

Meeting: No. 473
Date: Monday, January 24, 2000
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: No. 1 Committee Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

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

Advisory Panel

P. Grant Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
A. Gjernes Representative of Development Industry
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry
R. Roodenburg Representative of General Public

Absent

J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions
B. Parton Representative of General Public
D. Chung Representative of General Public
R. Mingay Representative of General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

R. Segal Development Planner (Item 3)
M. B. Rondeau Development Planner (Item 3)
E. Fiss Development Planner (Item 4)
N. Peters City Surveyor

Item 3 - 1598 WEST 7TH AVENUE - DE404590

Tom Staniszakis Staniszakis Doll Adams Architects
Chuck Brook Brook Development Planning
Kim Perry Landscape Architect
Jillian Watson-Donald Operator for Seniors Living Group of Companies
Joe Ger President of Seniors Living Group of Companies
David Bell Representing the current owner, 450198 B.C. Ltd.
Edward Calb Representing the new owner, Cape Development Corporation

Item 4 - 3200 EAST 54TH AVENUE (CHAMPLAIN MALL) - DE403146

Paul Kwasnicky Hewitt Kwasnicky Architects Inc.
Chuck Brook Brook Development Planning
Jane Durante Durante Kreuk Landscape Architect
Andrew Grant Pacific Can. Investment Corp
Nina Wolanski Representing Killarney Gardens Housing Co-operative

CLERK TO THE BOARD:

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of December 13, 1999 be approved.

2. NEW BUSINESS

A copy of the recent publication, "Vancouver's Urban Design, A Decade of Achievements" was distributed to the Board members. Mr. Beasley explained the brochure is meant to express projects which the City feels exemplify good urban design and set the pace for future projects. For those on the Advisory Panel to the Development Permit Board, it reflects excellence in urban design. Mr. Rudberg said it was an excellent document. It is available for \$6.00 in the Planning Department. Mr. Beasley explained there is about 3/4 cost recovery with about half of that coming from donations from architects and others, and the other half from the sales.

**3. 1598 WEST 7TH AVENUE - DE404590 - ZONE C-3A
(COMPLETE)**

Applicant: Staniszki Doll Adams Architects

Request: The addition of a dining and kitchen facility and amenity areas on the roof of the existing medical building and the construction of a 12-storey seniors congregate housing containing 100 dwelling units with a public open space on the westerly portion of the site. Eighty-three of the 100 residential units are proposed as rental located on floors 2 to 8.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Ralph Segal, explained the background on this site which had a previously approved application for retaining the existing medical clinic building and adding an adjacent residential tower containing rental (83 of the 100 units), and strata condominiums on the upper floors. Residential use is still proposed but as seniors' congregate housing (SNRF - Special Needs Residential Facility). To the south, on Broadway, is the 18-storey Manhattan tower and across the lane are 2 to 3-storey buildings; across the street is the Soci t  Maison de la Francophonie, a community centre with a theatre, and also street-level commercial. At the front, there is a maple tree which is valuable in the street scape. Mr. Segal referred to the previously approved drawings to reference the minor variations in height and massing. The proposal is to retain the Seymour Medical Clinic building with an addition of one storey for amenity space, which is 1.18 ft. higher than previously approved. The absolute height of the tower component is slightly lower but, because it is measured at a lower point on the base surface, four ft. is added. The shoulder portion is approximately four ft. higher and 11 ft. wider but within massing guidelines. Previously, the qualitative impacts of view and shadow were dealt with in great detail and proposed changes are considered minor. The C3-A zoning requires that height and density be earned and the open space with the retention of the significant tree, and the proposed seniors' use is more compatible with the neighbourhood, so staff support this application.

A parking relaxation, for which the Board is asked to use the hardship clause, is consistent with the change of use. Engineering has done a site specific study and 50 spaces is the real demand, based on the condition of a legal

agreement for an age limitation of 65 or over for the rental units, as the draft guidelines for congregate housing are considering amendments to the Parking By-law. A further issue, referred to in condition 1.3, is the location and type of laundry facilities. Staff, in keeping with the draft guidelines, would like more than the one facility proposed, with adjacent lounges. The applicant does not have an issue with conditions 1.4 and 1.5. Both Conditions 1.6 and 1.7 are from the previous approval and relate to the surrounding context, because of the theatre, with attached drinking establishment, and its annual event that closes 7th Avenue. Condition 1.6 is to avoid complaints to the City about noise and 1.7 requests the same mechanical ventilation system to be used so residents can close their windows and still receive adequate ventilation. Changes concerning parking were passed out: A.1.2. should be changed to two class A stalls, deleting one class B passenger parking space, and if possible, to provide a HandiDart space. This is a consideration item.

Ms. Rondeau spoke to a new condition 1.8 being proposed: “arrangements to be made, to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services, to clearly advise purchasers of the financial and management implications of the ownership structure.” As renters will be majority of the strata-corporation in terms of management and the financial aspects of the project, it is to warn the purchasers that a corporation owning the rental units will have the majority of the say on decisions. The applicant is agreeable. Mr. Scobie asked if the rental units would be a single strata lot and that was confirmed. Mr. MacGregor suggested purchasers should be responsible for their own due diligence.

Discussion:

Mr. Gjernes noted a change at the ground level from the previous application. Mr. Segal explained it is for a more viable commercial area, placing the opening where the current entry is to the garage, as there is 12 ft. depth limit on the frontage except there. Mr. Scobie asked about the amount of bicycle parking and as it was discussed at staff committee, it will remain as it is in the DPSC report, as the residents will have more of a need than usual for parking their scooters. Then Mr. Scobie asked if the amenity areas on the 1st, 5th and 10th floors are really intended to be accessible to all residents. Mr. Segal explained the policy is to have no discrimination so all residents have access to all amenity areas. Mr. Scobie also asked for clarification of the age restrictions being imposed because of the parking relaxation requested. Mr. Segal said the age limitation had not been discussed in detail but that only one occupant would need to be over the age of 65 and, as the units were mostly one-bedroom, a live in care-giver (relative) would not be the norm. Mr. Scobie asked if there was a limitation to the rental period of no less than a month, as another development of this type had proved problematic over time, advertising the restaurant for general public use, and renting residential units like a hotel. Mr. Segal said there was no condition that spoke to minimum stay.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Staniskis commented on several design issues. He said there is an agreement with the Development Planner to resolve the issue concerning the vertical expression of the tower element and the type of cladding used on a portion of the building. The Parking By-law needs to be relaxed for the rental units but the condominiums units will have their full complement as required. As expectation is for single occupancy and there are only seven or eight two-bedroom units with the possibility of a live-in care-giver, concern about under-age occupancy is minor. Bicycle parking in the future might not be required but it is expected the residents will use electric scooters so the area will be converted.

Ms. Watson-Donald of the Senior Living Group, an Ontario company which has entered into a long term (25 year) lease to operate the facility, addressed the biggest issue, as relates to condition 1.3. The proposal is for one full

laundry facility on level five, and having additional laundry facilities with adjacent the lounges on the 3rd and 7th-storey is counter to the operational philosophy. The resident will be an average age of 80, the frail elderly, who require meals be provided; flat laundry and housekeeping done weekly; and social stimulation to keep them mentally active. The units are large enough to invite a guest for tea or coffee. With one central laundry, facility staff are able to assist with personal laundry and keep tabs on the residents, being immediately alerted to possible problems. It is also for safety and security reasons there is only one lounge and laundry facility - to be aware of the health of the residents who may be becoming forgetful, for example, leaving an iron on. In each suite, there are 24-hour emergency systems which can be voice activated, and adjustable, and also connected to a pendant or wrist band. It is important to know where the frail elderly are at any given time. The footprint is small enough in the high rise that the distance from the elevator to a single laundry facility is not very far.

Mr. Calb addressed the proposed new condition 1.8. As the units on the top floors will be strata condominiums, part of the legal obligation is to have a Disclosure Statement, regulated by the Province, with conditions concerning votes, cost sharing agreements, etc. Mr. Calb was concerned about inserting another legal condition that might be contrary to what the regulators see as fit. The property owners assume the responsibility and would be willing to show the Disclosure Statement to the City's Legal Services if so requested.

Discussion:

Mr. Scobie had Mr. Staniszki confirm that he was in agreement with the 50 parking spaces to be provided, being more than proposed in the application. Mr. Beasley questioned the small number of washer and dryers and their location. The operator explained that a ratio has been established of one to 35 residents, as they only need to do personal laundry, and different times are scheduled for doing laundry and dining to avoid congestion in the main corridor. Also, adjacent the laundry is a seating area with views to the north, there are washrooms across the hall, and the common area is nearby. Concerning the Disclosure Statement, Mr. Beasley asked for more information about the legal handling of these units. Mr. Calb responded that, first the Board has to approve the application so agreements can be confirmed, but there will be 19 strata units. Mr. Calb had been advised that the Province is very protective of the interest of tenants in general. The cost sharing agreement indicates the areas of the participants: the strata is separated so the cost of the rental remains within the rental and the shared elements are clearly defined, such as the elevator, the entrance hall, the fire exits, etc. The people that buy their units will also buy a minimal package of services. The strata units are larger, up to 1400 sq. ft., with their own washer and dryer and Mr. Calb suggested they should have their own lounge to hold their meetings, etc. This project responds to public needs, offering flexibility in terms of ownership. Mr. Beasley was concerned about future obligations of the owners to pay for renovations, etc. and through further discussion and a change in the wording to "in co-ordination with" suggested by Ms. Rondeau, he felt condition 1.8 was deemed adequate. Mr. Scobie had Mr. Calb further clarify two issues. The amenity space is open to all residents, except that the current property owner would like the 600 sq. ft. lounge on the 10th floor to be for use by the condominium residents only, contrary to condition B.2.3. The common area on top of the medical building will part be of the rental portion but it will be within a parcel separate from the medical building, as will the parking for the medical building. Mr. Scobie suggested Mr. Calb have his

lawyers look into the strata-title in depth, possibly creating the top floor strata units within a separate air space parcel. Mr. Gjernes then asked about the understanding of alternative mechanical system to ventilation and Mr. Stanizskis replied that they are proposing to provide an air-conditioning system to all the floors.

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Grant said there was unanimous support from the Urban Design Panel who praised medical clinic addition as it was respectful of the old Seymour Clinic and would enhance the streetscape. Generally speaking, they were pleased with landscaping, the mass, and the height. The parking was discussed but the Panel was convinced by the applicant that the proposed solution was the correct one. The other issue in condition 1.1 was related to the expression of the vertical element of the tower component and the applicant has said today that this has been discussed further with the Planning Department and resolved satisfactorily.

Mr. Kavanagh generally supports the prior-to conditions, agreeing in particular with condition 1.2. He asked for deletion of 1.3; and in regards to 1.8, he supports the use of alternative wording as suggested by Ms. Rondeau. He then requested the Board to permit an amenity/meeting room for the sole use by the condominium owners.

Mr. Gjernes supported approval as the west side has a need for congregate housing. He recommended deletion of 1.3. He was concerned that the legal arrangements in 1.2 and 1.6, then 1.8, could be too cumbersome as there is a license for a congregate facility, and if it was renewed for another use, the legal arrangements would presumably stipulate the necessary parking. In condition 1.8, change the wording to “in co-ordination with”, as, if there has to be any such reference (Mr. Gjernes would prefer not), then it should be toned down. Concerning the amenity space on the 10th floor, B.2.3 should be amended, limiting its use to the condominium owners.

Mr. Roodenberg supports the proposal. The prior-to conditions he addressed were: 1.2 - suggesting that if the person over 65 has a companion living with them, when they pass away or move to receive a higher level of care, the younger person could stay for as long as they would like; 1.3 - he accepted the applicant’s explanation as the operator should be the judge but should get together with the staff to ensure there is mutual agreement; and. 1.8 - it would be prudent if the Director of Legal Services received a copy of the Disclosure Statement for perusal then, if there are issues of concern, they can be addressed before occupancy.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Beasley then asked the owners what usually happens if the person over 65 passes away and Ms. Watson-Donald said the younger occupant can stay as long as they want to stay. Mr. Scobie suggested that one occupant needs to be over 65 and adding the phrase “at the time of initial occupancy” but Mr. Beasley said the condition does not need to be changed as it states ‘to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services’.

Mr. Rudberg noted the issues of noise, view corridors, and other concerns were addressed previously and that approval set the direction for this development.

Mr. Beasley commended the team because making good use of the medical building and overcoming the objections of the upland neighbours, and given that there are impacts, it is good to see such a socially supportable use. The explanation of the reason for one laundry facility and lounge was very convincing.

Mr. MacGregor thought condition 1.8 as proposed was unnecessary because he considered it moving into an area where the Board should not get involved as there is a disclosure procedure which is adequate. Mr. Beasley

received confirmation from Mr. Calb that the rights of strata lot owners will be clearly portrayed in the Disclosure Statement. Mr. Rudberg would usually be inclined to agree, but he thought that if the lawyers wished to reflect on this condition and then advise it should not be required by the Board, then in the future he would be prepared to support deletion of condition 1.8.

It was moved by Mr. Rudberg that a new condition 1.8 be added, amending the condition submitted by the Development Planner to read “arrangements to be made, in co-ordination with the Director of Legal Services, to clearly advise purchasers of the financial and management implications of the ownership structure.” Mr. MacGregor then put forward an amendment to the resolution moving that the new condition 1.8 be deleted and Mr. Beasley seconded the friendly amendment.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 404590 as submitted, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated January 12, 2000, the plans and information forming a part thereof, thereby permitting the addition of a dining and kitchen facility and amenity areas on the roof of the existing medical building, and the construction of a 12-storey market, seniors congregate housing (Special Needs Residential Facility) containing 100 dwelling units with a public open space on the westerly portion of the site, with the following amendments:

Delete condition 1.3 and Note to Applicant.

Amend condition A.1.2:

A.1.2 provision of *two* class A passenger *loading stalls with a 3.5 m height clearance;*

Note to Applicant: If possible, provision for a HandiDart bus should be made.

Amend condition B.2.3:

B.2.3 The 5,534 sq. ft. of residential amenity areas (lounge, library, theatre, workshop, located on the 1st, 5th and 10th floors) excluded from the computation of floor space ratio, shall not be put to any other use, except as described in the approved application for the exclusion. Access and availability of the use of all amenity facilities located in this project shall be made to all residents, and, further, the amenity spaces and facilities approved as part of this Development Permit shall be provided and thereafter permanently maintained for use by users/tenants of this building, *with the exception of the amenity space on the 10th floor which may be for the exclusive use of the strata residents.*

4. 3200 East 54th Avenue (Champlain Mall) - DE403146

Applicant: Hewitt Kwasnicky Architects Inc.

Request: To demolish the easterly half of the existing mall (the Zeller's wing) and add to and renovate the remaining existing mall, approximately 5,978.8 m² (64,357 sq. ft.), and to construct three new free standing commercial buildings, approximately 4,779.8 m² (51,451 sq. ft.). This proposed development includes a public library on site.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Eric Fiss, introduced this application, for Phase 1 (after the preliminary approval for this site in February, 1999) for demolition of the eastern portion of the existing mall to make way for a rejuvenated, neighbourhood oriented convenience shopping centre. The eastern portion of the site which includes a proposal for 320 units, a combination of apartments and townhouses, will be Phase II. This phase is only for commercial components. The site context was reviewed. There were small modifications to the form of development, the key change being a relocation of pad 1 (building) that was in the parking lot in front of the food store, and shifting it to the parking lot to the north. Staff reviewed and support this as it provides more generous parking in front of the food store, and helps reinforce the urban character of the corner.

Modifications were made to the parking layouts to the northern parking lot, adjacent to the 3-storey building which will contain the relocated medical/dental offices. The library is relocated to the main floor with a prominent entry from the plaza. Two design conditions were put forward as the application showed changes from the preliminary, and these were to ensure the landscaping and redesign of the parking lay-out were achieved. Subsequent to the completion the DPSC Report, staff met with the applicant who submitted a revised plan that will essentially address the concerns expressed in conditions 1.1 and 1.2. Some priorities had to be scrutinized because the more landscaping put on the site, the greater the reduction in parking. There was a strong recommendation from Staff Committee that the parking not be reduced but to find ways of achieving both, such as maximizing parking by using a higher percentage of small car spaces.

Subsequently, there are conditions for which staff are proposing modifications and deletions. Mr. Fiss outlined several proposed revisions. Concerning the parking lot layout, staff need to ensure the westerly entrance apron is adequate to ensure safe drop-off and pick up. The bulges define and direct the primary circulation through the site. There must be adequate sidewalk area around the mall building perimeter with an approximate 12 foot sidewalk acceptable, including protected covered sidewalk. Staff are willing to forgo a sidewalk that was in the middle of a row of parking in order to achieve a sidewalk environment of 10 ft with additional trees along the driveway entry to the site from Kerr Street.

Another concern is the complex set of logistics concerning the demolition portion of the proposal and the continuity of services of library and medical services. The condition is to ensure that the site is not over occupied at any time. In condition 1.6, staff have asked for submission of a detailed phasing plan, not yet received, to indicate the proposed vacancy, demolition and construction schedule. Related condition B.2.5, which appears on the permit, is to ensure that once buildings are vacated, they can not be re-occupied.

The only condition being brought forward to the Board by the applicant is A.2.9 concerning the 20 ft. right-of-way for existing underground utilities. Mr. Fiss read the condition which stated in part: "shall be provided unless otherwise agreed with Engineering staff" but said the proposal, as currently shown,

does include a proposed portion of a loading bay intruding into the right-of-way. The applicant is proposing the figure of 20 ft. be deleted.

Discussion:

Mr. Scobie explained that staff dealt with the complete application as submitted, and then the Staff Committee drafted appropriate conditions in the DPSC Report relating to Phase 1, which was completed last week. It is a confusing process when staff receive a later submission responding to this report, and try to bring forward amendments to deal with the recent changes. The Board, having contemplated the conditions in the report, are now asked to craft a new set of recommendations based on a revised plan they have not yet seen. The Staff Committee should give some thought as to how best to deal with this type of circumstance in the future.

Mr. Beasley asked about the narrow drop-off area at the entrance to the food store, particularly next to an area popular with seniors. Mr. Fiss advised that currently, there is a full lane for loading space for food services but the revised condition would provide adequate control to ensure there is an adequate pick-up/drop-off zone, but not the former full length. Staff have not had a lot of time to review adequacy of this layout with the large curb-ramp so there is a need to consult further with Engineering staff to ensure it does not create a traffic conflict. Mr. MacGregor asked about a drop-off for the library and was told the patrons would have to use parking spaces as there is not an actual drop-off or loading bay for the library.

Mr. Fiss clarified the need to craft a condition such that the Zeller's commercial space, did not continue to exist and operate as commercial at the same time as the other buildings became occupied, exceeding FSR and parking By-laws on site in terms of commercial development. Staff need the construction and demolition phasing plan from the applicant. Condition A.1.6 must be done before permit is issued; and condition B.2.5 will appear on the permit itself and Mr. Scobie suggested both were necessary with rewording off A.1.6 such as, 'demolished in a timely fashion once each new building is occupied'. Mr. Beasley noted that an appropriate phasing plan would indicate how these two conditions would be met. Mr. Scobie said that B.2.5 should mandate that the approved phasing plan be followed.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Brook started by addressing the two very general conditions 1.1. and 1.2 that would ultimately have severe impact on the viability of the development. In advance of this meeting, a mutual understanding of how it might be resolved was arrived at and the applicant is in agreement with the amendments as proposed by staff which present a reasonable compromise to soften the site plan but maintain economic viability.

The applicant is requesting flexibility in the wording of condition A.2.9 as a letter from B.C. Hydro dated December, 1999, was received stating that all issues had been resolved satisfactorily, in principle. To address the issue of the apron for pick-up and drop-off, which is about 30 ft. in width, there are additional opportunities to the north that can be revisited to find an acceptable, workable resolution in consultation with staff. He said the concept of 90 degree angled parking with a 15 minute limit had been discussed with staff. Mr. Brook pointed out that there are now 30 percent small car spaces overall and that makes it difficult to open doors and load groceries, although a number of them are shorter and not narrower. The loss of the stalls in front of the library is regrettable but putting the cul-de-sac there makes more sense to traffic circulation.

Mr. Beasley, recalling the long presentation by seniors, said the length of a car and a half for the drop-off needs to be at least doubled in size. Mr. Rudberg explained that trade-offs may have to be considered as,

with a wider drop-off, pedestrians have to come across a wide swath to the grocery store entrance. Mr. Beasley said the access to the food store itself is narrow and staff will have to work it out with the applicant..

Comments from Other Speakers

Nina Wolanski, representing the Killarney Gardens Housing Co-operative (located from 54th Avenue through to 57th Avenue, behind the fire station) handed out copies of a letter and then spoke on behalf of the group. She said they were happy to see the extra row of trees on the west side of the site.. There are a lot of families very close by and the population of the Co-op is quite dense so there are two main concerns.

The first is child-care. Because there will be families in the townhouses, competition will be created for daycare spaces. The expansion might include day care facilities but it is too far for them to walk with a small child. There is space in the Co-op that is perfect for drop-in for infant and toddler and they are asking the Board to set aside a portion of the CAC for their Co-op to provide additional child care in the neighbourhood. The traffic is the second issue, particularly where the children are concerned. When is 54th Avenue being downgraded to a collector street, along with Tyne and Elliot Streets, as noted on page 40 of the City's Transportation Plan? The community feels there is a conflict between the Transportation Plan and the development.

Mr. MacGregor explained that, in terms of child care, the developer is making the obligatory contribution to the City in general. It was determined some time ago by Council that the monies are going into the community centre. Council can decide who would receive extra funding from the other monies received in the City. Mr Beasley suggested further liaison with the Co-op in the future, an idea that deserves consideration of staff. The residential portion includes design development for a location on site for a child care facility and that will be addressed by condition 1.10 in Phase II.

In response to Ms. Wolanski's comment about a proposed increase in traffic on 54th Avenue of 20 percent between 7:00 and 9:00 am., Mr. MacGregor queried the applicant who responded that he would have to consult the earlier report prepared by his traffic consultant. He said that the new mall is not much different from the current situation. Mr. Rudberg gave an explanation of the community visioning process that has been completed in two areas in the City: Dunbar and Kensington /Cedar Cottage. Killarney is one of the communities on the schedule and the role and function of the streets, transportation corridors, arterials, etc. are developed in conjunction with the community and then calming traffic measures, pedestrian movement, greenways, etc. are addressed in that context. Mr. Beasley suggested that, when the residential component comes forward, staff from Engineering Services and Planning should respond to the concerns raised in Ms. Wolanski's presentation.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Grant, on behalf of the Urban Design Panel, said the Panel was in support but not unanimously. There were concerns as to where the library was located with respect to access from the back, instead of being accessible from the mall. The applicant did address the issue in rebutting the concerns but it was still a concern with some of the Panel, as was the mall not going through and relating to the residential area. The 'drop-off' was not dealt with, but there were questions regarding the entry to the food store and its importance relative to the rest of the commercial enterprises. The reinforced intersection, parking and landscape was well taken care of to make it a better neighbourhood. On an aesthetic basis, it was suggested the number of idioms used architecturally on the building could be simplified or reduced. The improved scale and the humanization of the complex was positive.

Mr. Kavanagh was pleased to approve this complete application, suggesting any revisions to conditions A.1.6 and B.2.5 make a reference to a phasing plan. There should also be examination and enlargement

of the drop-off and pick-up apron, at the same time attempting to avoid conflicts with pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Gjernes said this is a positive step for Champlain Mall, now more of a neighbourhood centre. It's not a big food floor, approximately 27,000 sq. ft., and the shopping centre was a good size for the community, approximately 110,000 sq. ft. Condition 1.1 could be combined with 1.2 and made simpler; or condition 1.2 could be improved on with wording to the effect that staff can work out a parking plan for the site with some modification. There is wording to deal with the issue of phasing and the project should be encouraged to move ahead.

Mr. Roodenberg did not consider it a complete application. The setbacks are not known: The building can shift back and forth, parking requirements are not solved, so if he recommended it be accepted, he would be relying on the applicant and staff to work together for solutions. These issues should have been dealt with after the preliminary. There has been progress, but it is not complete.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Beasley had clarified that there were two submission of landscape plans in January: one in 1999, and a recent one in 2000. He suggested condition 1.2 be amended as submitted by Mr. Fiss today but with additional amendments, adding after mall entrance in the revision of Mr. Fiss – *“of an appropriate width having regard for the various access arrangements that must be accommodated”*; then the last phrase - *“all in line with the January 24, 2000 landscape plan recently submitted by the applicant”*. The Note to Applicant can read exactly as submitted to the Board by Mr. Fiss. Also, Mr. Fiss outlined amending the introduction on page 1 of 3 of Appendix A as well as a number of other additions and deletions.

Mr. Scobie read new wording for condition A.1.6, Note to Applicant and Mr Beasley suggested the additional wording be a second paragraph. Also in condition 1.6 and after phasing plan, add *“to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning”*. And after the word ‘bank’ at the end of the condition, add a second clause, *“and also whereby new occupancies will only be permitted on the condition that arrangements for existing commercial floor area be made to ensure demolition within an agreed period, provided always that the total commercial floor area occupied shall not exceed that permitted on site today.”* Then delete the note to applicant on A.1.6.

Mr. MacGregor asked Mr. Rudberg about the addition of ‘up to 20 ft.’ to give the applicant a direction to condition A.2.9, after originally replacing the specified 20 ft. width with *“and appropriate right-of-way”*. He stated that Engineering Services would not typically allow that kind of intrusion into the right-of-way, which should be free and clear. Mr. Rudberg was confident that the city and any utilities would be looked after.

Mr. Beasley suggested that in response to the letter from Ms. Wolanski that we are referring the question of child care to the Social Planning Department when future child care arrangements are to be dealt with by Council, and that we bring forward the concern about additional traffic when the residential development application is brought before the Board.

Mr. Beasley said the Board had to deal with this application in too much detail, but did so in recognition that it was necessary in order to not put off the timing. He said it was a good development, most of the problems have been solved and that, as Council supports the direction it is taking, it deserves the support of the Board.

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. 403146 in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated January 12, 2000, as submitted, the plans and information forming a part thereof, thereby permitting the demolition of the eastern portion of the existing mall, and the renovation of the remaining existing mall, totalling 64,357 sq. ft. and construction of three new free-standing commercial buildings totalling 51,451 sq. ft., with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.2 and Note to Applicant:

- 1.2 design development to the parking layout to delete the 4 parking spaces and relocation of the loading bay at the north side of the library entry plaza in order to improve *sight* lines into the plaza from 54th Avenue entry drive and to improve vehicular circulation to the site, *to provide an*

improved pedestrian drop-off peninsula at the westerly mall entrance of an appropriate width having regard for the various access arrangements that must be accommodated, and to provide directional bulges along the primary vehicular circulation route, all in line with the January 24, 2000 landscape plan recently submitted by the applicant;

Note to Applicant: Consideration should be given to area for cart storage, and to provide a drop-off and pick-up zone parallel to the sidewalk, as currently exists on the site. The width of the proposed sidewalks- *are to be approximately* 12 ft. adjacent to the north side on commercial units Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5, and to the west side of commercial units Nos. 7, 8, and 9.

Delete and add, to the introduction of Appendix A, Page 1 of 3:

The following is a list of standard conditions that must also be met prior to *issuance of the Development Permit.*

Amend A.1.6, and delete Note to Applicant:

A.1.6 submission of a phasing plan *to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning* to indicate proposed construction and demolition schedule and to minimize disruption to the continuous operation of the Champlain Heights Branch Library and of the neighbourhood serving stores including the grocery store and bank; *and also whereby new occupancies will only be permitted on the condition that arrangements for existing commercial floor area be made to ensure demolition within an agreed period, provided always that the total commercial floor area occupied shall not exceed that permitted on site today;*

Note to Applicant: Deleted

Add to A.1.10, Note to Applicant:

Note to Applicant: The location of "pad building 1" may need to be shifted to the north (in conjunction with reducing the canopy overhang) to provide adequate space for two additional trees; and the elimination of the four ft. sidewalk in the south double row of parking.

Delete A.1.11:

Amend A.1.14:

A.1.14 provide a second row of trees to be incorporated into the entire Kerr Street planting strip. The second row of trees should be staggered with the proposed street trees;

Amend A.2.1, Note to Applicant:

Note to Applicant: The total parking spaces *could be reduced to about 420 to 430 spaces*, as a result of satisfying requirements for landscaping, pedestrian and drop-off areas, and cart storage. As these requirements

are met, as much parking as practical should be preserved. For example, some of the additional landscaping may be achieved by shortening standard parking spaces to the length of small car spaces, with no reduction in the overall supply.

The principal circulation aisle should be given more prominence through extending curbing and landscaping at its 90 degree turns, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services.

Amend A.2.9:

A.2.9 arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and the Director of Legal Services for *an appropriate* right-of-way for utility purposes along the south property line of the site. Show right-of-way on plans and indicate what is existing and what is proposed;

Amend B.2.5 by deletion and replacement:

B.2.5 *The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved phasing plan.*

5. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:15 pm.

Louise Christie
Clerk to the Board

F.A. Scobie
Chair

FAS/lc