

Date: Monday, July 16, 2007
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

D. McLellan Deputy General Manager, Community Services Group (Chair)
B. Toderian Director of Planning
J. Ridge Deputy City Manager
T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

J. Wall Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry (excused Item 1)
J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry
M. Braun Representative of the General Public
H. Hung Representative of the General Public

Regrets

D. Chung Representative of the General Public
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission
S. Tatomir Representative of the Design Professions

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

M. Thomson City Surveyor
D. Morgan Development Planner
A. Higginson Project Facilitator
B. Boons Co-Manager of Processing Centre - Development
V. Potter Rezoning Planner (Co-Manager)
K. Magnusson Projects Engineer
N. Losito Regional Director, Health Protection

2758 PRINCE EDWARD AVENUE - DE410898 - ZONE C-3A

L. Baker Linda Baker Architect Inc.
P. Kreuk Durante Kreuk Ltd.
B. Khangara SRC Engineering Consultants Ltd.
A. Rogers SRC Engineering Consultants Ltd.

1075 WEST WATERFRONT ROAD - DE411400 - ZONE CD-1

J. Wollenberg Coriolis Consulting Corp.
R. Baxter West Coast Air & Baxter Air
P. Evans Harbour Air

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Ridge, seconded by Mr. Timm, and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on July 3, 2007.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 2758 PRINCE EDWARD AVENUE - DE410898 - ZONE C-3A
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Linda Baker Architect Inc.

Request: To develop this site with a nine-storey multiple dwelling containing 103 units, over three and one-half levels of underground parking to serve both this development and the adjacent Howard Johnson Plaza Hotel.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced the application for a nine-storey multiple dwelling on Prince Edward Avenue on the east of Kingsway at East 12th Avenue. Mr. Morgan described the zoning and recent developments in the surrounding area. He noted that Engineering requires a twenty-two foot road dedication along East 12th Avenue for future road realignment. Mr. Morgan also described the location and route for the Mount Pleasant Wellness Walkway.

The proposal had been reviewed by the Urban Design Panel twice and Mr. Morgan stated that both the former model and the revised model were available to the Board and Advisory Panel to view. The first review identified issues relating to liveability, scale, massing, materiality and the public realm. The proposed height was considered supportable by the Panel. Following a substantial redesign, a second review resulted in unanimous support and staff concurs that the issues have been successfully resolved. Mr. Morgan added that the UDP commended the applicant on the sustainable aspects including an intensive green roof.

Mr. Morgan stated that the preferred use for this location is residential without commercial. He added that the parking use for the hotel is supportable based on the historical use of the site and the improvements to the current grade conditions.

Mr. Morgan reviewed the recommendations contained in the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated June 18, 2007. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the report.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by Mr. Morgan:

- Townhouses are planned for the units along East 11th Avenue.
- Pedestrian lighting will be provided along East 12th Avenue.
- The Telus kiosk is to be relocated or screened with plantings if relocation is not possible.
- The intent of the rear yard setback is to improve the interface at the lane where residential uses face onto a commercial.
- The stairs at the north east corner would be difficult to move without impacting the units in that location. The stairs will only have occasional use.

- There are issues regarding the on-going maintenance of the art feature and therefore will be located on the property and not at the end of the cul-de-sac in the plaza. The applicant offered the art feature as part of the earnings for density. Other issues regarding trees and benches in the plaza relate to utilities underground and the need to access these services for repair and maintenance.

Applicant's Comments

Linda Baker, Architect, had no concerns with the conditions recommended in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- The hotel is expected to remain for quiet some time.
- The building glazing will be high insulating, non-reflective with some interior shading devices.
- The green roof will not have access.
- The applicant does not intend to get LEED™ certified.
- The applicant has chosen a buff coloured brick for the exterior.

Comments from other Speakers

Jeannie Kerr expressed concerns regarding additional traffic in the area. Mr. Thomson replied that a lot of work had been done by the Parking and Traffic Management Departments and staff felt the area could handle the load.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall stated that the main concern for the Urban Design Panel with the first application was liveability, however the redesign at the second review was very warmly received by the Panel, and they supported the application. The Panel thought the applicant should find some additional shading on the western facades to improve liveability. Mr. Wall noted that the Panel felt the change from red brick to buff was in keeping with the neighbourhood and would blend in with the Howard Johnson Plaza Hotel to create a greater sense of neighbourliness. Mr. Wall thought the Panel would be disappointed regarding the changes to reduce the street bulges and paving materials and to turn the street into a standard cul-de-sac and would change the way the Panel reviewed the project. Mr. Wall asked if it was possible to alert the UDP when there are issues on the drawings that haven't been addressed by staff. Mr. Wall felt the street design as presented on the drawings showed a lot of quality to the overall design of the development.

Mr. Stovell was disappointed that the art feature needed to move off the end of the cul-de-sac as he felt it was a lost opportunity to improve the street end. He had some concerns about the family requirements for the project noting the night club in the hotel, liquor store and extreme traffic intensity on Kingsway. Mr. Stovell stated that he was in support of the recommendations in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Hung thought the development was suitable for the area and commended the design team. He added that the landscaping, the amenity space, the green roof and the offering of the art feature all helped to earn the increase in FSR and the height of the building. Mr. Hung suggested the colour of brick to be yellow rather than buff. He recommended support for the proposal.

Mr. Braun recommended support for the proposal. Mr. Braun thought the building could be a little more interesting as he had some concerns regarding the brick and the painted concrete.

He also had concerns regarding the interface between the hotel and the residential and thought office space along that interface as a buffer from the night club and liquor store was more suitable. Mr. Braun suggested that the art feature needed to be put in the place where it would be enjoyed by the most people. He thought the applicant should be commended for including the green roof, the children's play area and the urban agriculture.

Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian commended the applicant for the design of the building and on their sustainability measures but thought they could be more ambitious. He had some concerns regarding how the building form had been designed for unit liveability rather than energy efficiency. Mr. Toderian saw a potential increase in the cost of the glass to make up for the loss that could impact affordability of the units. Mr. Toderian suggested the applicant experiment more with the colour on the exterior. Mr. Toderian supported the relaxation and thought the design in general had earned the discretionary density.

Mr. Ridge agreed that although there were some good sustainability initiatives, he thought they were basic and suggested more could be done. He noted that a lot of developers were applying for LEED™ certification and LEED™ equivalency for new developments. Mr. Ridge added that he was in support of the amendments.

Mr. Timm thought it wasn't the place of the Board to apply their own architectural sensitivity or sensibility to a design that has been through an extensive process. He agreed in giving the architect more latitude with the design in order to be less constrained by the process.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE410898 in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated June 18, 2007, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.1 by moving "*along 11th Avenue*" to the end of the sentence, to read as follows:

design development to improve the livability and variety of dwelling units, providing ground oriented townhouses suitable for families *along 11th Avenue*;

Amend Condition 1.2 by adding "*and in accordance with Standard Condition A.2.6*", to read as follows:

design development to improve and provide clarification to the public realm in the following manner, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services *and in accordance with Standard Condition A.2.6*;

Amend second bullet in Condition 1.2, by adding "*if feasible, or alternatively, treatment*" after relocation, to read as follows:

relocation, *if feasible, or alternatively, treatment* of the existing Telus kiosk at the southeast corner of 11th Avenue and Prince Edward Street to minimize its visual impact in the public realm;

Add Condition 1.6, to read as follows:

further design consideration for sensitive integration of additional materials, variety and/or colour.

**4. 1075 WEST WATERFRONT ROAD - DE411400 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Coriolis Consulting Corp.

Request: To permit the use of this site for the operation of a float plane facility for a temporary period of time expiring November 9, 2010.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Bill Boons, Co-Manager of Processing Centre - Development, introduced the application from the Coal Harbour float plane operators. The new application is seeking a further three period, through November 2010, as the current application expires in November 2007. In 2004 there were concerns from the neighbours regarding noise, air quality, traffic and safety issues. Mr. Boons stated that Nick Losito from Vancouver Coastal Health was available to answer any questions. Mr. Boons noted that there wasn't an issue with the float planes in the harbour but there are concerns that the application will continue to be extended. Part of the problem is the completion date of the Convention Centre which should have been completed by October 2007 and now won't be completed until March 2009. At that time, the float plane's operation will be moved to their permanent location. Mr. Boons added that the rezoning application is expected shortly. At the rezoning the float plane operation will go through a completely separate process that will require Council's approval. He added that Harbour Green Park and the seawall connecting the plaza will also be completed. Mr. Boons noted that there is a timeline in place and believes the float plane facility will be moved to their permanent location after the games in June of 2010. Mr. Boons recommended the June deadline to the Board. Mr. Boons noted that staff will require quarterly reports and asked the Board to not consider any further extension without getting the advice of Council.

Mr. Boons reviewed the recommendations contained in the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated July 4, 2007. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the report.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by Mr. Boons:

- Mr. Losito noted that there have been many noise complaints.
- Some of the noise comes from the run up activities and engine maintenance.
- Having quarterly reports will help with logistics in getting the permits in place.
- Intention is to have the City Manager involved in the process.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Wollenberg, Consultant, stated that his clients were disappointed to have to come before the Board to ask for a temporary extension as they thought the new facility would be completed by now. They recognize that the Convention Centre is behind schedule but they have no role in the creation of their new permanent facility as they will be tenants. Mr. Wollenberg added that there is no other location for the float planes and would endorse seeking Council's advice if another extension were needed.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- Normal maintenance of the float planes is done in Richmond.
- 300,000 people use the float planes each year.
- The applicant has had several meetings with the proponent regarding the location of the float plane dock and a discussion on fuel issues. They have not seen the final design although the proponent displayed the most recent drawings at a public open house.
- It is a requirement of the rezoning that the Convention Centre make provision for a functional float plane facility.
- The land operations for the float planes will be further east in the new Convention Centre.
- No rezoning application is in place at this point for the new location for the float planes.

Comments from other Speakers

The following delegations spoke in opposition to the application:

Art Kelm

Doug McClelland, President Coal Harbour Residents Associations

Roy Rauser

Allan Weisman

Larry Heidecke

Gerry Sieben

Dimas Cravero

Carlos Teixeira

June Richardson

Comments in opposition included:

- Thought the float planes would have to move on the expiry of the three year term regardless of whether they had a place to move to or not.
- The float planes operate 14 hours a day, 365 days a year with much noise and air pollution.
- No single authority to complain to in order resolve issues with the operators.
- Would like to see the number of take offs and landings remain at the present level.
- Operators need to define operational hours with nothing before 7:00 AM.
- Concern that promises continue to be broken by the operators with no consequences.
- Rowers from the Coal Harbour Rowing Club get deluged with particulate matter when the planes are landing or taking off.
- No contact person at City Hall.
- Is a float plane operation in the downtown part of Coal Harbour necessary? Are there other alternatives?
- During maintenance the applicant's employees play loud music on their radios.
- Could a west bound approach be used as there is not as much noise?
- Development of the Convention Centre along with new marinas is cutting off the rowing channel that has existed since 1887.
- Can't open windows or use decks and balconies when the planes land or take off because of the noise and air pollution.
- Don't want the planes to leave but they could become better neighbours.
- How big can the area get before it becomes too congested or too dangerous?
- If the float planes had been included in the expansion of the Convention Centre we would not be here.
- Would the Board consider the application for 1 year with a possibility of an extension for a maximum of 3 years?
- Ask the float plane operators to give a plan for reducing their pollution and noise.

- Has there been an environmental impact study?
- Would like to see no engine noise after 8:00 PM. Recently they have gone as late as 8:45 PM.
- Would like to see the operators consider scheduling the last flight a little bit earlier to keep in line with 8:00 PM.

The following delegations spoke in support of the application:
Jim Allard, Hyack Air

Comments in support included:

- Is there an opportunity to have a float plane facility adjacent to the heliport?
- Need to have a joint policy between the Vancouver Port Authority and the City.
- Victoria Harbour has a licensed aerodrome with run-ways in the harbour and an enforcement officer. One of the safest waters in Canada with a safety rating of 99.9%. Operators meet monthly to go over any concerns. There are a number of cameras that monitor the take offs and landings.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- Transport Canada regulates the Vancouver harbour area.
- Transport Canada limits the time for flights between 7:00 AM and dusk.
- Float planes have always been anticipated in Coal Harbour.
- There is a short window between March 2009 and September 2009 at the end of the Olympics when the public realm will be finished which will include the park build-out and the finishing of the sea wall.
- Take offs and landings are based on the weather as the planes need to land with the wind.
- The applicant felt that they were doing their part to make changes and improvement and also letting the residents know what their challenges are with their operation.
- There is a Safety Management Plan in place as there are often on-going situations that are unfamiliar or need an explanation. Staff has been in discussion with the community and the operators regarding a revised Management Plan.
- The Management Plan will afford the opportunity to put a plan in place and then be able to ask if the plan had been successful at the end of the three year period.
- The objective is to have the permit last until the operators can move to their permanent location.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall stressed that a process needs to be put in place so that everyone feels heard. He asked if it was possible for the operators to implement some of the ideas from the Victoria aerodrome now and not wait for Transport Canada. Although the operators know what they are doing, the community seems to not have a surety that the rules are being followed. Having a policy could ease some of the tension since the operators will be there for another three years.

Mr. Shearing thought there were two issues; one is time and the other is management. He liked to idea of creating an aerodrome similar to Victoria but noted that it will take time to implement. Mr. Shearing also noted that the operators are not in control of the situation as they are simply tenants. He thought it would be a burden on the operators to give them a 1 year renewal permit as it needs to be renewed until they are able to move to their permanent location. He added that the possibility that they might not meet the November 2010 timeframe should be considered. Mr. Shearing agreed that a Management Plan was important

for the neighbours and that it could be included into the development permit and then the City could ensure that they carried out their obligations under the plan.

Mr. Stovell thought there would still be noise problems if the float planes were moved east of the Convention Centre. He noted that there are swells out in the outer reaches of the harbour and having the planes take off and land further out would cause problems for the pilots. The harbour has the operations of an air port and the float planes are not going to go away. He realized that the majority of complaints were about the flight path and that needed to be addressed at higher levels of government.

Mr. Hung stated that the float plane location is only temporary but he agreed that there needs to be better communication between the operators and the neighbours and suggested that the City should be the mediator. He thought it was important to keep the data on how many complaints there were from the neighbours and the responses from the operators. Mr. Hung supported the application. He suggested that the City, the operators and the neighbours should get together in sixteen months or so to see how the Management Plan is working.

Mr. Braun noted that he lives in the Shaw tower in front of the float planes and hasn't experienced any problems. He agreed that the float planes were a necessity in the downtown and their location is only temporary. He thought part of the problem was the lack of information being given new owners of the residential towers. Mr. Braun suggested that the Management Plan should be available to all the neighbours so that their concerns can be addressed. Also, Mr. Braun thought there should be a contact in the City and that Council should consider the complaints. Mr. Braun thought the water-way needs to be better organized and the federal government involved. He noted that it was impossible to get the float planes relocated before the Convention Centre is built and thought the extension should be permitted. Mr. Braun added that he thought the operators should be in consultation with the Convention Centre as well as the Provincial government.

Board Discussion

Mr. Timm thanked the Advisory Panel for all their comments. He noted that the facility will have to stay in its present location until the Convention Centre is completed and they can move to their permanent location. He added that the concerns will continue until something is done to change that and he thought a registered aerodrome would be a good idea. He suggested that he would make himself available to the operators to pursue the aerodrome. Mr. Timm agreed that the staff needs to ensure a better float plane Management Plan is put in place before the renewal.

Mr. Ridge said he was struggling with the three year versus one year term. He noted that Council had been clear about the permanent location adjacent to the Convention Centre. Mr. Ridge didn't think it would be responsible to ask for a shorter period of time and he was hesitant to use the DP process as an enforcement mechanism. He thought a detailed process with the outcome reported in a quarterly report through the float plane Management Plan would assist in reducing problems.

Mr. Toderian thanked the public for coming to the meeting and sharing their comments. He also thanked the applicants for listening to the concerns. Mr. Toderian thought having the float planes in the harbour made for a diverse downtown and was part of living in a highly urban, mixed environment. He added that part of the challenge of being in a highly urban environment is the challenge of being good neighbours. Mr. Toderian would like to see the Management Plan include more sustainability initiatives regarding noise and fumes and thought this should be done before the City issues the permit. He reminded the applicants that being

in a highly urban area; they are responsible for their employee's behaviour. Mr. Toderian added that he thought the aerodrome would be a good solution and suggested Council could make a formal request to other levels of government and ask them to take a leadership role.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Ridge and seconded by Mr. Timm, that if a further extension was required, the extension would be approved by Council.

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE411400, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated July 4, 2007, with the following amendments:

Amend the opening paragraph on page 2, in line 6, to read as follows:

. . . 2010 Winter Games security restrictions (compared with that of a temporary location) *all* to the satisfaction of the City Manager, *and* subject to the following conditions:

Amend Condition 1.1, to read as follows:

in consultation with the community, prepare and execute a revised Float Plane Facility Management Plan (FMP) to the satisfaction of the City Manager and the Director of Planning in consultation with the General Manager of Parks and Recreation and the General Manager of Engineering Services which shall include *at a minimum the following*:

5. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

6. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:43 PM

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

D. McLellan
Chair