice a year at the same time the windows are cleaned.

Mr. MacGregor noted that the wording in the table on page 5 of the report under the heading "Height" should be changed to indicate that the additional height requested is a discretionary increase and not a relaxation. He noted that the view cone intrusion is also discretionary up to ten percent.

Mr. Scobie asked Engineering staff to explain their support for the significant loading relaxation proposed as well as the lack of any class C loading bays for the larger grocery and drug store retailers, given the absence of an acceptable Loading Management Plan. Mr. Pinsker responded that the grocery and drug store are each under 2,000 sq.m. and the Parking By-law requires a class C loading bay for 2,000 sq.m. or more. He said the loading relaxation is one reason why the Loading Management Plan is a crucial part of the application. Mr. Pinsker said the applicant hired the consulting services of Bunt & Associates who determined that with 60-65 trucks coming to the site per day and provision of 10 class A and B spaces, the site could accommodate 30-35 trucks in an hour if properly managed. Mr. Pinsker said it is possible to serve this site with less than class C loading because it is being done elsewhere in the city and he cited Urban Fare as an example. He noted that there is a condition for submission of a proper Loading Management Plan and staff have confidence that the plan will work. Mr. Pinsker said that Engineering staff are still waiting for the applicant to confirm the size of the largest vehicles that will need to access the site and how they will arrive and depart from the site and then a decision can be made as to whether there needs to be any physical changes to the proposal.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding the number of dwelling units, Mr. Hein confirmed that that number has been confirmed and condition A.1.1 can be deleted.

With respect to condition 1.3 and the maintenance obligation of the green wall, Mr. Scobie asked how the condition can commit the Strata Council to ongoing maintenance and how that would be managed to ensure the maintenance is performed adequately, suggesting the possibility of a Section 219 covenant imposing a positive obligation. Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, said that issue arose during the Staff Committee review and the intent was to add the Director of Legal Services to condition 1.3. He said that there might be an agreement for maintenance that is similar to the agreement for the Shangri-La sculpture garden.

Mr. Scobie confirmed with staff that they would be agreeable to amending the preamble on page 3 of the report to change "Council approval" to *Council enactment*.

Applicant's Comments

Gregory Henriquez, Henriquez Partners, said he was in agreement with most of the conditions of the report with the exception of the following conditions: 1.1, A.1.6, A.1.13 and A.1.23.

In terms of condition 1.1 regarding intrusion into the view corridor from 10th Avenue and Cambie Street, Mr. Henriquez said that the intrusion measures approximately 2.2 m high and although it would be possible to lower the elevator penthouse overrun it would cost an additional three-hundred thousand dollars. He felt that the intrusion into the view cone was minor and asked the Board to support a discretionary height increase. Mr. Ian Gillespe, Westbank, noted that the Urban Design Panel unanimously supported the proposal with the view cone intrusion.

Mr. Henriquez asked that the Note to Applicant in condition A.1.6 be deleted to allow bicycle storage within the single non-market housing units. Mr. Henriquez said that he has had extensive consultation with the Portland Hotel Society who confirmed that the tenants that will

occupy these units will not leave their bikes in a secured but distant storage area. He was told that the tenants would bring their bikes into the units anyhow so in-suite bike storage has been incorporated.

With respect to condition A.1.13 which requires provision of in-suite storage, Mr. Henriquez said that he has provided storage in the form of built-in storage rather than a separate storage room which would be excluded from FSR. He said that 5.7 sq.m. of storage is provided within the open floor plan, just not in the form of a separate room. He asked the Board to allow the storage as proposed and to delete condition A.1.13.

Mr. Henriquez sought the deletion of condition A.1.23 which requires a children's play area be provided on the roof top area of the W tower. He said that extensive amenities for internet access, pool tables, movie screening etc. are already being provided on the roof top and basketball hoops will be available in the atrium space for children to use. Mr. Henriquez said the development is close to Andy Livingston Park which has children's play amenities and over sixty percent of the units in the W tower are one bedroom units which are not marketed to families so a children's play area is not necessary.

With regard to loading issues, Mr. Henriquez said that there have been thorough consultations with the anchor grocery and drug store tenants who feel that their loading needs can be met as proposed. He said that there will be a full-time Loading Dock Master to coordinate on-site loading.

Mr. Gillespe said that feedback from retailers that will be on this site have indicated that a mid-block crossing is important for their business. Mr. Gillespe said that securing desirable retailers on this site is vital to the area.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Scobie asked staff to respond to the applicant's request to delete condition A.1.23. Vicki Morris, Social Planner, responded by commending the applicant for the excellent provision of indoor/outdoor amenity spaces for the singles non-market portion of the development, as well as the family non-market portion. Housing Centre and Social Planning staff had originally sought indoor/outdoor amenity space for the family market portion of the Abbott building, however after discussions with the Development Planner Ms. Morris said that staff were convinced that they could relax that requirement given that there was a greater percentage of two bedrooms units in the W tower. On that basis, Ms. Morris stood behind the recommendation as per condition A.1.23.

In response to a question from Ms. French, Ms. Morris confirmed that the proposed children's play area on the W tower would only be available to the market family occupants.

Ms. French asked the applicant to clarify why they did not want to provide a children's play area on top of the W tower. Mr. Gillespe responded that sixty percent of the units in the W tower are one bedroom units so they do not expect a lot of families to live there. He also felt that a children's play area on the roof would take away from the unique amenity space that they are trying to achieve there with theatres, pool tables, internet access, gyms etc. In order to have a children's play area one of the other amenities would have to be removed and Mr. Gillespe felt that would hurt the marketing of the project.

Mr. Timm asked if there was somewhere else on the site that could accommodate the children's play area. Mr. Henriquez responded that there are CPTED issues in other locations

and also proforma issues. Mr. Henriquez said there is space for children to play on the roof top but it is not secured and does not offer play equipment.

Mr. Timm asked the applicant to comment on the ground floor security for retail units and the potential use of bars and shutters over windows. Mr. Gillespe responded that he would not have an issue with a condition to preclude the potential use of bars or shutters and said that ultimately those uses would be negotiated into the leases with tenants. He could not say whether the drug store tenant would agree to not having an obvious security device such as bars.

Following up on that discussion Ms. French noted some creative devices being used by retailers on South Granville and would like to see tenants encouraged to design security devices that become a part of the store. Mr. Hein said that staff may be able to work with some wording to achieve decorative security devices that would be set at the back of the display bay rather than in front of the glass. Mr. McLean noted that some smaller tenants are not able to get insurance for plate glass damage and hence more of the security grille devices are being used.

Mr. Scobie questioned whether in-suite storage space was a By-law requirement or a Guideline. Mr. Hein responded that in-suite storage is something that is usually required in a development; however there is no technical requirement for in-suite storage. The provision of such storage is voluntary and in this case the applicant has not opted to provide a bulk storage room.

Mr. Acton asked why the applicant is proposing the green wall system. Mr. Gillespe responded by saying that Vancouver as a city should be trying to take these steps and the green wall will be an enhancement to the sustainability of the project. He said the green wall is central to the aesthetic of the building and will make the building special. Mr. Gillespe also noted that even if it takes several years for the greenery to fill in the screens themselves will be attractive.

Ms. Maust said the Vancouver Heritage Commission is very happy with the application and asked if the applicant would be willing to continue more design development to the base of the W heritage tower. Mr. Henriquez responded that he is very open to that suggestion.

Mr. Scobie sought clarification regarding the provision of access for loading to all units. He noted many of the smaller retail spaces appear not to have direct access to loading, garbage, etc. Mr. Henriquez said that a materials handling consultant has been hired to review how garbage and recycling will move around the site and also how the delivery of goods will happen. He said he is confident that it will work for everyone including the tenants.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding Building By-Law issues identified on page 42 and 43 of the report, Mr. Henriquez said that the applicant team does not have any concerns. They have sent staff a memorandum of understanding on Building By-law issues and the applicant team is very clear on which ones they will be complying with and on which ones they will be pursuing equivalencies.

Mr. Scobie encouraged the applicant to ask their Code Consultant to consider the future subdivision of this project because future airspace parcel boundaries can create many Building By-law issues that can be solved up front when they are preparing the building code drawings.

Comments from other Speakers

Lee Dononhue, Co-Chair of the Woodward's Community Advisory Committee, addressed the meeting and said that he has been personally involved in the redevelopment of Woodward's for 11 years. He spoke about the community process, from the original application to the Development Permit Board review stage, and emphasized how important that process was to him and his community.

Mr. Dononhue thanked the applicant team for allowing the community to have a voice and for incorporating the community's needs into the design. He said that this project is unique and has demonstrated that working with the community is successful and has been a positive experience for everyone involved.

Mr. Dononhue would like this Community Advisory Committee process to be used as a model to set up similar groups for future housing developments and the development of the South East False Creek lands.

He felt that this project would revitalize Hastings and Cordova Streets and the amount of people within the project, both residents and students, will create a level of safety. The Community Advisory Committee unanimously supported the additional height of the tower and expressed their interest in remaining involved as the proposal moves forward and the non-profit selection process begins.

With respect to the children's play area, Mr. Dononhue expressed concern that children may be tempted to throw something from the roof top and felt that it was not a good idea to have a play area so high off the ground. He said that the suggestion by the applicant that families would use Livingston Park in lieu of a children's play area was not realistic because the park is often booked by user groups and the washrooms facilities are not open for use. He felt it would be best to have a play area somewhere within the project itself.

Mr. Dononhue said that mid-block crossings may not be prevented since there are a lot of people that choose not to cross at the lights. He would like to see traffic calming measures from Main Street along Hastings Street.

Todd Peterson spoke in opposition to the proposal because he felt that there was no provision made for a proposed use that he put forward for a bowling alley. He felt that his proposal had not been heard sufficiently and was disappointed with the community involvement process.

Mr. Peterson provided some site history from 1908 which included a bowling alley at that time and said that his idea would also invoke the heritage aspect of the project. He said that a bowling alley would give people an opportunity to come in off of the street and get rid of some of their frustration; it would also be a step towards building teams and contributing to recreation. He said that the community needs an alternative to being on the street and a bowling alley that is open until 10:00 p.m. would provide that alternative.

Mr. Scobie encouraged Mr. Peterson to have a discussion with Michael Flanigan, Deputy Director of Real Estate Services, so that he would be better able to understand the steps that were taken to involve the community in the process. He said that he was confident the staff involved in this project had engaged the community to a far greater extent than may have been seen in the City elsewhere in the past. Mr. Scobie said that the Board was not in the position to deal with Mr. Peterson's concern regarding the project not containing a bowling alley.

Susan Lan, a neighbouring property owner, expressed concerns about traffic flow for the whole project and how that might affect loading and receiving to her warehouse, westerly adjacent to the site. Karen Magnusson, Project Engineer, responded that the traffic consultant has been asked to look at the configuration of the lane and the proposed access/egress. She said that the City will consult with Ms. Lan and other neighbouring property owners as this project moves forward.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Lea provided a brief summary of the Urban Design Panel review, noting that the Panel was impressed with the significant level of work done by the applicant. The Panel felt that this project would be a tremendous contribution to the neighbourhood in terms of bringing life to the street. The proximity to downtown will make this site a natural extension of the downtown.

Mr. Lea reviewed the Panel's comments about areas for improvement in the proposal and said that it appeared the applicant was making moves to address those concerns. The Panel supported the tower height and the minor intrusion into the view cone. The Panel also supported the proposed width of the tower noting that this tower was singular in terms of location and unlike other towers. Generally the Panel felt that both building facades were highly supportable.

Mr. Lea personally felt that this would be a great project and the emphasis should be on making Hastings and Cordova great streets.

Mr. Acton commended staff on the clarity and conciseness of the conditions within the report. He supported the additional height and intrusion into the view cone stating that the trade-off was warranted. In terms of the floor plate size, Mr. Acton felt that the arguments put forward by the applicant were convincing and appropriate and that the area could handle the density.

Mr. Acton felt that the mass and articulation was well handled and well resolved. He said the issue of bars and shutters over windows warrants a creative solution. He did not have any issues with the proposed green wall system and was impressed with Mr. Gillespie's response as to why it was being proposed.

With respect to the mid-block crossing, Mr. Acton said he liked the idea of it but would leave that issue up to Engineering Department staff to resolve. Similarly with the issue of loading, Mr. Acton said that if the City is satisfied that a Loading Management Plan will address the issues then he too would be satisfied. He said that truck operators are likely to schedule their deliveries to minimize waiting time for loading bay access.

Mr. Acton supported the Board's use of discretion to allow the additional height of the tower as a minor intrusion into the view cone. He felt that bike storage should be accommodated in the single units since it was a logical and realistic solution. Mr. Acton also supported the applicant's solution for provision of storage in the small units. Finally, in terms of play areas for children on the tower roof, Mr. Acton felt that it would be unrealistic to expect children to play on a jungle gym located on the top of a 400 ft. tower. He thought that parents would be more likely to take their children down to the ground plane to go outdoors.

Mr. McLean said that he did not have any issues with the proposed loading. He felt that a Loading Management Plan would address any concerns and that the retailers would be able to specify the size of truck that makes deliveries to them.

Mr. McLean supported the additional tower height and view cone intrusion. He thought the green wall was a great idea but had concerns that the Vancouver climate might prevent its success. He suggested that a positive covenant be placed on the green wall.

With respect to the children's play area, Mr. McLean said he would like to see one play area for the whole project to allow all of the children to play together in one space. He supported the applicant's solution to providing storage. In conclusion, Mr. McLean said a new building will not solve many of the social problems in the area and everyone should be conscious of that.

Mr. Scott noted the complexity of the project and said he was excited to see this problem area being revitalized. He congratulated the developer and commended the City for working with the community. Mr. Scott encouraged the Board to use their discretion to allow the additional tower height since the tower is important to the project and the applicant tried to meet the height requirement. Mr. Scott said the trade-off for open space to allow pedestrian traffic, which will make it safer, as well as the residents looking down on the open space and acting as eyes on the street, is worth the minor view cone intrusion.

With respect to the three conditions that the applicant requested be reconsidered, Mr. Scott supported in-suite bike storage, the provision of built-in storage as proposed especially since the applicant is not seeking an FSR exclusion for the storage, and he felt that it was inappropriate to place a children's play area on the 40th floor of a tower. Mr. Scott agreed with Mr. McLean that children from the whole project should have one place to play together. Mr. Scott was very supportive of the application.

Mr. Henschel said his first impressions of the project brought up concerns regarding safety and security, view blockage, floor plate sizes, height and the amount of heritage retention being proposed. He felt that the applicant responded to almost all of those concerns.

In terms of safety and security, Mr. Henschel felt that the amount of people who will reside within the project will help to turn the area around by providing eyes on the street and that will make it more secure. He felt that the floor plate sizes were enormous and the tower is huge from certain perspectives, however the trade-off in doing that to bring more people into the area and to create a secure core in the building complex is acceptable. Mr. Henschel hoped that this proposal would not be used as a model to build these types of massive flat iron building walls throughout the old part of the city.

Mr. Henschel said that the view cone restrictions should be enforced because it is City policy to maintain the view cones and proponents should be required to respect the height limits. He suggested that hiding the additional height obstruction with trees was not acceptable and a storey should be removed from the tower so that it meets the height limit.

Mr. Henschel thought that in-suite bike storage was a brilliant idea and it should happen in other projects. He preferred the storage proposal in this application to the typical bulk storage room which is often located in a hallway and ends up filled with junk. He hoped that this project would help to turn the neighbourhood around and felt that staff, the community and the applicant team had done a great job in developing this proposal.

Ms. Maust said the Vancouver Heritage Commission thought that the developer and the City put together an incredible package and made a significant heritage contribution. The Vancouver Heritage Commission requested an additional condition be included for further design development to the W sign tower so that it would replicate the tower base as it was in the 1950s.

Ms. Hung said she was pleased to see the project as it was presented. She was disappointed that more of the original building could not be retained but thought it was a nice gesture to see the memory and history of it preserved.

Ms. Hung expressed discomfort with the possibility of closing off some of the public areas and said that she would prefer to see 24 hour access to the atrium with a management plan for that space. Safety is paramount for the residents that will live within this site. She supported the applicant's request to delete condition A.1.23 regarding provision of a children's play area on the tower roof. Ms. Hung appreciated the other Advisory Panel member's comments regarding segregation of the play spaces and took that one step further to suggest that the market and non-market entrances should also be combined rather than segregated.

She appreciated Mr. Peterson's comments and felt that it reinforced the need to remember whose space this has been for a long time. Ms. Hung did not want the view cone intrusion issue to make or break this project and did not have strong feelings about it. She was concerned about bikes being stored within units, as proposed, but felt that if it met the needs of the residents then it would be supportable, as was the bulk storage alternative solution.

Mr. Braun said this project has been a decade in the making and is now a fabulous proposal. He felt that in partnership with the community and the City, this project has gotten better and better and actually meets and exceeds the guidelines set by City Council.

Mr. Braun strongly recommended approval of the application with the deletion of condition 1.1 because the view cone intrusion is minimal and acceptable in the case of this unique proposal. He also supported the deletion of the Note to Applicant in A.1.6 and deletion of conditions A.1.13 and A.1.23 as requested by the applicant. Mr. Braun said the tower roof top would be subject to high winds and would not be a suitable location for a children's play area. Further, he supported the addition of a new condition for design development to the W sign tower since the applicant indicated they were in agreement with a new condition as proposed by Ms. Maust.

In terms of a mid-block crossing, Mr. Braun said for safety reasons, this is a place where a mid-block crosswalk is necessary.

Board Discussion

Ms. French moved approval of the application with several amendments to the conditions of approval recommended by the Development Permit Staff Committee.

Mr. Timm seconded the motion for approval with several friendly amendments which were accepted by Ms. French. Mr. Timm said that this project is important for the community and it should be clear that the scale of the tower and context is unique to the particular context of this site. Mr. Timm congratulated everyone who worked on this application and said this project will make a difference in the area and is an important project to proceed with.

Mr. MacGregor said this is a ground breaking project although he would not consider approving this type of application in the Downtown South District. Mr. MacGregor said this is a massive development but the tower and floor plate sizes are supportable on this site in order to start a transformation of the area. He noted that the City has been involved on this site for years and has contributed a lot to the project.

Mr. MacGregor was intrigued by the green wall proposal although he was not sure that all people would appreciate the green screen from the inside of the building looking out. In terms of the community amenity and non-profit space in this application, Mr. MacGregor stated that it is to be approved as office-use space and City Council will determine how the office space will be used. He supported the approval of the proposal and the amendments to the conditions as put by Ms. French and Mr. Timm. Mr. MacGregor hoped the project would be successful and help to change and transform the area.

Mr. Scobie expressed mixed feelings about the project. This is a very big project and Mr. Scobie had concerns that it was somewhat driven by the proforma. He hoped that, with the City's contribution, the project would come to fruition because it is needed to turn around this part of the city.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 409942, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 15, 2006 with the following amendments:

Amend the approval preamble on p.3 to delete "approval" and replace with enactment;

Delete 1.1 and the Note to Applicant;

Amend 1.2 to add; *AND arrangements to be made to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services in consultation with the Managing Director of Cultural Services and Director of Social Planning, for a Community Use Agreement to provide community use of the atrium plaza space;*

Delete A.1.1;

Delete the Note to Applicant in A.1.6;

Delete A.1.13;

New CPTED A.1.23:
consider design development to the ground floor doors and windows to integrate architecturally designed security features which would eliminate the need or desire for barred windows;

Delete old A. 1.23;

Delete A.1.24;

Amend A.1.25 to read:
provision of drawings, outline specifications and where appropriate implementation and management plans *with arrangements to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services in consultation with the Director of Planning* for the:

Amend A.1.25 bulleted list to add:

- *further design development to the tower base of the W to recall the original design;*
- *ongoing maintenance and operation of the W.*

Delete A.2.1 (m);

New B.2.10 and renumber former B.2.10 to become B.2.11:

“Roll Down” security shutters shall not be installed on any ground floor windows.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

D. Kempton
Assistant to the Board

F. Scobie
Chair