

Date: Monday, January 13, 2003  
Time: 3.00 p.m.  
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

---

**PRESENT:****Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)  
L. Beasley Co-Director of Planning  
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager  
T. Timm Deputy City Engineer (excused for 151 Cordova Street/150 Water Street)

**Advisory Panel**

W. Francl Representative of the Design Professions (UDP) (550 Taylor Street only)  
S. Lyon Representative of the Design Professions (UDP) (151 Cordova Street/150 Water Street and 1530 West 8th Avenue)  
E. Mah Representative of Development Industry  
D. Chung Representative of General Public  
J. Leduc Representative of General Public (550 Taylor Street and 151 Cordova Street/150 Water Street only)  
C. Henschel Representative of General Public

**Regrets**

J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions  
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry  
M. Mortensen Representative of General Public

**ALSO PRESENT:**

R. Segal Sr. Development Planner (550 Taylor Street)  
S. Hein Development Planner (151 Cordova Street/150 Water Street)  
M.B. Rondeau Development Planner (1530 West 8th Avenue)  
C. Warren Project Facilitator (550 Taylor Street)  
V. Potter Project Facilitator (151 Cordova Street/150 Water Street)  
A. Higginson Project Facilitator (1530 West 8th Avenue)  
M. Thomson City Surveyor  
P. Pinsker Parking & Development Engineer

**Item 3 - 550 Taylor Street**

M. Bruckner Hancock Bruckner Eng & Wright  
P. Kreuk Durante Kruek Ltd.

**Item 4 - 151 Cordova Street/150 Water Street**

G. Henriquez Henriquez Partners Architects  
C. Phillips Phillips Wuori Long Inc.  
M. Flanigan Manager, Real Estate Services  
B. Macdonald Parking Engineer, Engineering Services

**Item 5 - 1530 West 8th Avenue**

N. Baldwin Nigel Baldwin Architects  
T. Miller Intracorp 8th Avenue Dev. Ltd.  
B. Hemstock Phillips Wuori Long Inc.

**Clerk to the Board:**

C. Hubbard

---

## 1. MINUTES

The following amendments/clarifications were noted:

### 1001 Homer Street

p.7, **Questions/Discussion** - add "continuous" before frontage; delete "height" in first sentence of para. 2.

p.8, **Questions/Discussion** - Mr. Beasley noted the discussion related specifically to weather protection on the Nelson Street elevation in the context of an amenity frontage: weather protection along the residential component was not being advocated.

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of October 15, 2002 be approved as amended.

## 2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

## 3. 550 TAYLOR STREET - DE406939 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Hancock Bruckner Eng & Wright Architects

Request: To construct a 26 storey residential tower/townhouse development containing 233 units in the tower and 22 townhouse units with 3 levels of underground parking accessed off Shanghai Alley.

### Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Ralph Segal, presented this application, referring to a model and posted drawings. Staff found the proposal in close compliance with the intent of the zoning and design guidelines. However, during the notification process and as a result of a meeting with the Chinatown Historic Area Planning Committee, a number of serious community concerns became apparent. These concerns related to the impact of the height and massing of the tower on the adjacent Dr. Sun Yat-Sen Chinese Classical Garden, the proposed vehicular access off Shanghai Alley, and the compatibility of the architectural character in the Chinatown context. Further meetings took place between the applicant, the community and staff and concurrence was reached on a number of important design amendments to the project. These adjustments are reflected in the major prior-to conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report dated November 13 & 27, 2002. Mr. Segal advised the developer has also agreed to consult with the Dr. Sun Yat-Sen Garden Society as the design of the project advances to ensure its continued support of the project.

The Staff Committee recommends approval of the application, subject to the conditions contained in the report. Mr. Segal tabled a minor amendment to the approval preamble, reflecting that on January 14, 2003, responsibility for Chinatown area approvals related to designated heritage property is expected to be transferred from the Provincial Government to the City.

**Applicant's Comments**

Martin Bruckner, Architect, concurred with the Development Planner's comments. He noted they have been involved in a fair amount of discussion with members of the community and look forward to bringing this part of the process to a successful conclusion. He added, there is also community support for the project because it is thought that development of this site will bring in new residents and help to revitalize this part of the city.

With respect to the proposed changes, Mr. Bruckner said these are to generally reduce the mass at the top of the building in such a way that when the tower is seen from the Dr. Sun Yet-Sen Garden, particularly the Scholar's Study, it will appear less massive and have more pleasing proportions. It will generally be more sympathetic with the Garden, with additional design motifs introduced to the elevations as well as landscaping at the upper levels. The revised scheme will also have less shadow impact on the Garden. Mr. Bruckner stressed there will be a variety of suite sizes, including those suitable for families, for which a children's play area will be provided on the second level. Relocating the vehicular access ramp from the lane to Taylor Street and shifting the tower to the west provides an important benefit to the Alan Yap Circle by making it a much more effective space. They intend to introduce windows into the blank townhouse end walls in response to the request for refinement of the corners. Similar improvement will be made to the brick wall facing onto the Alan Yap Circle.

Mr. Bruckner advised the technical requirements are quite achievable. With respect to condition A.1.24, he confirmed the letter from a Building Envelope consultant has now been submitted. Mr. Bruckner requested some flexibility regarding the requirement for increased balcony depth (condition 1.8), noting they are attempting to provide at least one balcony for each of the 233 units. A deeper balcony compromises interior space on the smallest units.

Peter Kreuk, Landscape Architect, advised they are continuing to work on revisions to the landscape plan.

**Questions/Discussion**

The Development Planner confirmed staff would have no objection to amending the condition regarding balconies to provide some flexibility to the applicant.

In response to a question from Mr. Timm regarding condition 1.1, Mr. Bruckner confirmed they believe it is appropriate for the ground floor volume of the tower adjacent to the Alan Yap Circle to be some form of amenity space.

Mr. Francl sought clarification regarding the proposed landscaping at the upper levels of the tower. Mr. Kreuk advised this part of the design has not yet been finalized; however, there will be sufficient depth to provide planter material (likely coniferous) that will be visible from the Sun Yat-Sen Garden.

In response to a question from the Chair, Mr. Bruckner confirmed he had no major concerns regarding the comments of Processing Centre-Building and Fire & Rescue Services contained in Appendix C. Mr. Scobie noted the request for provision of non-toxic plants in the children's play area and recommended this requirement be extended throughout the project. Mr. Kreuk agreed the plant list would be reviewed accordingly.

**Comments from Other Speakers**

Rod Chow, Lisa Lam and Jack Chow were present on behalf of the Chinatown Property Owners Association & World's Famous Building Corporation (submission on file).

Mr. Rod Chow advised that while they support residential development on this site they are unable to support this proposal unless it also incorporates a public parking component. He described the serious parking deficiency in Chinatown and requested the Board to either refuse the application or make additional parking a condition of approval, with its form, accessibility and final quantity to be determined by an independent study and in consultation with local property owners.

Mr. Jack Chow provided some further background on the parking problem in Chinatown and its impact on the local business community. He provided some illustrations of how parking has been dealt with in Honolulu's Chinatown.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, Mr. Chow confirmed he was present at the CD-1 Public Hearing and made a submission to Council at that time *requesting public parking in the development*. Paul Pinsker, Parking & Development Engineer, confirmed that Council decided not to include a component of separate public parking. Engineering Services has reviewed Chinatown parking approximately every two years since 1995 when the CMA Parkade opened and each review has concluded there is a surplus of parking, both on and off-street. Therefore, no further public parking addition is supported by Engineering Services. Mr. Beasley commented that the Development Permit Board is not a policy making body and must make its decisions based on policy established by Council.

Yijin Wen, Chair, Chinatown Historic Area Planning Committee, advised CHAPC was surprised when it first reviewed this proposal on November 12, 2002, noting the site and adjacent area context has changed since the CD-1 guidelines were approved. Mr. Wen advised their concerns were taken very seriously by staff who initiated a series of consultation meetings among staff, community groups and the applicant, with Mr. Beasley acting as neutral facilitator and with the assistance of Joe Wai, Architect. The community groups now support the proposal, subject to the revisions recommended by staff and provided they can review the design as it progresses. Mr. Wen read three supportive e-mails from community groups.

Peter Kwok, Immediate Past President, Dr. Sun Yat-Sen Chinese Classical Garden Society, said they were pleased to see this site being proposed for market development but had serious concerns about its negative impacts on the Garden in terms of shadowing and sightline. He said they are very appreciative of the efforts of City staff for initiating the consultation meetings to find ways to minimize the negative impact on the Garden. Mr. Kwok also expressed appreciation to the developer and architect who were sympathetic and willing to address their concerns. Since the project modifications as agreed to by the applicant and recommended by staff will still leave the tower visible from the Garden they are unable to provide their wholehearted support but given the efforts that have been made to minimize the negative impact, they are now in a position to state that they do not oppose the application. The three critical elements of minimizing the impact are: the reshaping of the upper portion of the tower, its detailed design, and the introduction of greenery. Their recommendation is for deciduous trees so that the tower will be blocked from view in summer and reduce shadow impact in winter. Mr. Kwok recommended that the Note in condition 1.3 be part of the condition as a requirement.

In discussion with respect to condition 1.3, the Chair pointed out that the Note calls for "consideration" rather than requirement. Mr. Beasley stressed the importance of the greening to the Garden and noted the developer has agreed to the request. Mr. Segal advised the location of the trees, whether on City property or Garden property, is yet to be determined.

Fred Mah, Chinese Benevolent Association, expressed appreciation to Mr. Beasley for bringing the developer and the community together to resolve some of their concerns. A major issue was the original location of the parkade entry and the development itself which was too close to the Alan Yap Circle. They are very pleased with the proposed amendments in this respect and are very supportive of bringing more residents to the area. Mr. Mah recommended that the Board approve the application, with the conditions presented by staff.

Deborah Monet expressed concern about the aesthetic impact of this development on the Dr. Sun Yet-Sen Garden. She urged the use of more greenery to be more in keeping with the Garden and stressed the importance of the Garden to the heritage of Chinatown.

Kelly Ip, Vice Chair, S.U.C.C.E.S.S., endorsed the comments of the representatives of the Dr. Sun Yat-Sen Garden Society and the Chinatown Benevolent Association. S.U.C.C.E.S.S. supports the project with the proposed revisions.

#### **Panel Opinion**

Mr. Francl complimented the applicant and everyone involved in the process that has evolved since this project was reviewed by the Urban Design Panel. The proposed changes are very positive - the relocation of the parking entry to Taylor Street, an effective redistribution of the mass, and improvements to the character of the treatment and materials. Mr. Francl recommended approval. He said he did not believe public parking should

be a requirement of this project. He supported the applicant's request for flexibility with respect to balcony depth, noting 5 ft. minimum for all balconies could prove to be onerous given the large number of small suites.

Mr. Mah commended the developer for agreeing to some significant changes to the scheme. He supported the application and said it will be a positive addition to the area.

Ms. Leduc commended staff, the community and the developer, stating it is an excellent model of how projects on difficult sites can proceed. She recommended approval, noting that the addition of market housing will help to revitalize the area.

Mr. Henschel also supported the application, mostly because it is supported by the community. He agreed with the proposed changes to the scheme as recommended in the conditions posed by the Staff Committee.

Mr. Chung supported the application on the basis that the applicant is willing to make significant changes and that the community has now agreed to accept the proposal. He recommended flexibility with respect to balcony depth.

### Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor was encouraged to see the design solutions that further mitigate the impact on the Dr. Sun Yat-Sen Garden. He noted the hours of the shadow analysis go beyond what is normally required, reflecting the importance of the Garden to Chinatown and the City. Mr. MacGregor noted that Council decided at the rezoning stage that there was not to be additional public parking on this site. This could only be achieved at the initiative of the applicant. He also noted that some years ago the Chinatown Merchants' Association, in cooperation with the Provincial Government, developed a public parking facility within two blocks of this site. He moved approval, with amendments to the conditions. He was not in favour of amending 1.3, having confidence that, with the cooperation that has occurred to date, the appropriate landscaping will be provided.

Mr. Beasley stressed that at the beginning of the consultation between the community and the applicant, he declared his own neutrality in order to be able to deal with the issues as a member of the Development Permit Board. He noted the community representatives and the developer have shown a high level of sophistication and wisdom in realising they have common interests. Mr. Beasley added, it was an excellent way to proceed and he commended Mr. Wai and Mr. Hancock for achieving the solutions. New housing is a critical component of the new vision for Chinatown and being able to achieve it in a sensitive way is very positive. With respect to condition 1.3, he stressed the items in the Note will be followed through very closely by staff.

Given the importance of Shanghai Alley, Mr. Timm recommended a minor amendment to 1.1 which was accepted by Messrs. MacGregor and Beasley. He pointed out that the requirement for continued consultation with the community further strengthens the requirements of condition 1.3. Mr. Timm added he was encouraged by the process which saw this application through a difficult period. He congratulated the community for their maturity in acknowledging the benefits they will receive from the new housing on this site and the rights of the developer, in exchange for some impact that will remain.

Mr. Scobie commented it is unfortunate that it was apparently unclear to the community at the rezoning stage what was envisaged for this site. This situation should be taken in account in the future on other site specific zoning considerations to ensure that all interested parties have a clear understanding of what may occur. Mr. Scobie added, it is encouraging to see that a satisfactory resolution was ultimately achieved.

### Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 406939, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated November 13 and 27, 2003, with the following amendments:

Add *if required* after "Ministry of Community, Aboriginal and Women's Services" in the preamble;

Amend 1.1 to add, after "Alan Yap Circle" , *including active ground floor uses that enliven and provide casual surveillance of the Alley and Circle;*

Delete the last sentence of the **Note to Applicant** in 1.1;

Amend 1.8 to replace "a minimum of" with *in the order of;*

4. 151 CORDOVA STREET/150 WATER STREET - DE407151/DE407152 - ZONE HA-2  
(COMPLETE APPLICATIONS)

Applicant: Henriquez Partners Architects

Request: To construct a new City-owned Cordova Street Parkade with theatre use. To renovate, add four storeys to the front elevation for office use, add two and one half levels of parking on top of the existing City-owned Water Street Parkade, and change the use of the ground floor to theatre and retail uses.

The Chair announced that Mr. Timm has indicated he would be in a perceived conflict of interest on this application. He was excused from the meeting on this item.

#### Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Scot Hein, presented these applications, noting they are the first applications to be considered under the new Gastown Management Plan and Guidelines recently approved by Council. Mr. Hein referenced minor amendments to the approvals preamble on p.2 and 5 of the Staff Committee Report dated January 7, 2003. He briefly described the site context and the proposal, referring to a model and posted drawings. The proposal is for a replacement facility to accommodate the parking needs of Gastown as well as to accommodate a tailor-made space for Westcoast Historical Xperience (WHEX). There is no detailed information on this proposed tenancy and the use will be the subject of a separate Tenant Improvement Application (not part of today's deliberations). Mr. Hein briefly reviewed the technical aspects of the proposal, noting both applications are at or under the height prescribed in the new Gastown Management Plan, with some allowance for elevator overrides and architectural appurtenances. Some variation in height of the appurtenances also contributes to achieving a "saw-toothing" of the façades, particularly noting the long frontages of these sites.

Mr. Hein briefly reviewed the issues and the conditions that are recommended to address the concerns. Subject to satisfactory resolution of the conditions outlined in the Staff Committee Report, the recommendation is for approval of the applications.

#### Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley questioned the inclusion of the conditions requiring a safety and security management plan for the parkades. Mr. Hein confirmed it is not an untypical requirement for developments of this magnitude and particularly noting that parkade use is not active in terms of surveillance. Given that methods of security change on an ongoing basis, Mr. MacGregor questioned whether any future changes would require an amendment to the development permit. Mr. Hein advised it would not involve an amendment although the plan would require notifying the City of any changes in technology or method of operations.

With respect to condition 1.4 (Water Street) calling for provision for office space for the Gastown Community Policing Centre, Mr. Beasley questioned the authority for this request. Mr. Hein advised there is no such requirement in the zoning or guidelines; however, in discussions with the Police Department, it is their desire for the existing centre to be relocated to the Water Street development.

Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding the interface with the heritage Leckie Building. Mr. Hein advised there is no record of approval for the windows on the easterly wall of the Leckie Building and they are existing non-confirming with respect to the Building By-law.

Mr. Beasley questioned the inclusion of condition 1.9 (Cordova Street) calling for consideration to be given to a streetcar stop. The Development Planner noted that in the event there is a streetcar stop in this location it is possible that a portion of the Cordova Street façade might need to be pulled back given the narrowness of the sidewalk, to ensure the public realm is maintained. Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, explained this issue was identified fairly late in the process. A streetcar stop may require a raised platform along the sidewalk and the Staff Committee was concerned about ensuring adequate sidewalk space given the number of visitors in this area. Regarding the request for a Facilities Management Plan, Mr. Hein advised this has been a requirement on some recent institutional approvals which have after-hours and weekend activities. Staff are seeking a commitment from the owner, an outline of anticipated issues and how they would be responded to. Pedestrian congestion on Water Street was identified as an area of concern in the response to notification.

Mr. Beasley said his major concern is what occurs at the sidewalk level, in particular on Water Street. Mr. Hein advised the zoning does not require retail use but the Guidelines suggest a rhythm of one or two bays. This issue was raised early on in the inquiry process, both on Water and Cordova Streets, and efforts have been made to reduce the aperture of the access point on Water Street to introduce a gift shop. Mr. Hein said it is not yet fully understood how the proposed single tenant intends to break down the spaces. These details are being sought from the applicant as soon as possible.

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor concerning the construction schedule, Mr. Hein advised there is an interest to proceed with both developments at the same time; however, at this time funding approval has only been granted for the Cordova Street site and all but the top 2½ floors of the Water Street site.

Mr. MacGregor sought clarification on the rationale for the upper level trees. Mr. Hein explained there are some visual screening issues for residents across the street. As well, there is an interest in softening the façade. The prior-to conditions adequately control the possibility of the trees exceeding the height limit.

With respect to the technical analysis (p.8 of the Staff Committee Report), Mr. MacGregor questioned the inclusion of reference to parking for the Woodward's building, regardless of the commitment for the parkade to provide spaces for Woodward's.

With respect to signage, Mr. Hein said staff understand that WHEX may be considering aspects of signage that would not be approvable under the Sign By-law. Conceptual illustrations of the signage suggest it will be contained within a certain area and designed to be demountable. Staff are urging the applicant to provide as much information on signage as early as possible although it is not a matter for the Board's consideration.

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

Bob Macdonald, Parking Engineer, Engineering Services, stated the proposal is primarily for replacement parking for the Gastown community. There is also a potential obligation to provide parking for the Woodward's building but it is not certain at this time given the building is yet to be redeveloped. To date, Council has approved the Cordova Street building and the renovations, offices and commercial uses on Water Street, but not the top 2½ floors which has been approved in principle only.

Mike Flanigan, Manager, Real Estate Services, advised they are not opposed to provision of a streetcar stop as a condition of approval. A number of options would be explored and it would be an important integral link to the building. However, since the final streetcar route is not yet known it may be appropriate to defer delivery of this condition until date of occupancy rather than issuance of the development permit. With regard to the office space to accommodate the Gastown Policing Centre, Mr. Flanigan said he believes this is a very onerous condition and requested deletion of the condition (1.4, Water Street). He confirmed the City's Facility Design and Management group have already undertaken to put together a Facilities Management Plan. It is believed to be in the best interests of the project. However, they would request some flexibility in delivery of the final plan.

Regarding the Water Street retail frontage, Mr. Flanigan advised the City has entered into a lease agreement with WHEX for the full frontage. It was the original intent to attempt to accommodate multiple commercial retail tenants on this frontage; however, on May 28, 2002 it was brought to Council's attention that there would be a compromise: WHEX will consume all of the Water Street CRU's and an internal mall and the building will become a single tenant occupancy. The lease was endorsed by Council.

While they are optimistic that WHEX will be a successful venture, Mr. Flanigan advised Real Estate Services is obliged to consider the worst case scenario. For this reason there will be a conversion plan for retrofitting the building in the event the tenancy fails.

Gregory Henriquez, Architect, expressed appreciation to staff, GHPAC and the neighbours for their involvement in the process. He stressed this is a base building application which does not include the details of the proposed WHEX tenancy. Regarding the Leckie Building, Mr. Henriquez advised they do not believe there were windows, historically, in the lower three floors of its easterly wall. The windows there now were not part of the original heritage structure. With respect to the Water Street frontage, Mr. Henriquez said the Guidelines relate to the architecture and bay widths, which they have tried to address, not uses within.



Mr. Henriquez briefly reviewed the prior-to conditions. Regarding 1.3 (Cordova and Water Streets), he noted a security consultant will be engaged and requested that it be a condition of issuance of the complete building permit rather than the development permit. He also requested that conditions 1.10 and 1.11 (Cordova Street) and 1.12 and 1.13 (Water Street) be conditions of final occupancy permit for the WHEX use. Deletion of 1.4 (Water Street) calling for space for the community policing centre is requested. Mr. Henriquez said they believe the provision of publicly accessible washrooms is an important addition, but request this condition (1.10, Water Street) be a consideration item.

With the exception of the foregoing, Mr. Henriquez said they are in full support of the prior-to conditions and look forward to resolving them in the coming weeks.

#### Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning the signage rationale requested in conditions 1.5 (Cordova) and 1.6 (Water), Mr. Henriquez suggested this will be similar to design guidelines without getting into the signage details. Mr. Hein advised the intent of this condition is to encourage the applicant to work with WHEX as early as possible to determine their signage interests, to establish whether or not they will be seeking approval for non-compliance with the Sign By-law.

With respect to the conditions requesting a Construction Management Plan and Facilities Management Plan, Mr. Thomson said the Staff Committee acknowledged these may create time constraints. He suggested the Committee would support them being conditions of tenant improvements rather than occupancy. Mr. Henriquez advised this would be acceptable to them. Some discussion ensued regarding an appropriate timing for compliance.

Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding the lease arrangements with WHEX with respect to the space along Water Street. His concern was to ensure that the allocation of their program space is such that active spaces are located along the sidewalk in order to achieve something close to the experience of a typical retail frontage, with a variety of tenancies. Mr. Flanigan said he is confident this can be worked out with the tenant to ensure both Water and Cordova Streets have a high degree of pedestrian and retail animation. Mr. Henriquez advised that WHEX is proposing an unusual program whereby, during favourable weather conditions, the Water Street frontage will slide back, opening up the public realm to the building. Considerable discussion has taken place to find an architectural expression that allows it to appear like storefronts (and to convert to actual storefronts in the event the tenancy is unsuccessful) and still give WHEX the ability to open up to the street. Mr. Henriquez added, his firm is responsible for the base building only and their involvement with WHEX relates to the interface of the streetscape.

#### Comments from Other Speakers

Fraser Atkinson, President of Strata Council, 141 Water Street, advised his building contains 14 residences and three commercial units on the ground floor. He noted they have been working with the City to deal with the problems of noise and lighting associated with the existing parkade and the proposed trees at the upper level may help to dampen the noise. Mr. Atkinson said they did not believe the proposed Water Street façade meets the requirement for a "saw-tooth" appearance and will change the nature of the neighbourhood. He said the proposed materials (granite and metal framework) are foreign to Gastown which is predominantly brick. With respect to the proposed open concept for WHEX, Mr. Atkinson pointed out that this will cause serious congestion in the peak summer tourist period. He stressed they are very supportive of the many events and festivals that take place in Gastown. He suggested the appearance of the Water Street façade is more in keeping with the Granville Street entertainment district than Gastown. Mr. Atkinson recommended that this project not be "fast tracked" and the core requirements of WHEX should be identified in order to achieve a viable, long term project that adds value to the Gastown community.

Sylvia Berry, 141 Water Street, expressed support for the previous speaker's comments. She said the proposed change of use to theatre is very ambiguous given there is no business plan at this point. She noted it will bring up to a million visitors a year and locating the main entrance of WHEX and the parkade directly opposite their residence will create a significant amount of traffic noise and congestion. Ms. Berry stressed the need for a viable traffic management plan, noting that regulations are currently being ignored. The proposed additional 2½ storeys will impact their privacy and light access. They strongly support the proposed trees at the upper

level because they provide a visual buffer, and strongly oppose public access to the rooftop. She noted the parkade is very problematic in terms of noise and nuisance and hoped the proposal will help prevent many of the security issues they are currently experiencing. Ms. Berry expressed concern that the trees proposed for the upper level are deciduous which will limit screening in winter. She noted the architect has attempted to achieve a saw-tooth profile, but believes the Gastown Management Plan aims to preserve the existing saw-tooth appearance rather than create one. Permitting the 75 ft. maximum height essentially fills in the entire block. She urged that the upper levels of the parkade be restricted to reserved parking. She expressed concern about the proposed glass elevator which will impact their privacy, and sought clarification regarding the proposed lighting. She thought the introduction of granite and marble was inappropriate for Gastown. She also expressed concern that some of the street trees might be compromised by the canopy.

Allan Berry, 141 Water Street, stressed that the number of residences in the area is increasing and the proposed WHEX tenancy is not in keeping with this change and will have a serious impact on livability.

Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding the upper level trees. Mr. Henriquez explained there will be a concrete wall to shield lights from vehicles. Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, advised they are proposing tulip trees which will be planted very close together to create a solid green barrier in summer and a fairly solid barrier of branching in the winter. They will also provide the variation of seasonal colour. With respect to street trees, Mr. Hein said staff are seeking more information but in any event if any trees are compromised they will be required to be replaced. Mr. Henriquez confirmed there is a commitment that the top two levels of the parkade will be for reserved parking. He also advised they are opposed to any rooftop access. With respect to lighting, Mr. Hein advised there is a requirement for a lighting plan to minimize glare for residents.

Ms. Leduc sought clarification with respect to materials. Mr. Hein advised staff support the applicant's proposal for materials and believe it is appropriate for Gastown. Staff also consider the proposal conforms to the Gastown Management Plan. The materials were also supported by the various design and heritage review bodies.

Mr. Hein confirmed the elevator will be redesigned along with the stairwell, and privacy issues will be carefully considered.

Michael Prout, 141 Water Street, supported the comments of the previous speakers. He expressed concern about the impact of the upper 2½ storeys on natural light access and views from 141 Water Street. He was also concerned about the noise and sidewalk congestion caused by the WHEX tenancy, and the affect on the historic architectural characteristics of Gastown. He urged the Board to refuse the application.

James Baird, representing the owners of the Leckie Building, said they were pleased to see conditions 1.14 and 1.15. He advised the windows on the east facade of the Leckie Building have been in place for many years and were certainly there at the time the building received Provincial heritage designation. He agreed with staff's conclusion that the windows are probably non-conforming. The building tenants are schools and the windows in question provide natural light to classrooms on that side of the building. Mr. Baird said the owners are very concerned about any requirement to brick up these windows and make changes to the building. He urged the Board to consider the impact of the proposal on this heritage property and suggested any new development should be required to compromise. They would recommend some amelioration on the design to allow for a light well or some setback. The current tenants are making very good use of an existing heritage building and bringing people to Gastown. Mr. Baird commented on the rapid pace in which this application is being processed, noting they were first made aware of the development in December 2002. He stressed the owners of the Leckie Building are very willing to meet with the City to negotiate some form of amelioration.

Mr. Hein advised a number of adjustments need to be explored with respect to the Leckie Building windows. These include some physical adjustment to the parkade, involving the loss of some parking stalls. Mr. Henriquez commented there are serious seismic ramifications to moving the party wall. The matter is currently being explored.

Deborah Monet, resident of Hotel Europa, concurred with the comments of the residents of 141 Water Street. She added her concerns about potential traffic congestion. She also thought the theatre use was inappropriate in this area.

Paul Mater, West Coast English Language Centre, advised they are a principal tenant of the Leckie Building and have occupied the 4th and 5th floors for the last ten years. He said ten or eleven of their classrooms will be impacted by this proposal with respect to light access. If the windows are required to be blocked they will reluctantly have to vacate the premises and move elsewhere. In other respects, Mr. Mater said they support the initiative, noting that WHEX would be very compatible with their school. He urged that the applicant be required to implement an appropriate option regarding the windows.

Bob Leshgold, Chair, Gastown Historic Area Planning Committee, advised GHAPC is generally pleased and excited by the proposal because it will provide much needed revitalization in Gastown. He noted the prior-to conditions accurately reflect the amendments recommended by GHAPC. The Committee supports the theatre use for the ground and basement levels, as well as the additional storeys of parking. Mr. Leshgold noted the issue of the windows in the Leckie Building was not discussed by GHAPC but he suggested the Committee would support the two recommendations in the report (1.14 and 1.15).

In response to a question from Ms. Leduc with respect to the provision of public washrooms, Mr. Leshgold advised some members of GHAPC thought it was very important, noting the Committee generally supports anything that will assist businesses in the area.

Leanore Sali, Gastown Business Improvement Society, said the BIS totally supports the project. They believe it will be a very good addition to the area and support the GHAPC recommendations. She stressed the importance of a Tour Bus Management Plan and requested it be required to be reviewed by the GBIS as well as GHAPC. Likewise the Facilities Management Plan. Ms. Sali advised they strongly support the provision of public washrooms. They also support the position of the residents of 141 Water Street regarding the privacy impacts of the glass elevator. Ms. Sali stressed that the issue of storefront widths and the potential loss of a vibrant streetscape with a single tenancy is a serious concern to the GBIS. While Gastown is very much a mixed use area, Ms. Sali urged that the residents' concerns be taken into consideration. With respect to the community policing office, Ms. Sali suggested it may not be appropriate for it to be prominent on Water Street.

The meeting adjourned for a 5 minute break and reconvened at 8.20 pm

#### Panel Opinion

Mr. Lyon advised the Urban Design Panel was generally very supportive of this project and recognized it is a very challenging undertaking. The Panel recognized the treatment of the Cordova and Water facades each responds to its own immediate context. The Panel considered the saw-tooth pattern has been maintained quite well within the veneer of the parkade and there was an appreciation for there being usable space behind this facade. The Panel also appreciated that if the WHEX use is not successful there is an opportunity to convert to small scale retail use. Mr. Lyon advised the recommended prior-to conditions are generally consistent with the Panel's discussions. Some concern was expressed about the appropriateness of the trees above the parapet level in terms of the vocabulary of Water Street. As well, the Panel appreciated the effort toward "greening" the facade on the lane and Cordova but there were some questions about how well it would be maintained and integrated with the facade, particularly on Cordova Street. With respect to materials, the Panel supported the applicant's design rationale.

Mr. Mah urged the applicant to make every effort to minimize light and view impacts on the Leckie Building. He supported the project subject to the recommended conditions.

Mr. Chung also recommended approval. He had some concern about the homogenous shape at the top of the building not reflecting the heritage saw-tooth pattern. He hoped satisfactory timing could be agreed upon with respect to the facilities and tour bus management plans. Mr. Chung questioned the need for a community policing centre in this location if the WHEX use is successful.

Mr. Henschel did not believe the design achieved a saw-tooth appearance which, linked with the single occupant on the ground level, is not in keeping with Gastown. He had serious concerns about the impact on the Leckie Building and thought the City could do better than box it in. He recommended conditions 1.14 and 1.15 in this respect be requirements rather than consideration items given the importance of the Leckie Building.

Ms. Leduc commented this application is far from exemplary in terms of public consultation and working with the community. It is unfortunate the City does not apply the same rigour to itself that it does to other developers. Given this project will have a big impact on the streetscape in the historical context of Gastown, Ms. Leduc urged the City to ensure there is proper consultation so that the interested parties are on side. She also strongly recommended that these kinds of projects also be reviewed by the Heritage Commission. She was opposed to this project being "fast tracked" because there are a lot of issues outstanding. With respect to the impact on the Leckie Building, she felt that new buildings in Gastown should make compromises, not existing heritage buildings. She urged that conditions 1.14 and 1.15 be requirements. She agreed the applicant should not be required to provide for a community policing centre but otherwise supported the recommended conditions. She was unable to commended approval of the application given the amount of work that is needed to be done.

### Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley noted that Council has approved the use in this case, both the replacement of the parking facility and the theatre-like WHEX use. If these uses can revitalize and bring more energy and activity to Gastown it will further regularize the street and lead to business opportunities as well as the enhancement of the character of the street, which is in keeping with the goals of the Gastown Heritage Management Plan. Mr. Beasley said he agreed with the design approach, the success of which will depend ultimately on the detailing. With respect to public consultation, Mr. Beasley stressed it behooves the applicant team to continue discussions with the neighbours as the project is finalized. He noted the application is for the base building configuration only and a number of items are not relevant unless and until the WHEX tenant improvements are brought forward. He noted many of the issues relate to the ongoing management of the parkade and it is imperative there be a much more positive relationship between the applicant team and the Downtown Parking Corporation with respect to the details, particularly relating to security. As well, that there be some dialogue with the neighbours regarding ongoing maintenance of the parkade.

In recommending deletion of condition 1.4 (Water Street), Mr. Beasley recommended the community policing centre be referred to discussion between the City's Real Estate Department and the Gastown BIS. He also recommended deletion of reference in the report (p.8) to the Woodward's parking. As well, in recommending deletion of 1.5 (Cordova Street) and 1.6 (Water Street), Mr. Beasley noted this matter should be dealt with through the normal approval process for signage.

Mr. MacGregor stressed the project is to maintain parking for Gastown. He commented the proposal represents a comprehensive approach to deal with the two parking garages together. He supported the design of the scheme and said the recommended conditions will add further improvements. It is an innovative approach. He stated it is a challenge to balance all the needs in the area and not everyone will be satisfied. Mr. MacGregor noted that Council will be soon reviewing the entire city's community policing stations and it should not be included in this development. He urged that consideration be given to pedestrian safety with respect to the trees at the upper level, especially as they mature. He concurred with Mr. Beasley regarding security issues.

Mr. Scobie commented this application has been challenging for the City in its regulatory role, as noted in the final comment of the Staff Committee in its report. The City's various approval authorities are consistently and inappropriately confronting applications where the City is the proponent which fail to respect the normal requirements of processing and review. This results in considerable disruption to other applications in order to accommodate the timing demands of the City.

### Motion

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

151 West Cordova Street:  
THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 407151, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated January 7, 2003, with the following amendments:

Amend the preamble to add *if required* after "Ministry of Community, Aboriginal and Women's Services";

Amend the Note to Applicant in 1.2 to add , *among other things*, after "This can be achieved by"; and add to the end: *Suggest to Engineering Services and the Downtown Parking Corporation completion of a comprehensive safety and security management plan for the parkade by a licensed security professional outlining detailed hardware and electronic design features, security personnel and hours of operation;*

Delete 1.3;

Amend 1.4 to change "gridlines C-4 and C-5" to *gridlines C5 and C-6;*

Delete 1.5;

Delete reference to Director of Planning from 1.8;

Amend 1.10:  
provision *for consideration in the context of an application for WHEX tenant improvements*, of a Facilities Management Plan ... etc.;

Amend 1.11:  
provision *for consideration in the context of an application for WHEX tenant improvements*, of a Tour Bus Management Plan ... etc.;

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

150 Water Street:  
THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 407152, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated January 7, 2003, with the following amendments:

Amend the preamble:  
THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 407152 as submitted,  
*subject to approval by the Ministry of Community, Aboriginal and Women's  
Services if required, ....* etc.;

Amend 1.1 to add:  
*and further moderate noise impacts;*

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in 1.1 to add *and elevator shaft* after "exit stair";  
and delete the last sentence;

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in 1.2 to add *, among other things,* after "This can  
be achieved by" and add at the end: *Suggest to Engineering Services and the  
Downtown Parking Corporation completion of a comprehensive safety and  
security management plan for the parkade by a licensed security profes-  
sional outlining detailed hardware and electronic design features, security  
personnel and hours of operation;*

Delete 1.3;

Delete 1.4;

Delete 1.6;

Amend 1.10 to add *Consideration for;*

Delete reference to Director of Planning in 1.11;

Amend 1.12:  
provision *for consideration in the context of an application for WHEX tenant  
improvements* of a Facilities Management Plan ... etc.;

Amend 1.13:  
provision *for consideration in the context of an application for WHEX tenant  
improvements* of a Tour Bus Management Plan ... etc.;

Amend 1.14 to add *and access into the Leckie Building* after "Leckie Building"  
in line 4;

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in 1.14:  
Consultation with the owner of the Leckie Building is *required;*

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in 1.15:  
Consultation with the owner of the Leckie Building is *required;*

Add 1.16:  
*consideration, in the context of an application for WHEX tenant improve-  
ments, for design development to introduce a sense of separate activity  
frontages along the Water Street sidewalk in response to clause 4.4 of the  
Gastown Guidelines by assigning active components of the WHEX program  
along this frontage;*

The meeting adjourned for 20 minutes and reconvened at 9.30 pm.

5. 1530 WEST 8TH AVENUE - DE407049 - ZONE C-3A  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Intracorp 8th Avenue Dev. Ltd.

Request: To construct a 49-unit, 11-storey, multiple dwelling and 10 townhouse units, for a total of 59 dwelling units, all over two-and-one-half levels of underground parking, with vehicular access from the lane.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

The Development Planner, Mary Beth Rondeau, presented this application in the Burrard Slopes C-3A zone, referring to a model and posted drawings. She briefly described the project and its immediate context and noted the applicant is requesting the maximum allowable FSR of 3.0. An increase in height from the outright allowable 30 ft. is also being sought. The Burrard Slopes Guidelines suggest 100 ft. for a tower element, stepping down to midrise and lowrise elements across the entire width of the site. Staff support the request for a maximum height of 104.6 ft. for the architectural feature at the front of the building and seek a reduction in the most view sensitive areas. Increases in height and density are conditional in this zone and must be earned. Staff believe the relaxations are primarily earned by the proposed streetscape. The applicant has also proposed the addition of an art feature to enhance the 6 ft. setback on West 8th Avenue. The proposal locates the tower as far away as possible from the neighbouring Manhattan West residential building, which is strongly supported by staff. The midrise section of the proposed massing is much slimmer than envisaged in the Guidelines, which benefits the streetscape in terms of improved light access. It also provides some view benefits for existing residential towers to the south and west of this site.

Ms. Rondeau briefly reviewed the prior-to conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report dated January 13, 2003, subject to which the recommendation is for approval of the application. Referring to p. 14 of the report, Ms. Rondeau reported a correction regarding Notification in that 84 forms have now been returned from The Triton (1575 West 10th Avenue). Staff believe this proposal meets the intent for the Burrard Slopes, particularly with respect to the streetscape and the massing.

**Questions/Discussion**

Mr. Beasley questioned the inclusion of condition 1.3 given the benefit of private decks for the livability of the units, particularly if relocated north of the elevator penthouse as to be screened from southerly overview. He noted the structure for the roof stair is already in the view shadow, even if diminished, of the elevator penthouse. As well, the recommendation to add balconies on the east and west side of the tower may have greater negative impact on the massing. Ms. Rondeau advised this condition was specifically requested by the neighbours.

**Applicant's Comments**

Nigel Baldwin, Architect, confirmed the Staff Committee Report fully describes the proposal. He said the intent has been for careful placement of the massing and the provision of amenity in the balance of view provisions for the neighbours. Mr. Baldwin noted the townhouses on the lane provide the opportunity to enclose the space in relation to the open space of Manhattan West. He briefly commented on the prior-to conditions. With respect to 1.3, said they are open to either solution but noted that roof decks are needed for suites on the south side of the building. He suggested they might be reduced in width to lessen the view blockage. Mr. Baldwin asked the Board to consider the deletion or modification of 1.4 which calls for adding decks to six studio units on the east side of the building.

With respect to the trees at the southeast and southwest of the site, Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect, advised this has been discussed with staff and they would be agreeable to amending the tree species, if requested, to ensure viability given adjacent lane vehicles. He said the intent was to create a green lane and use the opportunity of having residential use on the lane to go beyond typical lane treatment. He also agreed to review the plant list with respect to toxicity.

Tom Miller, Intracorp, stressed they have a stake in improving the neighbourhood and believe the proposal complies with the Burrard Slopes Guidelines. It responds to the building width guideline for the middle portion

of the building and allows for greater light penetration to the street. With respect to the process, Mr. Miller advised they have been actively working with staff to improve the proposal in response to various suggestions. As well, they met with neighbours before submitting the development application and, with input from the neighbours, have conducted a very thorough view analysis. He stressed the townhouses will be extremely livable.

#### Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor with respect to the proximity of this proposal to Triton, Mr. Thomson advised that from the northerly property line of The Triton to the southerly property line of this site is 364 ft., approximately 400 ft. from building face to building face.

Mr. Baldwin confirmed he had no problem with the issues raised by Fire & Rescue Services.

#### Comments from Other Speakers

Michael Russell, #1105-1575 West 10th Avenue, spoke on behalf of 84 owners in the building. He said they are not opposed to development as long as it is within reason and within the Guidelines. The proposed development is aesthetically pleasing and sound, but is too high. They object to the continual encroachment on views at their expense, and question how the proposal earns the maximum 3.0 FSR. Mr. Russell suggested lowering the tower to eight storeys and increasing the midrise portion. He added, this building will increase traffic congestion in the area. He questioned whether a traffic survey had been conducted.

Mr. Beasley commented that residents in the upper levels of The Triton will benefit if the proposed tower is lowered, but more people in the lower levels will lose their views with a lower and wider building. Mr. Russell confirmed the consensus of Triton owners was to recommend the tower be lowered.

J. Steven Buchan, #1106-1575 West 10th Avenue, also spoke on behalf of the Triton owners. He noted the owners agreed to define a process to achieve a consensus. He briefly reviewed the process they followed and referred to their submission dated November 5, 2002 (copies of which were previously circulated to Board and Panel members). In summary, they believe the FSR for this development should be capped at 2.0 and the height of the tower reduced by three storeys. Having completed a quantitative comparative analysis, including Manhattan, Triton, Terraces and Triton, they do not believe this proposal earns the density requested. They do consider the proposed streetscape is very attractive and many other elements of the proposal are excellent. However, they do not believe the neighbourhood can support 3.0 FSR, nor has the height relaxation been earned. Mr. Buchan noted the Burrard Slopes Guidelines emphasize quality of life and the need to accommodate development in-situ. Noting he had been informed by staff that, in many cases, 100 percent of the allowance is given because of precedence over time, Mr. Buchan said he hoped this was not the case. He summarized their recommendations and asked the Board to give careful consideration to their concerns.

Staff responded to questions from the Board as follows:

- Mr. Pinsker advised typical visitor parking provision is based on one visitor space per ten units; it is not a by-law requirement;
- Mr. Thomson explained the U-shaped lane is a standard 20 ft. width lane with 10 ft. x 10 ft. corner cuts, which meets City standards. The lane outlet to Broadway provides some advantage in that it disperses traffic within the block. This lane outlet currently provides secondary access to five lots fronting Granville Street. In the event these lots are redeveloped together and the secondary access is not required, Engineering Services would consider an application to close the lane outlet to Broadway at that time.

Mr. MacGregor noted the public open space provided by the Portico development was achieved from Development Cost Levies and use of considerable City lands.

Mr. Beasley commented he feels no compulsion to automatically approve 3.0 FSR and in every case the items listed in the District Schedule are taken into account. The Board has approved projects which do not achieve the full 3.0 FSR, nor do all developers seek the maximum.

Tracy Moyer, 1595 West Broadway (Manhattan West), representing 45 owners and tenants, said they have a number of concerns and requested three amendments. Copies of a questionnaire completed by Manhattan West



residents were distributed to Board and Panel members. Their concerns relate to increased traffic, increased density, noise impacts, loss of privacy, additional use of green space, view obstruction and property value decrease. She also urged that the development be required to provide eight visitor parking spaces.

In response to a question raised by Ms. Moyer regarding the public art proposal, Ms. Rondeau advised the developer is willing to seek input from the neighbours.

#### **Panel Opinion**

Mr. Lyon advised the Urban Design Panel unanimously supported this scheme. The Panel generally thought it was handled very well and is worthy of 3.0 FSR. Mr. Lyon noted the Panel takes into consideration, among other things, view, livability, open space, streetscape and aesthetics. The Panel thought the project had earned 3.0 FSR based on the massing location, the provision of the courtyard which was considered an exceptionally well handled green space, and the townhouses which are very well handled and achieve an optimal three-storey profile and scale vis-a-vis the tower. As well, the success of the townhouses is largely because the tower does not have a shoulder which would have compromised the open space. Mr. Lyon confirmed the prior-to conditions accurately reflect the Panel's comments.

Mr. Mah commented the project seems to be a good fit for the area. He recommended increasing the visitor requirement by converting some of the non-visitor parking allocation.

Mr. Chung recommended approval. He recommended maintaining the roof decks referred to in condition 1.3 and supported condition 1.4 calling for balconies on the "A" units. He also supported increasing the number of visitor parking spaces. He also commented that this scheme is a lot better than that suggested in the C-3A massing guidelines.

Mr. Henschel agreed that more visitor parking should be provided. He said the massing of the building is very good, noting the impact of a taller, more slender building is far less than a lower, wider solution. He supported approval of the application.

In response to a question from the Chair with respect to traffic congestion, Mr. Pinsker noted this area in recent years has been subjected to considerable construction activity with associated access problems. This should improve when the area is eventually built out. He noted this particular area is a somewhat unique pocket with little through traffic. As well, the shift to more residential use is beneficial because commercial development at 1.0 FSR generates more traffic than residential at 2.0 or 3.0 FSR. The area is also well served by transit.

#### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Timm noted the application is consistent with Council's general direction on traffic reduction to create higher density residential neighbourhoods close to the Downtown. The major traffic concerns the residents are currently experiencing relate much more to commuter traffic on Granville, Fir and Broadway than to local neighbourhood traffic impacts. Mr. Timm noted the intent for the area, as indicated in the Guidelines, is to create a predominantly residential neighbourhood. Criteria to be considered include high quality streetscape, livability, minimizing impact on neighbouring views through massing and height guidelines, and to take advantage of opportunities for open space. Not every development can meet all these criteria and, for a mid-block development, this proposal does as much as possible to achieve the intent of the guidelines. He supported the application, with amendment to condition 1.3 and deletion of 1.4. He also recommended increasing the visitor parking requirement by two stalls.

Mr. MacGregor agreed it would be beneficial if the number of visitor parking spaces could be increased. He acknowledged the concerns of the neighbours who feel strongly about the preservation of their views. He noted that one of the buildings concerned is some distance from this site, and the elimination of three storeys amounts to only 9 - 12 units, which has minimal impact on the density of the area. Mr. MacGregor said he believed the proposal earned 3.0 FSR and he supported its approval.

Mr. Beasley expressed appreciation for the neighbours' thorough presentations and said he considered their concerns very carefully. He noted the Urban Design Panel and the Development Permit Board Advisory Panel

strongly support the proposal, and it meets the intent of the Guidelines. Mr. Beasley said he found the proposal to be the right parti to balance all the different interests, including those relating to view impacts. He commented that the interests of people in lower levels are sometimes overlooked; however, schemes such as this which provide view slots through the site are frequently of benefit to owners who may not make their interests known because they believe they will lose their view under any circumstance. He said condition 1.1 is very important in regard to the concerns raised by the neighbours. He hoped staff and the applicant would work together to maximize the sculpting that can be done on the upper three floors to minimize any unnecessary intrusions. He concurred with the recommended amendment to 1.3 and deletion of 1.4, which will keep the building as slim as possible. Mr. Beasley supported the provision of more visitor parking. Commenting on a concern raised with respect to noise from roof decks, Mr. Beasley said he appreciated the concern but noted the experience of 10-12,000 units with roof gardens has generated no noise complaints to the City. He added that overlooking a green roof deck will be very positive for Manhattan West residents. The townhouses on the lane will also provide a positive enhancement to the Manhattan West open space.

Mr. Beasley commented the residents can expect an array of other development in this neighbourhood which is trying to evolve as an intensive residential community. The community eventually will begin to appreciate the benefits of having more residents in the area. In the long run, this development will contribute more to creating a true community than by diminishing it.

Commenting on the use of the roof tops for active amenities, Mr. Scobie said with increased density it is important to take advantage of available opportunities for outdoor space which improve livability.

#### **Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 407049, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated December 11, 2002, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.3:

*consider design refinement to reduce the view impacts of the two private roof decks and stair access on the tower roof;*

Delete 1.4;

Add 1.9:

*to provide a minimum of six visitor parking spaces, with consideration to provide up to eight visitor parking spaces;*

#### **6. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12.30 a.m.

C. Hubbard  
Clerk to the Board

F. Scobie  
Chair

---

/ch

O:\Clerical\DPB\Minutes\2003\jan13.wpd