

Date: Monday, February 28, 2005  
 Time: 3.00 p.m.  
 Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall and Plaza 500

**PRESENT:****Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)  
 L. Beasley Co-Director of Planning  
 B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager (arrived 3.10 p.m.)  
 T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

**Advisory Panel**

B. Haden Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
 J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions (present for Item 5. only)  
 E. Mah Representative of the Development Industry  
 C. Henschel Representative of the General Public

**Regrets**

J. McLean Representative of the Development Industry  
 D. Chung Representative of the General Public  
 G. Chung Representative of the General Public

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

M.B. Rondeau Development Planner (Items 3. and 4.)  
 A. Higginson Project Facilitator (Items 3. and 4.)  
 R. Segal Senior Development Planner (Item 5.)  
 V. Potter Project Facilitator (Item 5.)  
 R. Jenkins Assistant Director - Current Planning (Item 5.)  
 A. Molaro Planner (Item 5.)  
 K. Magnusson Projects Engineer (Item 5.)  
 M. Thomson City Surveyor

**1690 West 8th Avenue**

M. Cox Gateway Architecture  
 T. Morton Gateway Architecture  
 M. Patterson Landscape Architect

**2228 West Broadway**

J. McLean Developer  
 J. Hancock Hancock Bruckner Eng & Wright Architects  
 C. Dixon Hancock Bruckner Eng & Wright Architects  
 S. Chandler Architect

**1055 Canada Place**

R. Anthony Vancouver Convention Centre Expansion Project  
 K. Grassi Vancouver Convention Centre Expansion Project  
 J. Brown Architect  
 F. Musson Architect

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

**1. MINUTES**

It was moved by Mr. Timm, 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 31, 2005 be approved, with some minor typographical amendments noted.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

**3. 1690 WEST 8TH AVENUE - DE408976 - ZONE C-3A  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Gateway Architecture

Request: To construct an 11-storey multiple dwelling with 49 dwelling units on the 2nd through 11th floors and seven townhouses at grade (total 56 units), all over two levels of underground parking containing a total of 81 parking spaces (including four visitor parking spaces). This proposal requests a transfer of heritage density of 10 percent for a total Floor Space Ratio (FSR) of 3.30.

(Mr. MacGregor had been unavoidably detained and he arrived at the meeting at 3.10 p.m. during the Development Planner's presentation.)

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Mary Beth Rondeau, Development Planner, presented this application in the C-3A Burrard Slopes Neighbourhood. The proposal is for an all-residential building, which is consistent with the Guidelines which envisage Burrard Slopes (bounded by Broadway, Burrard and Granville Streets) as a predominantly residential neighbourhood. The application proposes townhouses on West 8th Avenue and Pine Street with setbacks of 12 ft. on West 8th Avenue and 10 ft. on Pine Street, about half of which is devoted to expansion of the public realm. The setback at the northwest corner is proposed as a public open space and there is also a landscaped corner bulge which will contribute to traffic calming on Pine Street. Full massing across the site is proposed, as called for in the guidelines, but the upper massing has somewhat slimmer mid-rise and tower elements and the floorplate is smaller than the guidelines suggest. However, the massing as proposed is beneficial because it improves views through the site and reduces shadow impacts. The proposed height largely meets the 100 ft. suggested in the guidelines except where there is a roof deck guard rail which increases the height to 100.7 ft. at the lane and 105 ft. on West 8th Avenue. Because of the topography of the site, the overheight at the front does not impact views although it does slightly increase shadowing.

Ms. Rondeau advised there are no major conditions related to this proposal. She briefly reviewed the areas where some design development is recommended and noted an additional condition relating to treatment of the exposed party wall of the adjacent property to the east. Staff recommend approval, subject to the conditions outlined in the Staff Committee Report dated February 2, 2005, and consider the application has earned the height and density it seeks

by way of its setbacks, the corner open space, the landscaped corner bulge, and resolution of the massing which meets the intent of the guidelines. The application also proposes sustainable building features including storm water management and a green roof which contributes to the overall amenity of the area and further contributes to earning the requested relaxations.

#### Questions/Discussion

In response to questions from Board members, Ms. Rondeau provided the following clarification:

- if treating the exposed party wall cannot be achieved in consultation with the adjacent property owner, the alternative of providing a self-supporting vertical trellis is recommended;
- it is not untypical to include off-site measures such as the provision of a landscaped bulge as a contribution to earning the maximum height and density;
- an "outright" 1.0 FSR proposal on this site would retain views only for the top floor of the 3-storey commercial building to the south.

#### Applicant's Comments

Tom Morton, Gateway Architecture, expressed appreciation for their excellent working relationship with staff and for the advice of the Urban Design Panel which has contributed considerably to the project. Mike Cox, Gateway Architecture, advised they had no concerns with the recommended prior-to conditions, including the additional condition relating to treatment of the party wall. He provided a brief overview of the project, noting they tried to shape the massing to respect views for as many neighbours to the south as possible. He also emphasized the sustainable features of the project.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie, Mr. Cox confirmed they have no concerns with the items identified by Processing Centre-Building and Fire & Rescue in Appendix C, or with comments of Engineering Services regarding public utility services on the site.

#### Comments from other Speakers

Bob Davidson, resident of the 9th floor, 1736 West 10th Avenue (the Monte Carlo), circulated photographs illustrating the impact of the proposal on his view to the north. He urged that the requested height relaxation over 100 ft. be denied, noting that every foot makes a difference and it does not seem fair for new owners to achieve a better view at the expense of existing owners to the south.

In response to a question from Mr. Timm, Mr. Davidson acknowledged his view of the north shore mountains will not be affected, only his view of the city skyline. Ms. Rondeau advised the extra height is in a view shadow area on the north side of the building. Portions of the building are below 100 ft. and only the guard rail at the south lane will exceed it by 0.7 ft.

#### Panel Opinion

Mr. Haden advised the Urban Design Panel unanimously supported this proposal. He noted the Panel had no concerns about the corner water feature and would recommend only a slight reduction in its scale. The Panel had suggested it might be better to eliminate the smaller water feature on the site in favour of one larger feature at the corner. Mr. Haden advised the Panel's advice on the relationship between the townhouses and the tower differed from staff's recommendation. Specifically, the Panel identified the relationship between the westerly curved wall and the townhouses as needing attention which is not reflected in the prior-to conditions. Also, the visual separation between the tower and townhouses on the north façade. With respect to building height, Mr. Haden said he believed the 0.7 ft. extra height is

acceptable, noting there are always trade-offs on specific sites. He did not believe the impact of this small overheight was significant, noting the resulting view blockage is of other buildings rather than ridge line or mountain views. Apart from wishing the Panel's recommendations regarding the relationship between the townhouses and the tower to be reflected in the conditions, Mr. Haden said he would support the application.

Ms. Rondeau advised that staff concluded the street interface of the townhouses was of primary importance in this location and the proposal contributes considerably to the domesticity of the street.

Mr. Mah said he liked the project a lot, including all the extra care and attention given to the public open space at the corner and the townhouse orientation to the street, adding he liked the complexity of the relationship between the townhouses and the tower. He also supported the shaping of the massing to improve views and the sustainability features, noting that many of the items voluntarily included in this proposal are commonly sought in conditions. Mr. Mah concurred with Mr. Haden that the height as proposed is acceptable, and he recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Henschel agreed with Mr. Mah's comments and noted that not much is needed to elevate the project to earn the density. He said he liked the west elevation and recommended that the east façade should also be treated as a primary elevation because of its prominence. He also recommended brick treatment rather than painted concrete for the south elevation of the townhouses to improve the livability of the courtyard. Mr. Henschel had no concerns with the building height and did not believe the view impact was significant. It is a well designed project.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley regarding the suggestion of adding brick on the façade of the townhouses to improve the courtyard, Mr. Cox noted they had tried to keep it simple but agreed it could be considered.

#### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Timm said he was very impressed by this application, noting that many of the features it includes are typically sought in conditions for design development or extra amenity. With respect to the height, Mr. Timm noted the only blockage is the view of buildings and is only 0.7 ft. which is not significant in this instance. He moved approval, with some amendments to the conditions.

Mr. Beasley agreed it is a very handsome project for a small background building and he commended the architects on its level of refinement. He supported Mr. Timm's amendments to the conditions and noted all the conditions are fairly subtle and should have no major impact on the project's design intentions. Mr. Beasley added that while he appreciated the advice of the Urban Design Panel with respect to the townhouse base, in this area the creation of a human scale is critical to achieving the desired level of domesticity.

Mr. MacGregor and Mr. Scobie supported the resolution. Mr. Scobie also noted there are very few conditions and a good working relationship between staff and the applicant has produced an excellent project.

**Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 408976 in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 2, 2005, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.2 to add "and consider treating it more as a primary façade";

Add 1.4:

design development to treat the exposed party wall of the adjacent property to the east to provide finishing to that wall or to provide a vertical trellis with vines;

Add 1.5:

design development to consider the use of brick on the courtyard (south) elevation of the townhouses.

4. **2228 WEST BROADWAY - DE407977 - ZONE C-3A  
(COMPLETE AFTER PRELIMINARY)**

Applicant: Hancock Bruckner Eng & Wright Architects

Request: To construct a mixed-use building comprising a drug store, grocery store, and other retail use at grade with 133 dwelling units above, all served by three and one-half levels of underground parking.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Mary Beth Rondeau, Development Planner, presented this complete application. The preliminary submission was approved in principle by the Board on July 17, 2004. The current submission has been reduced by a few hundred square feet but otherwise is very similar to the preliminary proposal. A drug store, a grocery store and other retail uses are proposed on the ground floor, with residential units above in three buildings elements. Ms. Rondeau briefly reviewed the revisions made to the scheme in response to the preliminary conditions and noted the conditions of approval of the complete application are quite minor. The main issues relate to traffic. Since the preliminary approval there has been extensive consultation with the neighbours and a focus group was formed to review and discuss suggested traffic mitigation measures. There was also a public open house which was very well attended and a traffic survey was sent to the larger neighbourhood. 72 percent of respondents were in support.

Generally, staff believe the increases in height and density have been well earned by this proposal. Among the benefits are the proposed traffic mitigation measures, superior pedestrian amenity including a corner public open space, the proposed public art feature, and sustainable building features. The staff recommendation is for approval, subject to the conditions outlined in the Staff Committee Report dated February 2, 2005, with an amendment to condition 1.1 to note the modifications are subject to Council approval.

**Questions/Discussion**

In response to a question from Mr. Timm as to whether the development permit could not be issued if for some reason Council approval of the traffic modifications was not forthcoming, Ms. Rondeau advised that Council approval of the traffic management plan would be

independent of the development permit. Given the strong neighbourhood support of the development application is on the basis of the proposed traffic modifications, Mr. Timm was concerned that the neighbours would feel misled if the traffic management plan was then not approved by Council. In discussion, it was noted condition 1.1 may need further amendment to address the issue. Mr. Thomson advised a report to Council could be put forward by late April/early May, which should not hinder issuance of the development permit.

Mr. Beasley noted the community has expressed some concern that the results of the proposed traffic modifications will not be known until the development is occupied, and additional measures may prove to be necessary. Condition 1.1 (e) requires an additional \$25,000 for this purpose, if necessary, within two years of building occupancy. Mr. Thomson agreed there may be unanticipated problems when the proposed traffic modifications are implemented and details for securing the \$25,000 will be handled by Engineering Services. Typically, the funds would be secured by a letter of credit or held on a non-refundable cash deposit. Mr. Timm added that traffic calming measures of this nature are normally installed on a temporary basis initially, with a report back to Council, including community input, six months later so that any necessary adjustments may be made.

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

Jim McLean said he believes this submission satisfies the Board's preliminary conditions. With respect to the traffic modifications, he noted that other projects which had a similar requirement did not require specific Council approval but the funds were submitted to the City when the permit was issued. Mr. McLean added they would be very concerned about any further delays, noting they have been working on the project for two years including an extensive public process.

Jim Hancock, Architect, confirmed they can meet all the conditions and have already gone a long way to address them. Sheldon Chandler referred to the long process involved in this project to satisfy neighbours' concerns. He also noted that delivery trucks will be a maximum size of 50 ft. and London Drugs' has a highly automated dispatch system. Mr. McLean confirmed they have no concerns with restricting deliveries to daylight hours.

#### **Questions/Discussion**

Mr. MacGregor spoke further to the issue of Council approval of the traffic modifications. He did not believe it was the responsibility of the developer to obtain Council approval since they have agreed to pay for the modifications and they are supported by staff. Council would be accountable to the public if for some reason it decided not to proceed, although Mr. MacGregor added he thought this was highly unlikely. Mr. Beasley agreed that if the approval of the development was contingent on the traffic management plan it could be difficult to manage. He also did not believe Council would take issue with the principle of the improvements. Mr. Beasley added it is rare to see such a high level of public support for an array of improvements such as this and Council will likely also take this into account. He further added that the Board will consider any advice offered by the Advisory Panel and the public delegations on this issue before reaching a decision on the application.

In response to a question from Mr. Henschel about whether it would be possible to move the grocery store entry on the westerly tower further to the east to make it more distinct from the residential entry, Mr. McLean said this has been considered but is difficult because of the grades in this location. He said there will be greater architectural differentiation provided and he noted this is the smallest residential entry and most residents will enter from the parkade.

In response to a question from Mr. Haden about the residential entries, Mr. Hancock confirmed the intention is that they will all be the same. Colleen Dixon, Architect, confirmed they will respond to the advice of the Urban Design Panel with respect to the setback and use of the different materials on the Broadway façade.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie concerning Appendix C, Mr. Hancock confirmed they have no concerns with the issues raised by Processing Centre-Building and Fire & Rescue Services.

#### Comments from other Speakers

The following residents addressed the Board:

Laura McDiarmid, 2305 West 10th Avenue  
Mary Moore, 2288 Marstrand Avenue  
Catherine Battye, 4134 Maywood Street, Burnaby (former Wellness Coordinator at The O'Keefe)  
Howard Young, resident of West Point Grey  
Lolly Bennett, 2305 West 10th Avenue  
David Fushtey, 2156 West 12th Avenue  
Michael Brown, 522 Moberley Road  
Verna Cull, 2268 West 12th  
Joe Ducet, Hampton Place, UBC  
Kathleen Moorby, 2815 Yew Street

As well, a resident read a letter of support from May Lee, 2855 West 14th Avenue.

All speakers spoke strongly in favour of the application and especially for the proposed traffic modifications. Speakers also expressed appreciation to the developer and City staff for the extensive public consultation that took place.

#### Panel Opinion

Mr. Haden said this submission is a very big improvement over the initial proposal two years ago and he noted it has considerable complexity in terms of its use, view and traffic. He also noted it is exceptional that so many residents have taken the time to speak in favour of the application when typically only those opposed will choose to make their opinions known. With respect to the traffic modifications, Mr. Haden said while the Board is clearly subservient to City Council, anything that can be done for the application to proceed unencumbered would be positive, especially given the strong neighbourhood support. With respect to the conditions, Mr. Haden recommended an amendment to 1.4 and an additional condition to address material quality on the Broadway façade. He strongly recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Mah expressed appreciation for the positive public feedback. He supported the traffic calming plan but did not believe the development permit issuance should be delayed if Council approval is required. He urged that greater differentiation be provided between entries on Broadway so that the grocery entry is more prominent and more similar to the London Drugs entry to differentiate it from the nearby residential entry. With respect to the benches/public art proposal for the corner plaza, Mr. Mah urged that children be considered in the selection of seating.

Mr. Henschel also thanked the public for their input. He noted that the public process has been very successful. He strongly supported the application. He thought the differentiation between the westerly residential entry and the grocery store entry needed to be clarified in

condition 1.4. With respect to the corner plaza, Mr. Henschel said it is an opportunity to have a more permeable seating area, which would be very positive.

#### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Beasley said it is good to see that this project is evolving to be consistent with the residents' aspirations for the neighbourhood, noting the considerable anxiety expressed by residents at the preliminary development application stage, in particular about the impact of traffic. In addition to determining the traffic calming measures, staff and the applicant have also clearly worked hard to resolve the detailed design issues. Mr. Beasley said he was pleased to see that what is quite a massive development has now been successfully broken down to a comfortable, human scale at the pedestrian level. He suggested the development may become a model for future development along Vancouver's major arterials and for the successful integration of anchor retailers into a neighbourhood. Mr. Beasley also strongly supported the residential component because it will provide alternative housing for existing Kitsilano residents, both empty nesters and young people who wish to stay in the neighbourhood. He moved approval of the application with amendments to the conditions. Mr. Beasley added he very much appreciated that the neighbours took the time to attend the meeting to comment positively on the scheme, noting it also speaks well to the efforts of staff and the applicant team.

Mr. MacGregor sought some further amendments to the conditions, to which Mr. Beasley concurred. He also expressed appreciation for the citizens' input, noting it is exceptional that all the delegations spoke in favour of the proposal. Mr. MacGregor added, that with the increasing densification of the city, other developers will need to take a similar approach in working with area residents. He commended the applicant and staff.

Mr. Timm agreed it is a very successful project which has significant design challenges. He also thanked the community for expressing its support, which he said is an indication of the success of the consultation process, both on the part of the developer and the City. He added it should also be recognized that it is important to provide these kinds of facilities to create complete communities so that people can remain in the neighbourhood and have access to services without travelling long distances. This development will also help to reduce traffic which meets some of the City's broader transportation goals, and while there may be increased local impacts, the proposed traffic modifications will address any problems that arise.

Mr. Scobie said he also found it refreshing that citizens would make the effort to attend the meeting to speak in favour of a development. Much of the credit for this response is due to the developer who has been willing to take an open-minded approach to working with the neighbourhood. Mr. Scobie also expressed appreciation for the considerable efforts of City staff.

#### **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. 407977 in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 2, 2005, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1 (f) to delete "(pending Council approval)";



Amend 1.4 to read:  
design development to the street frontage at the grocery store and residential entrance to clarify and differentiate these entries and coordinate column spacing with the uses inside the building;

Amend 1.5 to delete "and Vine Street setback";

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in 1.5 to delete "Bench seating should be provided within the setback along the Vine Street frontage and";

Amend 1.6 to read:  
develop an art feature concept with cost of at least \$50,000 to enrich the corner plaza, such as, among other things, a custom bench design and installation, with specific notation on the drawing and in consultation with the Office of Cultural Affairs;

Add condition 1.10:  
design development to consider maximizing the horizontal plan separation at material junctions on the Broadway elevation (where practical), with particular emphasis on the distinction between the main tower of building 3 and the brick façade to the immediate east;

Delete A.2.6.

The meeting adjourned at 5.35 p.m. and was reconvened in the Plaza 500 at 6.15 p.m.

## 5. 1055 CANADA PLACE - DE408490 - CD-1

The following members of the applicant team were present:

Russ Anthony, President & Project Director, Vancouver Convention Centre Expansion Project  
Ken Grassi, Design Manager, Vancouver Convention Centre Expansion Project  
Jim Brown, Architect  
Frank Musson, Architect

This preliminary development application was approved in principle by the Development Permit Board on September 13, 2004. A complete development application (CDP) has not yet been submitted. A February 23, 2005 memorandum from the Project Facilitator, Vicki Potter, provides a summary of the history of the application process to date and outlines the purpose of today's discussions. A report from Vancouver Convention Centre Expansion Project (VCCEP), attached to the memorandum as Appendix 3, outlines the status of a number of the preliminary prior-to conditions and seeks the Board's resolution that they are satisfied.

The Chair briefly reviewed the procedures for considering this item, including public input. In response to a question from the Chair, a number of people indicated an interest in the discussion.

Mr. Beasley noted that since a CDP application has not yet been submitted, he did not believe the Board had anything upon which to make decisions, but could only offer commentary as to how it thinks the conditions of the preliminary approval in principle are being responded to.

Mr. MacGregor noted that Council recently approved proceeding with a partial building permit approval in order for the foundation work to begin on this major project. He said he believed it was important, given the myriad conditions applied at the preliminary application stage, that the Board review the progress of the substantial items and indicate, to the extent possible, that the applicant is moving in the right direction to meet the conditions. By including this interim process it is hoped to expedite the processing of the complete application when it is submitted. Mr. Beasley agreed that this was also his understanding, but he reiterated that the Board will not make final decisions today, only indicate whether or not it believes the response to the conditions is moving in the right direction. This is because a final submission, which requires a public process and technical review, has not yet been made.

Mr. Timm said he generally concurred with Mr. Beasley's comments and said he was somewhat concerned about the degree of public input and the level of detail that is available for the Board to make any final decisions at this time.

Mr. Scobie said he shared the Board's concerns about making decisions at this meeting when there is no application before it, and particularly until the usual public process has taken place.

#### **Comments from City Staff**

Vicki Potter, Project Facilitator, provided a summary of what has occurred on the project since the preliminary approval in September 2004 noting there has been considerable work done and numerous meetings held with the applicant team. With respect to the design, particular attention has been given to the roof, the "transition area", the public plaza space and the pedestrian and bicycle circulation systems. Staff have also been working with the applicant to obtain a "development/build" permit for construction to the 3.5 m level in order to meet VCCEP's aggressive construction schedule. This permit is expected to be issued during the week of March 7, 2005. Since September, the project has been before Council twice to deal with Text Amendments and to obtain authorization for the development/build permit.

A complete development application is expected to be submitted on March 18, 2005. It will be reviewed by the Urban Design Panel on April 13 and will be before the Board on June 6. Ms. Potter stressed that this is a much abbreviated time schedule for such a large and complex project but everything will be done to ensure an appropriate level of analysis.

Referring to the memorandum dated February 23, 2005, Ms. Potter drew the Board's attention to an addendum to Appendix 3 in which VCCEP seeks the Board's response to the roof elevation as a result of the proposed commercial space at the north end of Thurlow Plaza. Ms. Potter noted that the Development Permit Staff Committee has not reviewed any of the material contained in the memorandum, nor has staff previously reviewed the materials posted today.

#### **Comments of the Applicant Team**

Russ Anthony expressed appreciation for the efforts of City staff. He noted that since the preliminary approval some real progress has been made on the key issues and the purpose of today's discussion is to report on how VCCEP has addressed the major prior-to conditions and responded to the City's concerns. As well as the Board's comments, Mr. Anthony said they would like, to the extent possible, to obtain approval so that they can prepare the complete development application. He confirmed it is their intention to submit the application on March 18, 2005. He said he believes they have significantly enhanced the roof design, and the plaza design "cradles" the public spaces while clearly being an extension of the Park. Mr. Anthony

also stressed that this building will be "one of a kind" in terms of its advancement of sustainable design principles.

With respect to the Master Plan, Mr. Anthony said there is now greater clarity with respect to what is included and what is outside the CDP application. There is also now a better understanding of the timing. Mr. Anthony advised that VCCEP met with the development community earlier today and this consultation will continue to ensure they can deliver on the vision that is inherent in what is being presented today. It is anticipated that an Expression of Interest will be issued in March to identify potential development partners, with a target for issuance of an RFP in April. By Fall 2005 it is expected that a development partner will be in place for the waterfront development and the commercial development that is planned to be part of this project. The float plane operations are expected to be relocated in 2007 and the other commercial development on the site in place by 2008.

Mr. Anthony stressed there are very severe time constraints on the project. The building is to be the international broadcast centre for the 2010 Olympics and these facilities must be in place by September 2009 and cooperation from the City will be very important to meet this schedule. Piling on the site will begin in mid March. Mr. Anthony advised they are proceeding with design development on the basis of the material presented today. While it is their intention to honour the usual process, anything more than a general indication of response from the Board would be most helpful. This will ensure that what is returned to the Board in the CDP application will contain no surprises.

Mr. Anthony noted there are also severe budget constraints on the project and the public sector support is fixed. VCCEP is endeavouring to provide some of the public amenities sought by the City from some of the commercial and Master Plan elements in the project but they must be able to satisfy themselves and their stakeholder funders that the revenue can be generated. The public sector partners have authorized them to generate revenue from the site and reinvest it in the project to make it better. The Board's response is therefore critical in order to understand the revenue-generating potential of the site, to translate that into what they are building and proceed with some assurance they will be able to deliver what is being presented.

In summary, Mr. Anthony said they intend to proceed on the basis of the materials presented today. They also want to have an understanding of what any additional issues might be and additional constraints on their ability to generate revenues so that there are no surprises at the CDP stage.

The meeting then assembled around the project model and Jim Brown, Architect, led the review of the scheme. General discussion ensued and the applicant team responded to questions from Board and Panel members. The applicant team then described their responses to specific prior-to conditions.

#### **Discussion of the Prior-to Conditions**

The applicant team described their responses to specific prior-to conditions and Rob Jenkins, Assistant Director of Current Planning, provided related staff commentary.

#### **Conditions 1.1 - 1.4:**

Mr. Brown described their response to the roof design.

**Staff Commentary:**

1.1: With respect to the landmark qualities of the building, staff consider there has been good progress but refinements and improvements need to continue. In particular, continued design development is sought on the roof edge treatment and the roof element above the ballroom. With respect to public access to the roof, a public viewing area platform, previously proposed next to the restaurant at the northeast corner, is no longer included. The north edge vertical circulation elevator (part of the Master Plan) would be an alternative opportunity for public overlooking of the roof but it is not clear this will be constructed since it is tied to the Master Plan component.

**1.2 and 1.3:**

Staff believe the applicant is well on the way to meeting these conditions.

1.4: This condition has not yet been met (as acknowledged by VCCEP) and the applicant is continuing to meet with staff to address the condition.

**Discussion**

In response to a question from Mr. Timm regarding the roof area above the ballroom, Ralph Segal, Sr. Development Planner, said staff consider this portion of the roof does not have the sculptural quality of the other roof forms which contribute to the overall roof composition. Further, its exposed edges consist almost entirely of mechanical grilles. It is also quite prominent because, other than the northeast corner, it is the highest element on the overall roof. Staff believe it should have a greater degree of triangulation in its shape and be more reflective of some of the interesting shapes and fascia conditions elsewhere on the building. This response is also reflective of the Urban Design Panel commentary. Mr. Brown advised they are very comfortable with the sculptural relationship of this element. They will be working with staff in resolving the edge treatment.

**Conditions 1.5 and 1.6:**

Ken Grassi, VCCEP, addressed conditions 1.5 and 1.6. He noted considerable progress has been made in planning the schedule for the commercial and Master Plan development as well as addressing infrastructure issues. All the land-based commercial development (77,000 sq.ft.), including the portion of commercial space at the northwest corner, has been designed as "shell" space as part of VCCEP's project and will be included in the complete development application. There is also a fixed walkway which wraps from the southwest corner of the building around the northwest corner. The intent is to have a development partner in place by Fall 2005. With respect to the infrastructure for the waterfront development, Mr. Grassi advised the utilities required will run through the convention centre and be capped off at the exterior of the loading dock. As soon as the Master Plan waterfront developer is in place and the planning requirements are determined, all the service connections will be available. The development/build permit application includes fuel storage and delivery and the optimum location for the float planes will be determined with the Master Plan waterfront developer. In the meantime, draft supplementary guidelines are being produced by staff.

In summary, Mr. Grassi said they believe they have gone a long way to addressing the infrastructure for the waterfront development as well as shell facilities for the commercial space, including the plaza restaurants.

Condition 1.6 deals specifically with vertical circulation at the north end of the building. Mr. Grassi noted they have brought the walkway around the northwest corner of the building

and the location of a future vertical element will be determined through the Master Plan developers' planning requirements.

Staff commentary:

Mr. Jenkins commended VCCEP for the work done on the Master Plan. There are a number of elements that will be delivered as part of the CDP and others are proposed to be delivered via the Master Plan developer. This approach is supported by staff. Mr. Jenkins noted that condition 1.5 requires design development up to the level of a preliminary development application. This has not yet been achieved and will evolve from the RFP process. In summary, staff believe some good progress has been made but the condition is not met.

With respect to the draft supplementary design guidelines being composed by staff, Mr. Jenkins said the intent is that they will clarify the Council-approved guidelines now in place as they apply to the site's evolution since these guidelines were established in 2002 and are for clarification to proponents; no changes are intended. Any changes to approved guidelines would require the approval of Council. It is not intended that the draft supplementary guidelines will identify specific locations, only to clarify the City's policy expectations, the overall development principles and general development parameters for uses, locations and extent of water-oriented development. Mr. Jenkins stressed there will be flexibility but they must also reflect existing policy parameters. With respect to marina, he noted there is emphasis in the ODP on commercial marine operations at this end of the waterfront.

With respect to other infrastructure items, staff believe they have been addressed, either through the early building/development permit or through incorporation of the shell space and the lower walkway. These are all supported additions to the CDP application. One exception is the vertical circulation piece which VCCEP has indicated will be the responsibility of the Master Plan developer. Mr. Jenkins said staff are concerned that if the Master Plan developer chooses not to build it, then it may not be done. This does not meet the intent of condition 1.6 which requires its completion to be secured. Mr. Jenkins added this vertical circulation also provides another possible opportunity for public overlooking of the roof. In summary, staff recommend that delivery of the vertical circulation be further pursued and confirmed through the CDP application.

#### **Discussion**

Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding the location of the float plane fuelling facility. VCCEP confirmed it allows the flexibility for the float plane terminal to be located anywhere across the north frontage. Mr. Beasley noted the design guidelines are not within the purview of the Development Permit Board. Nevertheless, it seems contrary to the ODP to be leaving the type of marina completely open because while it may have various kinds of tenure, the ODP calls for it to be a commercial marina rather than a recreational marina.

Mr. Beasley said he understood the PDP condition was that the horizontal circulation from the westerly waterfront walkway at the 3.5 m level, to the point at which there would be vertical circulation up to the eastern edge of the upper plaza, was to be included in the Master Plan process but secured by a legal agreement that in the absence of it being delivered by that process, it would be delivered by VCCEP prior to occupancy. Mr. Jenkins confirmed that this was the intent of the condition.

In further discussion, Mr. Anthony noted VCCEP's difficult position of being able to provide legal agreements with so many unknowns, and he requested that there be enough flexibility to allow the waterfront developer to determine the vertical circulation location. He said he

believed this was acknowledged by the Board at the PDP stage. Clearly, they will not have a PDP level application for the waterfront development by the CDP stage.

Frank Musson, Architect, sought clarification regarding the commercial marina and whether a marina operator which leases to private yachts would be included in the ODP definition. Mr. Jenkins advised the ODP indicates "a marine terminal for charter boats, visitor moorage, and other water-based transportation services including sea planes and passenger ferries". Mr. Beasley added, there has been a principle in the ODP since its inception that the commercial boats that need to connect to downtown would moor at this end of Coal Harbour, and recreational boats would be accommodated at the westerly end. Neither the zoning nor the ODP allows this end of the harbour to become a recreational marina.

**Condition 1.9:**

Mr. Brown said they seek the Board's resolution that by adding an entire retail block to the northwest corner the intent of the condition has been met.

**Staff Commentary:**

Mr. Segal said staff strongly support the evolution of this aspect of the design and seek the addition of weather protection at elevation 9 m of the walkway/bikeway. Mr. Brown confirmed that this can be discussed with staff.

**Condition 1.12:**

Mr. Grassi advised the plaza is designed to accommodate large crowds and light vehicles.

**Staff Commentary:**

Mr. Jenkins confirmed that programming of the plaza has been discussed with staff and the load restriction for service vehicles is not a problem.

**Condition 1.15:**

Mr. Grassi explained there are security concerns with the convention centre in being able to provide public washrooms for non-convention users. He said they will identify locations for temporary washroom facilities on the plaza.

**Staff Commentary:**

Mr. Jenkins advised that provision of temporary facilities for large events is supported by staff. However, there is a requirement for day-to-day access to washrooms if access to the convention centre washrooms is not an option. In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor, Mr. Grassi confirmed there will be other washrooms in various locations around the commercial component, including the Park Board restaurant, which might be available to non convention users of the plaza.

**Parking:**

Mr. Grassi said they wish to bring to the Board's attention that they have a fixed amount of parking within the facility (440 parking stalls). There is also the potential for up to 70 additional spaces to be available in the parking structure in the Park transition zone. They

believe this is sufficient parking for the development they are pursuing to CDP submission and what may come from the Master Plan developer.

**Staff Commentary:**

Mr. Jenkins confirmed there are potential additional parking stalls available but it is difficult to indicate at this time whether or not there will be more needed for the Master Plan uses. Karen Magnusson, Projects Engineer, said staff would recommend that the decision is made at the CDP stage, otherwise it restricts the ability to provide off-site parking noting it is recognized the on-site parking is limited by the floorplate. She said staff believe approximately 60-70 parking spaces will be required for the commercial uses. She agreed the potential spaces in the parkade under the Park will contribute to satisfying the demand for the Master Plan uses, including the water-based uses.

**Retail Roof Elevation:**

Mr. Brown sought the Board's confirmation that the revised roof elevation of the retail at the north end of Thurlow Plaza is acceptable.

**Staff Commentary:**

Mr. Segal advised staff agree the additional retail component below the north edge of the plaza will add activity to the waterfront walkway/bikeway. Staff seek a 1 m reduction in height at the north end of the plaza to maintain view of the water at the midpoint of the plaza, which could be achieved by a reduction in either the floor-to-ceiling height of the retail space or the height of the mechanical space above the retail which is being used to exhaust the Exhibition Hall.

In discussion, Mr. Musson stressed it is important to the success of the retail space, including the key anchor retail at the corner, that a floor-to-ceiling height of at least 4.5 m be maintained.

**Comments from other Speakers**

Gerry Sieben, Coal Harbour Residents' Association, acknowledged the improvements made to the building. He noted they were promised by the City that they would have significant and genuine input into the relocation of the float planes and charter boats and are concerned about the possible de-linking of the Master Plan items from the application. He said he was pleased to learn that the float planes can be located anywhere along the north face of the building. Mr. Sieben said it is important that the residents and the float plane and charter boat operators have some certainty and that they can have some input to a meaningful process. Mr. Sieben was also concerned about the impact of the large amount of retail space on this residential neighbourhood.

Rick Baxter, Westcoast Air, noted there has been a lot of progress since the preliminary application stage but he remained concerned about the next stage. The floatplane facility must be functional and affordable and it is imperative that the float plane industry experts come to the table and be part of its design. With respect to affordability, Mr. Baxter said the financial viability of the operation has been tested and he urged that the float plane operation be considered more as a traffic generator than a revenue generator. Mr. Baxter asked if any measures have yet been considered that would ensure the functional aspects as well as affordability of the float plane terminal.

John Melino, Shaw Communications, advised the Shaw Tower was designed to take into account specific view lines along the Thurlow corridor and they would be very concerned if any variance occurs beyond what is indicated in the ODP guidelines. Mr. Melino also expressed concern about how the living roof will be maintained and irrigated. In the discussion that followed, Mr. Brown noted the previous scheme that included an arts complex did violate the view corridor but the current proposal is a better situation.

#### Panel Opinion

Mr. Haden said there are some areas of focus that should not be obscured in this very complex project, in particular the issue of the convention centre being a landmark building. It is critical to recognize that there are a number of scales at which this building will be perceived, and it will not exclusively be perceived from the water, one of the most important facades being that facing Canada Place Way. Mr. Haden said that while he appreciated the time constraints of the project, it is important to ensure we have a great building beyond the 2010 Olympics. Not only does this building deserve to have the best roof in the city but it must also have the best walls and the best floor in the city. Because the roof has been the focus of the design concept, the importance of these other things must not be forgotten.

Mr. Haden said he believed the core concepts of the roof design are on the right track, as was reflected in the Urban Design Panel discussions in November 2004. The issue of program remains a challenge. There should be a place for some public interaction with the large roof and the tower at the foot of Burrard Street is likely quite critical in this regard. Mr. Haden stressed that it need not be a very large deck but he noted it is such a significant intervention in the waterfront that people who have no economic interest in the convention centre must have some degree of access at some point. As well, it should be noted that Burrard Street is the only major ceremonial street in the city that ends at the water in a genuine way and this should be acknowledged in the broader urban design perspective. The Panel considered that a vertical publicly accessible feature at the Burrard Street end is very important and it could be addressed in ways other than a major CRU at the corner. The Urban Design Panel considered that the proposed deck on the north façade was too small.

A principal issue for the Urban Design Panel was to recognize that the edges of the roof are critical and this is also tied to the wall treatment. The wall soffit and edge detail cannot be compromised because it will be as much a public face of the building as the roof itself. The Panel was particularly concerned with the consistency and thickness of the edge treatment of the roof, and with respect to the large roof section above the ballroom, it is critical that as little mechanical equipment as possible is visible. In summary, Mr. Haden reiterated that the Panel considered progress on the roof in general is on the right track but concerns remain with respect to its detailed resolution.

With respect to condition 1.2, Mr. Haden said the Panel was concerned about light access to the underground component and the interaction of the Harbour Green Park, the restaurant and the stairway access to the plaza. Mr. Haden said he believed the geometry of the plaza is now substantially better than when the Panel saw it and most of the Panel's concerns have been addressed. The underground link from the vehicular drop-off through to the waterfront walkway still requires further design development: it is a critical pedestrian link that is currently not adequately presented.

Regarding condition 1.9, Mr. Haden agreed that additional glazed covering at the northwest corner would be beneficial.



With respect to parking, Mr. Haden said his position is that parking should not be a driver of this project, especially for a development that has sustainability as one of its core values. There clearly will not be a substantial amount of additional parking on this site.

Mr. Haden strongly supported the retail space at the north end of Thurlow Plaza and noted it is an opportunity for a variety of long term uses which may also not need to have acoustic restrictions. Mr. Haden agreed that a floor to ceiling height of 15 ft. is very important in terms of allowing for appropriate lighting and organization. Given the absence of any other spaces of this nature along the north shore of the entire downtown, this should take precedence over any consideration of some degree of view blockage from the Thurlow Plaza.

Mr. Haden briefly reviewed the Urban Design Panel's consensus on key aspects needing improvement. In response to a question from Mr. Timm with respect to the large roof area above the ballroom, Mr. Haden said he had no major concern provided the edge details are handled properly, including creative thinking about mechanical louvres. He thought it could be resolved at the next level of design development. However, the Panel was generally supportive of increasing the degree of dynamism of the roof.

Mr. Hancock said the project has come a long way and is moving in a very positive direction. He liked the indents in the roof so that the roof is perceived from the inside. The whole big gesture of the roof is quite remarkable and is producing some interesting elevations. Some aspects are still a little awkward, however, including the rectangular section above the ballroom which seems a foreign geometry to the rest of the roof. He questioned whether it could be resolved by folding it or doing something more creative than just a flat, rectangular box. Mr. Hancock agreed with the concerns expressed about the roof edge and the relentlessness of its thickness. As well as varying the thickness perhaps the grass could be held back from the edge in order to treat it in a more architectural way. Mr. Hancock said he found the northeast corner interesting but still somewhat unresolved, especially as the angled glass turns the corner and becomes vertical. Mr. Hancock said he saw no need for public access to the roof, noting there are many ways to bring the roof down so that people can understand it without actually getting on it.

Mr. Hancock was pleased to see the introduction of the restaurants although he was not convinced they are yet well integrated into the overall fabric of the plaza. Mr. Hancock had some concerns about the north-facing retail and the uncertainty of how it terminates. He concurred with the importance of achieving 15 ft. floor-to-ceiling height for the large anchor tenant but was sympathetic to those who are concerned about view impacts. Mr. Hancock liked the weather protected public gathering space above the restaurant but was not convinced there is need for another one at the walkway/bikeway level.

Mr. Hancock questioned having temporary washrooms on the plaza for special events and said it would be much better to have them integrated into the restaurants or some more permanent public washroom facility. Mr. Hancock said it is difficult to comment on the parking issue in the absence of any real analysis of the needs but in general, he would not support any major alterations in the design to accommodate more cars.

Mr. Mah agreed the project is on track and a number of issues raised at the preliminary stage have been addressed. The roof design is a big improvement over the previous version. Mr. Mah also liked the cut and dropped areas so that people can see the roof from inside, and the accessibility to the smaller roof over the restaurant. Mr. Mah found the roof above the ballroom to be acceptable noting that some improvements are likely to occur in design development. He was glad to see the additional retail and restaurant uses which will add

activity when the convention centre is not in use. Mr. Mah supported staff's request for weather protection at the northwest lower level walkway and suggested including a bench in this location as well. Mr. Mah supported the inclusion of some public washrooms in the plaza. He did not believe there was a major issue with parking but recommended that no firm commitments be made until receipt of the traffic study. With respect to the Thurlow Plaza elevation, Mr. Mah agreed that 15 ft. floor-to-ceiling height is an important requirement to attract a good retail tenant. However, he urged that as much view as possible be made available from a greater area of the plaza rather than just at the platform at the end, while recognizing that the retail is of primary concern.

Mr. Henschel said he was quite disappointed in the process to date, involving the overlapping of planning, design and construction, which does not bode well for the ultimate success of the project. It has resulted in a great many uncertainties. Mr. Henschel did not consider it to be an icon building and was not convinced it is progressing very strongly. He preferred the original roof design. He stressed that the edges of the roof will be critical in this design and they need to be resolved, noting that in some areas the fascias of the roof become part of the vertical wall surface, particularly on the north elevation. He suggested that if the walls were stronger they would set up the rationale for the roof design. With respect to the vertical element at the corner, he suggested making it stronger, rising above the roof height with an observation area. At the northwest corner, Mr. Henschel found that the introduction of the retail has been at the expense of the public views. In summary, Mr. Henschel said the design needs to be stronger and he was concerned that the vertical walls have been neglected.

#### Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor said the project has moved along significantly since the preliminary stage and stressed that the process today is important so that it can proceed with greater certainty. With respect to VCCEP's concerns about the financial constraints of the project, Mr. MacGregor said he appreciated the federal and provincial governments' contribution is limited but thought it was important to state that it is a very important public project. With respect to conditions 1.1 - 1.4, Mr. MacGregor said he believed there has been a substantial improvement and the design is moving in the right direction. He agreed that the detailing of the roof edges will be extremely important. He had no concerns about the treatment of the roof area over the ballroom. He thought some adjustments could be made by moving the mechanical equipment from the top of the roof and he agreed it could be done in a way to make it an attractive element. With respect to the Master Plan, Mr. MacGregor pointed out that the preliminary conditions call for the applicant to carry out the conditions or identify the schedule for completion. He said it is very positive to see the applicant has accelerated the process for the Master Plan items but the application must proceed in the absence of having worked out all the details. Mr. MacGregor found the staff responses as presented by Mr. Jenkins were very appropriate.

Mr. MacGregor said he believed good progress has been made on condition 1.6. With respect to condition 1.9, Mr. MacGregor said he believed the applicant had made good progress and the inclusion of the retail space will add to the animation of the walkway at the corner. Regarding condition 1.12 and 1.15, Mr. MacGregor said public washrooms must be included somewhere in the plaza area. With respect to parking, Mr. MacGregor said the applicant needs to be given fairly clear direction, and he said he would not support additional parking that requires a significant change in the elevation of the plaza. With respect to the height at the north end of Thurlow Plaza, Mr. MacGregor said the current proposal is a big improvement over the original design. The retail will be very beneficial and there will be no major impact on views. Some adjustment may be possible with the mechanical equipment to reduce the height, but it is not essential.

In summary, Mr. MacGregor said good progress has been made and he looks forward to seeing the complete application. It will undoubtedly be a landmark building and an icon in the city. He urged the Board to concur with his advice to the applicant.

Mr. Beasley said he had no problem in endorsing Mr. MacGregor's motion. The project is making good progress in a number of areas and much has been achieved. Good progress is being made on the Master Plan, the waterfront walkway edges, and the plaza. Mr. Beasley said he was now more confident that the basic civic objectives put forward at the onset will be met, including issues of public-ness, accessibility, the vitality of the waterfront, the inclusion of water-based and land-based activities, and a major meeting place.

With respect to conditions 1.1 - 1.4, Mr. Beasley said the roof is brilliant because it is a living roof, not because it is iconic. It is unlikely to supplant Canada Place as a popular photography subject. He said he was not fulfilled by the design development to date, noting the roof is not much different, in principle, than it was before, although it functions better and all the moves are in the right direction. It does need an increased degree of dynamism. Nevertheless, Mr. Beasley said he believed it was approvable on the basis of its sustainability, although he will be looking very carefully at the roof in the complete submission. If it is successful, the occupants of Shaw Tower and other buildings will be fortunate to be overlooking this green roof rather than a parking lot or a more typical roof structure. Mr. Beasley concurred with the Urban Design Panel that the edge detailing is important and there may be a more artful way of dealing with the mechanical equipment. He urged that the living roof aspect of the design be "played to the hilt" as its redeeming feature that makes it worthy of support.

With regard to the Master Plan, Mr. Beasley said the Board had previously sought a PDP-level submission because there had been no commitment to include the Master Plan items. He said it will now be acceptable for it not to be at a PDP level because the RFP process is advancing on an aggressive schedule and the retail space will be roughed-in and included in the submission.

Commenting on the public input component, Mr. Beasley suggested it would be beneficial for the applicant and staff to meet with the area residents to determine their expectations and include them in the RFP guidelines. He noted this is not much different than what occurred throughout Coal Harbour where development applications for each building were dealt with as they came forward. He also stressed that the residents will also have the opportunity for input at the complete development application stage.

Mr. Beasley said he was encouraged to learn the float plane terminal can be located anywhere across the north face of the building noting that, if the Port Corporation maintains its position that the harbour headline cannot be redefined, then there may be few options. He agreed the RFP should be flexible on the final location. However, it must be clear in the RFP that it is a commercial marina, as described in the zoning. Any alternative would need to be considered by Council as a zoning amendment.

Mr. Beasley said the roughed-in retail space is a very positive addition. He said it is important to note that, while the lower level westerly walkway and vertical element up to the plaza will occur through the Master Plan, the Board will be seeking some security that they will occur by the time the building is occupied. It is a key element of the circulation system which must be achieved, as indicated at the preliminary stage.

Mr. Beasley said he did not believe the question of weather protection at the promontory was a major issue.

Regarding conditions 1.12 and 1.15, Mr. Beasley said he was comfortable with the way the plaza is proceeding. He noted, however, that if the plaza is to be useful for cultural events it must be designed to deal efficiently with the necessary equipment. He urged that discussions continue between the applicant and Cultural Affairs staff to ensure this occurs. The provision of public washrooms is not an option and they must be provided.

With respect to parking, Mr. Beasley said there was nothing in the Master Plan that should be sacrificed for the sake of parking. This may require a relaxation or pay-in-lieu, but Engineering Services should be looking now at the parameters. He added he believed there would be ample parking and he agreed with the statement that parking should not be driving the project. Under no circumstances should the elevation of the plaza be increased for additional parking.

Mr. Beasley said the commercial use at the north end of the plaza is very important and he agreed with the proposal to make it a significant space. However, there needs to be a very careful study of the view implications and the occupants of Shaw tower should work with staff and the applicant to understand precisely what is occurring with regard to their views. Mr. Beasley added he did not believe the bridge of the plaza's height was changing to affect their views.

In seconding Mr. MacGregor's motion, Mr. Beasley emphasized the areas that will be important in the final submission. Firstly, he did not believe the vertical elements had been resolved. He agreed there needs to be a strong vertical element, possibly extending above the roof to provide public overview, as suggested earlier by Mr. Henschel. The vertical element on the east side of the plaza also needs to be resolved in principle even if it cannot be detailed until the Master Plan proceeds. Secondly, Mr. Beasley said he was not convinced by the form of the Park Board restaurant. It should also be publicly accessible. Thirdly, Mr. Beasley said he was concerned about the exposed skirting below the pedestrian walkway which could be very negative if it is not well designed.

Mr. Timm concurred with the Board that the project is moving in the right direction and good progress has been made. There is nothing evident that needs to be completely re-thought. With regard to the roof design, Mr. Timm agreed that work is needed on edges. He was not convinced with the need for more public access to the roof given it is statement about sustainability rather than an architectural element and there are opportunities to see parts of the roof from various locations around the site. Mr. Timm said he had no concern with the shape of the ballroom section of the roof because it will have limited visibility. Regarding the advancement of the Master Plan items to the PDP level, Mr. Timm noted it is only the water-based components that have not yet been brought to the PDP level and it is reasonable to leave this to the RFP process when the needs of the successful developer can be determined.

Mr. Timm agreed with the concerns expressed about the vertical circulation needing resolution because there still remains the potential that nothing will happen on the waterfront. Therefore, having the lower level walkway terminate across the frontage with no point of egress would be a mistake. Mr. Timm did not support the addition of a canopy at the mid level walkway. It would also detract from the retail space that has been added in this location.

With respect to the Thurlow Plaza, Mr. Timm agreed there will be a need for public washrooms and there is probably an opportunity to include them in part of the restaurant structure. He agreed the plaza does not need to be designed to road standards for loading but must be able

to accommodate service vehicles. Mr. Timm was not concerned about the increased elevation at the north end of the plaza and thought the quality of the commercial space should take precedence.

Mr. Timm said he was confident that additional parking would not be required to be constructed on this site to service the Master Plan uses. However, he said he could not yet conclude there is no need to provide any additional parking, or that there should be pay-in-lieu or that some agreement should be made with an off-site parking source. It is not a design issue, but until the results of the RFP process are known it is not possible to determine the total requirement.

Mr. Scobie noted he is a voting member of the Board only if a voting member is unable to attend a meeting. On this basis, he offered his opinion so that the applicant understands his position in the event he is required to vote on the final submission. He agreed with Mr. Beasley's comments on the roof design. It is functionally superior to the earlier submission and has addressed much of the City's aspirations with the addition of the retail space and improvements to the waterfront edge, but it is not a very strong icon. The main attribute that enables it to go forward with any level of support is its sustainability characteristics, which hopefully will become commonplace in the city within the next decade. Mr. Scobie therefore agreed with Mr. Beasley recommendation to exploit the green roof aspects of the design. It is unfortunate that, because of the severe budgetary and schedule restraints, this building will never be what it could be or should be. But it will function and, given the direction it is now taking, will meet most of the City's objectives as well as can be expected.

Mr. Scobie agreed with the improvements made with respect to the Master Plan items, although it is regrettable they cannot be advanced to be more concurrent with the complete application. Nevertheless, it is hoped there will be greater certainty with respect to the vertical circulation on the lower level walkway because if for some reason the Master Plan proponent concludes it is not viable to proceed with anything at that level for the time being, it will be most unfortunate - and potentially dangerous - to have the lower level walkway terminate without some means of connection.

With respect to Thurlow Plaza, Mr. Scobie said he believed staff have acknowledged there will be practical limitations to events that can take place with the reduced loading standards. Nevertheless, everything should be done to ensure that activities can adequately and fully occur so as to not further compromise the capacity of the public space and make the best use of the plaza. Public washrooms are essential and it may not be sufficient to leave it to the Master Plan developer.

Mr. Scobie concurred with Mr. Timm that a weather protected area at the lower walkway is not necessary. Mr. Scobie also supported the Board with respect to the parking. With respect to the elevation at the north end of the plaza, Mr. Scobie commended staff for the rapid analysis of the view implications. While he agreed there may be an opportunity to be creative with the mechanical ventilation system to limit its height, Mr. Scobie agreed the proposal is now much more improved with the new area to be developed at the north end of the plaza.

**Motion**

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

THAT the Board is of the opinion that the current design for conditions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.9 and 1.12, as reviewed at the February 28, 2005 meeting, is moving in the right direction to satisfy the preliminary development conditions established by the Board on September 13, 2004.

CARRIED UNANIMLOUSLY

Mr. Anthony thanked the Board for its advice.

**6. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11.00 p.m.

---

C. Hubbard  
Clerk to the Board

---

F. Scobie  
Chair