

Date: Monday, January 7, 2002  
Time: 3.00 p.m.  
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

**PRESENT:****Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)  
L. Beasley Director of Current Planning  
J. Forbes-Roberts General Manager of Community Services (present for 583 Beach Crescent only)  
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager (present for 3778 West 28th Avenue only)  
D. Rudberg General Manager of Engineering Services

**Advisory Panel**

T. Bunting Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions  
J. Ross Representative of Development Industry  
D. Chung Representative of General Public  
J. Leduc Representative of General Public  
M. Mortenson Representative of General Public  
R. Bruce Scott Representative of General Public

**Regrets**

P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry

**ALSO PRESENT:**

R. Segal Sr. Development Planner  
S. Hein Development Planner  
M. Thomson City Surveyor  
P. Pinsker Parking & Development Engineer

**Item 3 - 583 Beach Crescent - DE406178 - Zone CD-1**

D. Gurney The Hulbert Group International Inc.  
D. Negrin Concord Pacific Group Inc.

**Item 4 - 3778 West 28th Avenue - DE405003 - Zone RS-5**

J. Clark L.O. Lund & Associates Architects  
C. Dyakowski Immaculate Conception Church Building Committee

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

**1. MINUTES**

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of December 10, 2001 be approved.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

**3. 583 BEACH CRESCENT - DE406178 - ZONE CD-1  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: The Hulbert Group International Inc.

Request: To construct a 29-storey residential tower (known as 1M) with a 3-storey component along Beach Crescent and a 2-storey component along a new "mews" connecting Pacific Boulevard to Beach Crescent.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Ralph Segal, Senior Development Planner, described the context of the application site, referring to a scale model and posted drawings. The intent is that the subject project will form a mirror image to the already approved project at 455 Beach Crescent. Mr. Segal briefly reviewed the conditions of approval, noting they are of a minor, detailed nature. Staff have no serious concerns about the proposal. It was noted the tower floorplate is slighter larger than the maximum recommended in the Guidelines. Staff have no concerns about the impact of this increase, noting it is, architecturally, a finely resolved tower form. Furthermore, the applicant has indicated the previously approved application for 455 Beach Crescent will be revisited to bring it into conformity with this application.

The Staff Committee recommendation is for approval, subject to the conditions outlined in the report dated November 28, 2001.

**Questions**

Mr. Beasley noted it is vital to the urban design of this neighbourhood that the two towers (455 and 583 Beach Crescent) match. However, the applicant is seeking approval of this application which does not, technically, match the neighbouring tower. He sought assurance from the applicant that a Minor Amendment will be forthcoming with respect to the previously approved application, to ensure the two towers are mirror images.

Referring to the standard conditions, Mr. Scobie questioned the rationale for the parties listed in A.2.10 with respect to the proposed access agreement. In discussion, it was agreed it would be appropriate for the Directors of Planning and Social Planning to be included. Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, explained the General Manager of Engineering Services is included because until the current subdivision application is finalized it is not known whether there is an engineering issue with respect to the access.

**Applicant's Comments**

David Negrin, Concord Pacific Group Inc., said they believe the subject tower is much better than the previously approved 455 Beach Crescent tower. He gave his word that a Minor Amendment will be applied for immediately for the previous tower, noting they intend to bring the project to market fairly soon. He agreed it is important that the towers are identical. Mr. Negrin confirmed they have no problems with the conditions.

**Comments from Other Speakers**

None.

**Panel Opinion**

Mr. Bunting supported the refinements sought in the conditions. The Urban Design Panel found some of the minor changes not critical to the symmetry given they are not viewed from the public realm side, and the Panel was fairly evenly split as to which tower is better. However, the Panel generally concluded that the symmetry should be maintained, noting the applicant's intent in this regard.

All members of the Advisory Panel recommended approval of the application. Mr. Hancock noted it is very consistent with the vision for this neighbourhood. Mr. Ross said he appreciated the intent for the towers to be identical but said he did not believe it to be critical.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. Beasley moved approval of the application. He reiterated a comment in the Urban Design Panel minutes that it is rare to see real urban design as opposed to just architecture. Mr. Beasley added, it is particularly commendable that the vision for this neighbourhood, formulated nearly a decade ago, has been followed through in these buildings. He said he appreciated the applicant's dedication to maintaining the symmetry and consistency among the buildings and was satisfied this would be achieved.

In seconding the motion, Ms. Forbes-Roberts drew attention to the Processing Centre-Building comments in Appendix C of the Staff Committee Report. She urged the applicant to work on these issues as soon as possible to ensure the application can be processed in a timely way. Mr. Scobie added, it is unfortunate that there are still some fundamental standard items that are not yet resolved and it would be helpful if it was not necessary for staff to identify such items in a complete submission.

**Motion**

It was moved by Mr. Beasley and seconded by Ms. Forbes-Roberts, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 406178, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated November 28, 2001, with the following amendment:

Amend A.2.10 to add the Director of Planning and Director of Social Planning.

*Ms. Forbes-Roberts left the meeting at 3.30 pm and the meeting adjourned until approx. 3.45 pm. Mr. MacGregor arrived during the early part of the Development Planner's presentation of the second application.*

4. 3778 WEST 28TH AVENUE - DE405003 - ZONE RS-5  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: L.O. Lund & Associates Architects

Request: To construct a new gymnasium, classrooms, parish seniors centre and two levels of underground parking on this existing church site.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

The Development Planner, Scot Hein, presented this application. He explained, Immaculate Conception School currently uses the gymnasium in the Dunbar Community Centre for its physical education requirements but the community centre is unable to expand or offer to continue programming to the school indefinitely. Referring to the Staff Committee Report, Mr. Hein reviewed the context, noting it is a very challenging site in an established residential Dunbar neighbourhood which also contains a number of institutional uses. The irregular-shaped site is double-fronting on West 28th and West 29th Avenues, and has a north-south slope of approximately 24 ft. There is a dead-end lane at the easterly edge of the site and the St. George's School precinct is immediately adjacent to the west. Mr. Hein briefly reviewed the background of the project, as outlined in the report. He noted there has been a fairly extensive consultation process in an attempt to find solutions which meet the needs of the applicant as well as respond to the Dunbar Community Vision. A number of public meetings have been held, at one point leading to an entire redesign of the project. Mr. Hein reviewed the technical evaluation of the proposal. He noted the FSR exceeds the maximum permitted by 0.1, due to the gymnasium being double-counted because it is located on the church site rather than the school site.

Condition 1.2 seeks compliance by way of a single site covenant with the school site. The height, at 33.5 ft., is below what is normally achieved under conditional approval in RS-5. The front and side yard setbacks are less than the by-law requirement for outright approval but well within the relaxation provisions. Parking has been negotiated with the Transportation Branch to meet the anticipated demand. In summary, Mr. Hein noted the technical issue of FSR is the most challenging and conditions are recommended to link FSR to the school site to the north.

Following a review of the design evaluation, Mr. Hein focussed on the principal issues and highlighted a number of the conditions that are recommended to address the concerns. He noted the application was evaluated against the Dunbar Community Vision as well as the RS-5 District Schedule and Design Guidelines. While there are no additions or changes being contemplated to the church at this time, staff believe there is an opportunity to secure the church as a heritage resource in the future. Mr. Hein stressed that staff would not support any additions to the church.

In summary, Mr. Hein advised that staff recommend approval of the application, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report dated November 28, 2001. He noted it is a private initiative which is largely the result of the programming pressures of the Dunbar Community Centre. It tries to respond to the local community with respect to some of the aspiration of the Dunbar Community Vision as well as providing for its own needs. Mr. Hein noted that some of the concerns expressed through the notification process have largely come from off-site sources. Staff believe that, on balance, this application will go beyond its own needs and start to address concerns about parking and traffic in the area.

**Questions**

Referring to condition 1.8, Mr. Beasley noted a fair amount of public involvement needs to occur to generate the development scenarios for the school site to the north. He recommended some rewording so that issuance of the development permit is not delayed in fully meeting this condition.

Mr. Rudberg sought clarification regarding a second phase. Mr. Hein explained there were at one time additions contemplated for the church. However, through the redesign that ultimately occurred, staff have indicated that additional density on the church site would not be supported in a second phase. John Clark, Architect, briefly explained the overall goals of the Parish. Initially, the need to address rebuilding the church was foremost because the building, constructed in the 1920s, has served its life and requires seismic upgrading.

Ultimately, it was decided the Parish Centre and gymnasium are more important, largely because the school currently has no gymnasium and must use the facilities at Dunbar Community Centre and St. Phillips. Mr. Clark

stressed the subject application is for the parish centre and gymnasium only, noting they did not want to confuse matters further by introducing a phase two at this time. He advised they support and agree with staff to proceed on this basis and any rebuilding of the church will be dealt with separately in the future. In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg, Mr. Clark confirmed it is not their intention to use the school site to support any work to be done to the church.

Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding the single site covenant sought in condition 1.2. Mr. Hein advised the covenant will be very specific so that any further development of the density left on either the church or the school site will have to occur on the school site. He confirmed the single site covenant will not have the effect of creating a pool of density which could be used on either site.

In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg concerning closure of the dead-end portion of West 28th Avenue in favour of public open space, Mr. Hein explained this will occur outside this development application. Mr. Thomson advised Engineering Services would support an encroachment agreement which would allow the Parish to use this area, creating special landscaping treatment so that it feels like an extension of the Pine Alley Greenway connecting West 27th and West 29th Avenues between this site and St. George's Junior School. Paul Pinsker, Parking Engineer, added the intent is to provide a drop-off/turnaround within the dead-end portion of West 28th Avenue, which will necessitate restricting parking in this location. This matter will be explored further as part of the traffic management plan, to arrive at a solution that is satisfactory to both the school and the neighbours.

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

Mr. Clark advised he supported the conditions contained in the report. He noted it has been a very complex process to date and the intent has been to satisfy all parties. He said they believe they have been very thorough in addressing all the issues that have been identified. The transfer of density to this site from the school site was first proposed during the consultation process and is a solution which addresses the neighbours' concerns that the site would be overdeveloped. With respect to the future redevelopment of the church, Mr. Clark explained the Archdiocese requires the gymnasium to be built first so that church services can be held temporarily in the gymnasium during any work on the church. This project will not negatively impact the community but is the enhancement of an existing historical institution.

Chris Dyakowski, Chairman of the Parish Building Committee, spoke in support of the application on behalf of the approximately 300 parish families who live in the immediate neighbourhood. He briefly reviewed the history of the church and noted the intent of the Archdiocese is to build the parish centre and gymnasium first and replace the church later in a second phase. They anticipate proceeding with phase two within the next five to ten years. Mr. Dyakowski advised they support the spirit of condition 1.1 and look forward to developing and implementing the Good Neighbour Agreement. The proposed parish centre will enhance and improve an existing historic neighbourhood institution and allow the parish/school community to continue its operations. Mr. Dyakowski said they have adopted a holistic approach, keeping the lines of communication open between the neighbourhood and themselves, and will continue to do so. He stressed they have raised all their funds to date for this project through donations, without impacting the community, and they see no reason for this fundraising approach to change.

#### **Questions**

Responding to a question from Mr. Beasley about the future redevelopment of the church, Mr. Clark confirmed this will involve either upgrading the existing building or replacing it with one which is no larger given the southerly site will be completely built out as a result of the legal agreement called for in this application. In discussion, Mr. Rudberg suggested an amendment to condition 1.8 to ensure the involvement of the neighbours in the process for reviewing any development scenarios for the church and the school site. This will establish the process now regarding any future development and provide a clear understanding of what will occur in the future.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding the heritage status of the church structure, Mr. Clark confirmed it is not currently on the Vancouver Heritage Register although it could possibly qualify for future designation. Mr. Scobie pointed out there is therefore the possibility that the Parish could, notwithstanding whatever process is established today, pursue a Heritage Revitalization Agreement that may seek to retain a

portion of the church upon its redevelopment in exchange for concessions, including additional density. There is also the legal opportunity for the Parish to apply for a rezoning, although the legal agreement called for in the conditions for this application may well influence how such an application is considered. Nevertheless, Mr. Scobie stressed it is important for everybody to understand that the certainty that is intended to be provided will not necessarily be foolproof, i.e., it sets a basis upon which other future alternatives can be considered but does not preclude the foregoing considerations from being advanced.

Ms. Leduc sought clarification regarding attendance at some of the anticipated church events. Mr. Clark said he did not believe there would be any events other than those listed in Appendix F which may have attendance in excess of 200.

*The meeting adjourned briefly for the Board and Panel to review the model and posted materials.*

The Chair referenced a letter from Mr. James Hall, copies of which were circulated to Board and Panel members before the meeting. A letter from Ms. Marilyn Davis was also circulated together with a petition letter. The writers opposed the application.

#### **Comments from Other Speakers**

Ms. Shelagh Lindsey distributed copies of a context map identifying the institutions adjacent to the subject site. She urged the Board to delay consideration of the application pending the formulation of a policy by the City for changes in institutional uses and expansion of institutions in residential neighbourhoods. She noted that St. George's, three blocks from Immaculate Conception, has applied for the expansion of their senior school by 85,000 sq.ft. She outlined a number of ways in which the proposal would prejudice the quality of residential life in Dunbar.

Mr. David Butcher, resident of the 3800-block West 29th Avenue, also requested deferral of the application and recommended that it be considered holistically together with the St. George's application. He suggested that the gymnasium would be better located on the school site. He said they were also very concerned about the proposed Good Neighbour Agreement given the friction that has occurred between the church and the neighbours in connection with this project. He said they are very concerned about phase two of this project and felt they deserved to have this site developed all at once rather than piecemeal. Mr. Butcher distributed statistics from a recent City Engineering traffic survey and spoke at length about the severe traffic conditions on West 29th Avenue. He also distributed copies of the church Building Committee minutes which indicate their intent to use the gymnasium extensively for uses such as fundraising activities, which are not included in the list of activities in Appendix F. Mr. Butcher also expressed concern that the owners of this property are not directly connected with the people present today.

#### **Questions**

Mr. Beasley sought clarification from the applicant on the implications of deferring this application, and from staff as to whether Community Planning intends to look at the institutional use in this neighbourhood comprehensively.

Mr. Clark said that while there is no specific deadline, the implications of deferral are very serious, noting this school has never had its own gymnasium, unlike most schools in the city. Furthermore, Dunbar Community Centre has suggested they cannot sustain the level of services it provides to Immaculate Conception. The Principal of Immaculate Conception School explained that their use of the Dunbar Community Centre facilities is very limited. As well, the St. Philip's gymnasium is substandard size and can only be used by Kindergarten and Grade 1 students.

Mr. Hein advised Community Planning staff have confirmed that any further exploration of institutional use expansion in Dunbar is not in their work program for this year. The status of the Dunbar visioning exercise will be reported to Council in June 2002 but not specifically on this issue.

In response to a question from Mr. Mortensen concerning the location of the proposed gymnasium, Mr. Hein said view impact would not be an issue if it were located on the school site but it would restrict the amount of

outdoor playground space. Given the slope of the land there is also an economic benefit to the proposed location.

Responding to a question from Mr. Scobie concerning participants in the Good Neighbour Agreement, Mr. Hein said staff want to maintain a locally negotiated agreement and believe this will be integral to its success.

With respect to the proposed uses, Mr. Hein advised that, given pressures on the public school system, such uses are quite common and a number of churches in the city have sought similar additions.

#### **Comments from Other Speaker (Cont'd.)**

Ms. Lissa Forshaw, 3750 West 30th Avenue, advised she has obtained the signatures of 61 Dunbar residents expressing concern about this application. They are seeking a moratorium on this proposal and the St. George's expansion. Ms. Forshaw noted the Staff Committee report fails to address a number of issues, including infrastructure needs. She was also concerned about the size of the proposal. She also expressed concern about traffic and distributed photographs to illustrate the severe traffic congestion on West 29th Avenue. She recommended that access to the parking off West 27th Avenue should have been explored more fully. Ms. Forshaw said they need a comprehensive plan given the possibility of a lot more institutional development in the area.

Mr. Ian Doddington, resident of 3700-block West 29th Avenue, said many of the neighbours were unaware of this proposal until the development application sign appeared on the site. He stressed they are not opposed to development but have serious concerns about the size of this proposal. Mr. Doddington was also concerned about misinformation in the neighbourhood. He distributed copies of a letter containing questions about the report which he asked that staff respond to later. Mr. Doddington also expressed concern about the traffic impacts of the proposal, and about the need to involve the community in the preparation of the Good Neighbour Agreement. He urged that the project be developed in a way that ensures more acceptance and harmony in the community.

Ms. Penny Crawford, 3804 West 29th Avenue, said her main concern was about traffic. She was also concerned about the size of the development, the zoning, and that this application was not being considered in conjunction with the St. George's proposal. She said she failed to see how this proposal fits with the Dunbar vision of a primarily single family residential area. Ms. Crawford was also concerned about the Parish seeking a future rezoning.

Dr. W. Ciszak, resident half a block from the subject site, supported the project and congratulated the architect on the design. The site is very well balanced; it fits the area very well and the finish and style complement the neighbourhood. Dr. Ciszak said he thought the residents' concerns about the intentions of the Diocese are misplaced and unjustified given the track record of the Parish which has been in the neighbourhood for many years. Activities in the church have not been a problem to date and there is no reason to expect there will be a problem in the future. Dr. Ciszak agreed the traffic congestion on West 29th Avenue is a serious issue and he thought the worst component was the through traffic, particularly to St. George's. He did not agree that the parking entry off West 29th Avenue will exacerbate the situation. Rather, it will be a convenience for visitors who will no longer have to drive around the neighbourhood in search of parking.

Mr. Joseph Kilpatrick noted that pick-up/drop-off for the school does not presently occur on West 29th Avenue and will not in the future. One of the reasons that this is a desirable residential area is that it provides the services needed to raise a family and these church facilities provide essential services to the neighbourhood. Mr. Kilpatrick said he believed the question of the size of the proposal has been addressed very carefully by City staff. He agreed the traffic on West 29th Avenue is very heavy, but it is not caused by this school and church facilities. He urged the Board to approve the application. He said he believed any concerns can be worked out with the Good Neighbour Agreement.

Mr. George Patterson, member of the Parish and resident a few blocks away, pointed out that the church activities some residents are concerned about are already occurring in the existing facilities. He urged the Board to approve the project.

Mr. Randy Quam, 3808 West 29th Avenue, was opposed to the development. He said he was not opposed to Immaculate Conception improving its facilities and providing a new gymnasium but the issue is how this neighbourhood has evolved over the years. Mr. Quam described the serious traffic congestion in the area and said it will only get worse with this development. He was concerned about the size of the proposal. He noted this is not the only institutional application in the area, nor is it the only application expected by Immaculate Conception given the buildings need upgrading. He concurred with previous speakers that this application should be considered in a holistic way rather than considering a transfer of density. He thought the gymnasium should be on the school site.

Mr. Robert Wells, member of the Church Building Committee, agreed that traffic on West 29th Avenue is a concern. With respect to the 80 vehicles that come to the school, Mr. Wells said the drop-off is generally about 20 on each corner, north of West 29th Avenue. He noted the original proposal had no parking and proposed having the gymnasium on the school site. Residents on West 27th and 28th Avenues objected, so it was relocated to the lower, church site where it would be less conspicuous and no higher than neighbouring houses. In discussion with City staff, however, the need for parking was imposed which meant raising the building to accommodate underground parking. He suggested the Dunbar Vision plan for densification along Dunbar Street does call for a lot of underground parking. The first priority for the Parish is the gymnasium, second, the church and third, the school, the total development to occur over the next fifty years. In closing, Mr. Wells said that, if the issue of parking access off West 29th Avenue is unresolvable then a solution might be to eliminate the parking or find some other location for it.

Mr. Ken Wicken, resident of the 3700-block West 28th Avenue, expressed concern about the proposed Good Neighbour Agreement's ability to resolve any disputes that might occur with respect to events in the Parish Centre. He thought the most effective way to proceed would be to work out conditions of operation now and have them included in the development permit and not in a Good Neighbour Agreement which is not legally enforceable.

Ms. Susan Cordonoyer, member of the Parish and P.E. teacher at Immaculate Conception School, said there is no room for a gymnasium on the existing playground. She noted that parents who currently drop their children off at the community centre for P.E. are increasing traffic in the neighbourhood. She explained she has lost time at the community centre over the last two years and has had to use a hall at St. Philip's which is substandard.

Mr. Jeff Garrett, 3726 West 28th Avenue, said the process over the last two years has been very open and inclusive. He supported the development and respected the need for the proposed facilities. Regarding the proposed closure of West 28th Avenue, Mr. Garrett said he found the turnaround too close to his home and asked that it be relocated. He was also concerned about the loading activities in the lane, and suggested the Good Neighbour Agreement could be more airtight. The potential phase two development was also a concern, combined with the other expansions of institutional uses in the area.

Mr. Beasley noted the design of the proposed closure of West 28th Avenue is not yet completed and it will be done in consultation with the neighbours. Mr. Thomson concurred and added, he would anticipate that the turnaround would be relocated westward. The Chair pointed out that city streets are not within the jurisdiction of the Development Permit Board and there is a separate process for dealing with the City Engineer with respect to issues such as street closures.

Mr. Bernie Crick, member of the Immaculate Conception Building Committee, explained that most of their funds come from donations, with relatively small amounts generated by a few fundraising events. He stressed there will be no major fund-raising activities. In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor concerning the church activities listed in Appendix F, Mr. Crick advised there will be no activities beyond what occurs now. He said he did not believe there would be many events with a liquor license.

#### Panel Opinion

Mr. Bunting advised the Urban Design Panel liked this application and acknowledged it is a very difficult site. The applicant was commended on the approach taken to the project and its high quality design and materials. The Panel generally felt the nature of the architecture was very much in keeping with the neighbourhood. The

landscape plan is well conceived, especially Pine Alley Greenway and the extension north to the school across West 28th Avenue. The Panel's comments are well addressed in condition 1.7, to try to lower the building. The Panel also strongly supported the closure of West 28th Avenue and the linking of this site with the school site to the north. There were suggestions that the drop-off was perhaps not well located and should be moved further west. Dealing sensitively with the courtyard between the existing church and the new facility will be very important to the project given its tight proximity to the church. If possible, a public connection through from West 29th Avenue would be desirable. Mr. Bunting noted the project had one level of parking when it was reviewed by the Panel and this may be a better solution. Overall, the Panel thought a lot of work had been done to massage the program into the site to fit in with the RS-5 zoning. The Panel supported the application unanimously. Mr. Bunting recommended approval.

Mr. Hancock said it is quite a clever solution to a difficult site and a complex program. He generally liked the massing, the north-south walkway, the materials, and the concept of the street closure. He said he was a little uncomfortable with the height of the gymnasium and would prefer to see it lowered to help mitigate some of the objections from West 29th Avenue neighbours. He did not believe the amount of parking was an issue but a solution to the problem, reducing the number of vehicles circulating in the neighbourhood in search of street parking. Therefore, the underground parking, while its entrance may be somewhat problematic, is probably a better solution than having no parking. He generally recommended approval with some further massaging of the massing of the gymnasium.

Mr. Ross said he saw this application as a positive addition to the neighbourhood and a necessary addition for the children who will use the gymnasium. He noted that staff have spent a lot of time working out the issues and the recommended conditions address the various points raised. The West 29th Avenue elevation is attractive, it will be a quality addition to the street and has been designed in a very sensitive way. Overall, the two levels of underground parking will be better for the neighbourhood. With respect to the St. George's application, Mr. Ross said that will have to be dealt with when it comes forward. He agreed the traffic on West 29th Avenue is a concern but did not think the underground parking would exacerbate the situation. With respect to future use, Mr. Ross said he believed condition 1.8 is clear that extensive consultation with the neighbourhood will be necessary and he encouraged the applicant to do this as early as possible. He recommended approval.

Ms. Leduc concurred that this has been a difficult project and it seems to be the best possible solution for the site. She noted the church appears to have been a good neighbour over the years and many of the activities the neighbours are concerned about are already taking place without any problems. She was confident the Parish would find solutions that will work for everyone. She thought access to the parking off West 29th Avenue would be difficult given the density of the traffic. Ms. Leduc noted that while St. George's *Junior School* has introduced many changes in past years, this project is not proposing major changes to add significantly to traffic congestion. At some point soon, however, the City will have to look at the traffic situation on West 29th Avenue. She recommended approval.

Mr. Scott said this development is a complement to the neighbourhood. It is not a massive project and it is long overdue. He was satisfied with the process that has occurred, noting that everyone has had an opportunity to exercise an opinion and be involved. Mr. Scott strongly supported the Good Neighbour Agreement and said its strength will come from input from the neighbours. He was opposed to deferring the application and said he would like to see it proceed.

Mr. Mortensen noted the church has long existed in this neighbourhood. There are a number of ways that this development is neighbourly: provision of a new greenway, the sensitive treatment of the West 28th Avenue closure, the finish of the project and its design. As well, the church is putting in two levels of parking, which is very neighbourly for people who live next to this project. It is not a huge change of use, as indicated by speakers from the church. Mr. Mortensen questioned how much of the traffic problem in this neighbourhood emerges from this facility. He recommended approval.

Mr. Chung also recommended approval, noting there are many positive aspects to the project. The addition of two levels of underground parking will improve traffic congestion. The integration of the school and church

sites with the closure of West 28th Avenue will be very positive. Finally, Mr. Chung stressed the importance of a new gymnasium for the schoolchildren.

### Board Discussion

Mr. Rudberg said it serves no purpose to delay a decision on this application. Staff have advised there will be no overall review of the institutional uses in this neighbourhood. In addition, it is not appropriate to link this application to St. George's which has to be reviewed on its own merits. At some point, the church will need to be renovated in some way and that will have to be considered with the information available at the time, recognizing that if this application is approved, the amount of development potential on the existing site as well as the school site will be limited by the single site covenant. There has been an extensive design process and not much more can be achieved by revisiting that process. The Board must therefore consider the application that is before it. Parking is an important issue and the fact that it is provided underground is also important. It can only be accessed in an economical way off West 29th Avenue. Based on the comments from the delegations as well as the Advisory Panel and the Staff Committee recommendation, Mr. Rudberg moved approval with some amendments to the conditions.

Mr. Rudberg stated that, clearly, a lot more work has to be done with respect to the Good Neighbour Agreement, the Traffic Management Plan, and the design of West 28th Avenue, and this work needs to be done in consultation with the neighbours. He added, it has been enlightening to hear about the traffic problems that are occurring on West 29th Avenue, both in terms of activities at the St. George's schools as well as the UBC-generated traffic further to the west. Mr. Rudberg advised he will take this information back to the appropriate staff to see if there are some other ways to mitigate the speed and, most important, the volume of traffic being generated to the west of Dunbar Street.

Mr. Beasley seconded the motion. He commented that, at one point, he found the idea of deferral very interesting given there does appear to be a variety of unresolved matters. These matters, however, probably relate less to this application than they do to other things happening in the neighbourhood. As well, the children's need for the gymnasium is a very compelling reason not to defer the application. Mr. Beasley noted his support is also ~~reflected~~ *motivated* by the Advisory Panel's commentary. He agreed there is a need for the institutions to get together with the residents to discuss how the neighbourhood will grow in the future. These are key institutions in the community, serving important needs in the whole city. Mr. Beasley said he believes the Dunbar Residents Association is a good organization to be a convener for these discussions - not the City. The Traffic Management Plan is essential and will likely spin off other traffic modifications in the neighbourhood. Mr. Beasley noted that Good Neighbour Agreements are proving to be very effective moral devices to develop a protocol for how institutions relate to the neighbourhoods in which they exist. He urged the residents to get involved with the Good Neighbour Agreement and make sure the issues they care about are included in the agreement. He added, whether the agreement is legal or not, the City does act as a watch dog in these situations. Overall, Mr. Beasley said he believed it is time for this project to proceed. He added, his support was mainly influenced by the fact that the church adopted a process that was quite consultative. Major changes were made to the scheme that seemed to respond to the neighbourhood's concerns. He said he hoped that all the neighbourhood will start to work positively on the issues.

Mr. MacGregor supported the advice of the Advisory Panel, and the motion of approval. He said he believed the underground parking helps to solve the traffic problem by reducing the amount of circulation from people looking for parking. He noted the proposed new facilities will allow the community centre to provide additional services in the area. As well, the proposal is not a huge increase in facilities over what exists now. Mr. MacGregor commented, the concept of a Good Neighbour Agreement is relatively new and is essentially an exercise in cooperation. It sets basic rules of cooperation between the major institution or development and the community and establishes methods by which issues can be resolved. Experience to date is that issues do get resolved by this process, without litigation.

Mr. Scobie said he had some concern about how the Dunbar Vision is being interpreted and brought to bear on applications such as this. Referring to Vision Direction 3.1 **Maintain Most Single Family Areas**, Mr. Scobie noted this was conceived in the context of this community, like many others, feeling they were under threat with a number of "spot" rezoning initiatives as well as redevelopment pressures under adjacent C-2 zoning. Mr. Scobie said he was unable to see why this site, which has not been single-family in use since 1924, should

be considered for single-family use as a result of that vision statement. He suggested the community perhaps needs to clarify the intent of the vision statements in the context of very site specific development initiatives, noting that if they are very general statements they can be interpreted in a number of ways to fit any person's particular objectives, which is not helpful. He urged the neighbours to seek some further clarification on the vision and directions so that they are applied in a fashion consistent with the context in which they were first developed.

#### 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. 405003, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated November 28, 2001, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1:

provision of a "Good Neighbour Agreement", *in consultation with the neighbourhood*, to the satisfaction ... impacts upon the neighbourhood are minimised";

Amend the first sentence of the **Note to Applicant** in 1.1, to change "for" to "of";

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in 1.2 to change "anticipate" to "anticipated";

Amend 1.5:

design development *and arrangements for the construction of* ~~to design and construct~~ the "Pine Alley Greenway" connecting West 27th Avenue and West 29th Avenue along the west property line;

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in 1.5 to change the reference to A.2.12 to A.2.10;

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in 1.7 to add:

*Consideration should be given to lowering the south elevation, particularly in conjunction with a review of a potential one level underground parking structure;*

Amend 1.8:

~~Confirmation of anticipated~~, *in consultation with the neighbourhood, of a process for any* development scenarios for *this site and* the school site to the north;

Amend the Note to Applicant in 1.8:

The development potential for the school site will be reduced *and the development potential remaining on this site will be limited* by the single site covenant recommended under Condition 1.2. Additional development *on the school site* will require extensive consultation with neighbours and Engineering staff and may not ultimately be supported.

Amend A.2.12 to delete "out" after "borne".

## 5. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8.25 pm.

C. Hubbard  
Clerk to the Board

F. Scobie  
Chair

/ch

Q:\Clerical\DPB\Minutes\2002\jan7.wpd