

Date: Monday, July 17, 2006  
Time: 3.00 p.m.  
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

---

**PRESENT:**

F. Scobie Co-Director of Development Services (Chair)  
L. Beasley Director of Planning  
J. Forbes-Roberts General Manager of Community Services  
P. Judd Deputy City Engineer

**Advisory Panel**

M. Long Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
R. Acton Representative of the Design Professions (present for Items 1. and 2. only)  
N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry  
J. Scott Representative of the Development Industry  
M. Braun Representative of the General Public  
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public

**Regrets**

D. Chung Representative of the General Public  
K. Hung Representative of the General Public  
R. Keate Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

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

D. Morgan Development Planner  
D. Robinson Project Facilitator  
J. Davidson Senior Housing Planner  
A. Molaro Rapid Transit Office - UDDPC  
M. Thomson City Surveyor  
D. Wong Engineer - Rapid Transit Office  
B. MacDonald Senior Parking Policy Engineer

**1068 West Broadway**

S. Lyon GBL Architects Group Inc.

**65 East Hastings Street**

S. Lyon GBL Architects Group Inc.  
M. Smith Triage Emergency Services & Care Society

**287 Davie Street**

A. Parker InTransit BC  
C. McCarthy InTransit BC  
E. Leflufy Canada Line Rapid Transit Inc.  
G. McGarva VIA Architecture

Recorder: C. Hubbard, Raincoast Ventures

---

1. 1068 WEST BROADWAY - DE410287 - ZONE C-3A  
(COMPLETE)

Applicant: GBL Architects Group Inc.

Request: To develop this site with a mixed-use building containing retail on the ground floor plus 12 storeys of residential all over 2 levels of underground parking. Further, the project includes a transfer of heritage density of 5,619 sq. ft. (10 percent) to this site, from a donor site at 42-46 Water Street, for a total FSR of 3.3.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Dale Morgan, Development Planner, presented this application and advised that staff have no major issues with the scheme. The site is on the south side of West Broadway in the Central Broadway C-3A Zone, mid-block between Oak and Spruce Streets. Mr. Morgan briefly described the site context, referring to a model and posted drawings, and noted there are two recently approved applications in the vicinity. The development now under construction immediately to the east of this site (1030 West Broadway) is very similar to the subject application with respect to building form, height and density. As with the previous project, staff have encouraged the applicant to develop a taller, slimmer building as opposed to the lower, wider form suggested in the Guidelines. Staff believe this form is beneficial because it reduces shadowing, improves sun access and provides views through the site. The applicant was also requested to assess the development potential of the neighbouring 100 ft. site to the west, currently occupied by a funeral home. It has been determined that the siting of the proposed tower would allow the adjacent property also to develop a tower.

This application was supported by the Urban Design Panel and the Panel's comments have formed the basis of the recommended conditions of approval. Mr. Morgan briefly reviewed the conditions as well as the relevant by-law regulations and guidelines. He also noted the items to be taken into account by the Board when considering height and density relaxations. Two responses to notification expressed concerns about view blockage, traffic congestion and tower separation and questioned the value of the development to the neighbourhood.

In summary, staff believe the proposal meets or exceeds the intent of the Guidelines. It earns the requested increases in density and height by: providing a slimmer massing which allows views and sunlight access through the site; reducing shadowing on the street; providing a high quality retail frontage and street trees; enhancing livability by improving material and architectural response to site orientation and solar gain; taking vehicle access from the lane; and the use of high quality materials. The Staff Committee recommends approval of the application, subject to the conditions outlined in the report dated June 21, 2006.

**Questions/Discussion**

With respect to condition 1.3 which calls for design development to respond to building orientation and solar heat gain, Mr. Beasley noted there is currently no City policy to require such features in an "outright" development application but they are sought in this case as a contribution towards earning the requested additional height and density.

Mr. Beasley questioned condition A.2.2 with respect to the parking ramp, noting provision of standard ramp slopes would be very difficult to achieve without adjusting the tower location which in turn would impact the development potential of the neighbouring westerly site. Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, noted the percentages referred to in the condition are Engineering Services design standards but are not a by-law requirement. He confirmed that

Engineering Services would be prepared to accept a greater percentage provided the applicant reduces the slope to as close as possible to the recommended standard. The benefits of taking vehicular access off the lane on this severely sloping site are acknowledged. Mr. Beasley stressed that under no circumstances would he want to see the location of the tower shifted. In discussion, it was agreed an amendment to condition A.2.2 would be appropriate to indicate flexibility on the part of Engineering Services.

Mr. Beasley noted he is required, as Director of Planning, to exercise discretion with respect to balconies under Sections 4.7.3 (a) and 4.7.4 (a) of the C-3 A District Schedule.

Ms. Forbes-Roberts sought clarification regarding the request to reduce the width of the residential entry. Noting the guidelines recommend continuous street frontage, Mr. Morgan advised that, similar to the adjacent development, staff recommend that the width of the entry be reduced by about 5 ft. to improve the commercial presence on West Broadway. It was noted that any resulting additional floor area will need to be taken into account in the total density calculation, which already needs to be reduced to the maximum permitted 3.3 FSR.

Referring to condition 1.3, Ms. Nystedt questioned the lack of standard sustainability requirements. Mr. Morgan noted there is currently no policy regarding sustainability, although sustainable measures are always encouraged. In this case, they are sought as a contribution towards earning the maximum height and density.

Mr. Scobie questioned condition A.1.10 regarding the significant trees on the adjacent site, close to the westerly property line, suggesting it is unrealistic to expect there will be no negative impact. Mr. Morgan advised a detailed arborist's report is requested to determine viability of these trees and perhaps requiring design modifications.

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

Stuart Lyon, Architect, advised he is generally satisfied with the recommended conditions with the exception of 1.4. He explained the tower has a relatively small floor plate and narrow width (61 ft.) which results in the building core to outside wall dimension being fairly tight. While this condition allows for highly livable units with excellent daylighting and cross ventilation, the layouts are challenging, in particular with respect to locating the storage spaces. Mr. Lyon asked the Board to reconsider the condition to move the storage rooms from exterior walls, noting they would be pleased to provide spandrel glass or some other opaque treatment on the outside wall.

Regarding the condition to reduce the width of the residential entry, Mr. Lyon said it could possibly be reduced by more than 5 ft. and they would prefer to tighten the gap on either side and bring the residential entry closer to the street. With respect to the trees on the adjacent property, Mr. Lyon confirmed they will undertake an arborist's report and they are prepared to respond accordingly if it is concluded there is a real benefit to taking measures to preserve them.

#### **Questions/Discussion**

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding the ramp grades, Mr. Lyon agreed it will be challenging to achieve no more than a 12.5 percent slope but they will look at making as much improvement as possible. Ms. Long pointed out that any efforts to retain the adjacent trees might further impact the ramp conditions, noting the trees were not of major concern to the Urban Design Panel.

Mr. Beasley asked whether consideration had been given to narrowing the retail frontage and making the courtyard a private residential space. Mr. Lyon confirmed this will be investigated and was also suggested by the Urban Design Panel.

Mr. Lyon confirmed they have no concerns with the items noted by Processing Centre - Building, in Appendix C.

In response to a question from Ms. Nystedt regarding condition 1.3, Mr. Lyon confirmed they will be considering a strategy with respect to solar heat gain.

#### **Comments from other Speakers**

Mr. Tom Crean, owner of the funeral home to the west, said while they would very much regret the loss of the trees on their site, they must improve their facilities. He said they will do their best to retain them but must maximize the property. He thanked Mr. Beasley for the attention being given to the development potential of his site.

Dr. Paul Molund, nearby resident, noted the current high level of construction activity in the area creates high levels of noise and dust. He was very concerned about the health consequences of additional development in the area, in particular arising from demolition of the existing building on the site. He described the various health issues arising for people living on major streets and distributed copies of several health reports on the topic. He urged that the development not be allowed to proceed because of the long term health effects of future residents of the building and negative impacts on the neighbours during demolition and construction.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning Building Code requirements for noise reduction, Mr. Thomson confirmed that these standards are set by the Federal government through CMHC. Mr. Beasley advised that these standards ensure the construction is better with respect to noise than most of the conditions noted in the international health studies referred to by Dr. Molund. With respect to the handling of asbestos during demolition, Mr. Thomson advised there are very strict standards regarding its removal and this is identified in the Building By-law. Mr. Beasley noted the Noise By-law, which is regulated by the Health Department, specifies permitted hours of construction. Dr. Molund confirmed the construction in his neighbourhood is not occurring outside the permitted hours.

#### **Panel Opinion**

Ms. Long said she believed the Urban Design Panel would support condition 1.1 but noted the Panel was also concerned that some of the commercial area should open onto the courtyard space to provide more animation than just a walk-through area. Ms. Long stressed the importance of condition 1.2 which she said also ties in with some of the sustainability issues. The Panel was concerned that sustainability had not been addressed in the scheme. With respect to condition 1.4, Ms. Long said the Panel was concerned more about unit layout and orientation than the location of storage spaces. She recommended strengthening condition 1.5 regarding detail improvements to the courtyard. Regarding the amenity room, Ms. Long said it is important that this space have direct access to the outdoor amenity area. With respect to the trees at the property line, Ms. Long noted they are fairly significant trees that add to the neighbourhood character. She recommended that they are replaced and provided with appropriate soil depth if it is concluded that they cannot be retained. She added that if retention of the trees requires a change in the building design it may be counter to what is trying to be achieved with the ramp. Ms. Long said that, in general a lot of design development is still required on the project, specifically with respect to the amenity areas, the

courtyard and interface with adjacent properties. She urged that staff ensure these improvements are made.

Mr. Acton supported an adjustment to the width of the residential entry but did not recommend specifying a dimension. He said he believed only subtle changes would be necessary to enhance the residential expression, as called for in 1.2. With respect to sustainability issues, Mr. Acton commented that the project as a whole is falling short of recent applications on West Broadway. Regarding condition 1.4, Mr. Acton said the units should be as livable as possible but he concurred that the layout presents a significant design challenge. He recommended providing the flexibility sought by the applicant, at least for some of the units. Regarding the courtyard, Mr. Acton recommended moving the gate forward and making it more of a residential courtyard, providing a visual benefit only to the public. He noted that part of the issue of treatment of the courtyard relates to materiality. He recommended a higher grade material, something more tactile and fine-grained, to help break down the scale. He added, the courtyard generally needs considerably more design development. Mr. Acton also thought the amount of green roof area could be increased. Mr. Acton said he sympathized with Dr. Molund and agreed that the City should do everything possible to ensure construction noise regulations are adhered to. He also agreed with the speaker's concerns about the use of diesel fuel.

Mr. Shearing said tightening up the residential entry courtyard is critical. However, the actual dimension need not be specified but determined in the resolution of the design. He agreed it would be beneficial to bring the entry gate forward to the street and make it a purely residential courtyard. With respect to 1.2, Mr. Shearing said he did not believe significant change was necessary to the low-rise portion but it should remain very legible and simple as shown. He said he appreciated the challenge with respect to the storage rooms and concurred with the applicant's solution to use spandrel glass. Mr. Shearing said he supported amending condition A.2.2 to provide some clarification regarding the ramp. With respect to the trees, he said that any heroic and costly measures taken to preserve them may not be warranted if the adjacent site is redeveloped in the near future.

Mr. Scott said he appreciated this form of development on West Broadway and he supported the application. The slimmer form provides more light and livability for the units and creates less shadowing on the street. It also provides an opportunity to seek higher quality materials on the tower which is important for the overall quality of West Broadway. With respect to the removal of asbestos, Mr. Scott commented that it is mandatory to file a contaminant plan prior to demolition so there is no possibility of asbestos becoming airborne. Referring to the major prior-to conditions, Mr. Scott agreed it is important to improve the commercial presence on the street. He suggested the use of low-E glass in addressing condition 1.3, and supported improving the detailed treatment of the residential entry.

Ms. Nystedt supported approval of the application, subject to the recommended conditions. She said an important concern is the current lack of any standardized way of dealing with sustainability issues in developments of this kind, suggesting there may be a policy disconnect that should be examined. She added, this underscores that with the increased density in the area and the city's serious transportation problems on Broadway in particular, transportation implications should always be taken into consideration.

Mr. Braun said he believed a courtyard of this scope was unique on West Broadway and expressed the hope that it will act as a piece of art in the absence of storefront. He was concerned that there not be a solid gate at the property line but that the courtyard should enhance the street experience. Mr. Braun agreed with Mr. Acton that the amount of green roof area should be increased, particularly for the benefit of people overlooking the building.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. Beasley said that Dr. Molund's comments are very helpful reminding the Board that many people suffer the inconveniences of redevelopment, albeit that the City does not have all the answers in its policies, given that, in this part of the city at least, an application cannot be refused due to the rate of change. We must therefore rely on regulatory agencies to ensure that construction occurs only during permitted hours. Developers should also be mindful of negative impacts and offer some assistance to their neighbours, noting that some developers offer free window cleaning, for example - not as a City requirement but as a neighbourly gesture. Mr. Beasley said he believed Dr. Molund's concerns about the handling of asbestos have been satisfied, and the construction material standards will as much as possible address noise issues, within and outside the units. Pollution has a citywide impact and does need to be considered; however, cars are likely taken off the roads with increased density, so in that respect this development is probably helping to reduce the overall pollution problem.

With respect to sustainability, Mr. Beasley said the issue is not that the City does not have a policy to make buildings greener. In fact, the City has a very aggressive policy to change all its by-laws to require all new buildings to meet at least LEED or LEED Silver standard, which would be the highest sustainability standard of any city in North America. This policy change, which is in the process of being implemented, has been carefully negotiated with the development industry in order to ensure equitability and not introduce measures randomly in advance of the policy. Nevertheless, on this application, being in a discretionary zone, it is within the policy to seek sustainability measures as a contribution to earning the relaxations being sought. Condition 1.3 is therefore warranted and appropriate.

Mr. Beasley said he agreed with the Advisory Panel that the courtyard needs further design development. It is currently not satisfactory either as a private or public space. He agreed improvements should be made to ensure it is a functioning courtyard, whether public or private, preferably the latter. Mr. Beasley said he was not convinced the storage spaces can be located only on the outer wall and urged that the units are redesigned in order to achieve as much window as possible for livability. With respect to the trees on the adjacent property, Mr. Beasley noted the property owner has suggested his site may be redeveloped in the near future. It might therefore be better to proceed based on the arborist's report, taking measures to minimize impact on the trees during construction, but leave it to the respective owners to determine their destiny.

Mr. Beasley moved approval of the application with amendments to the conditions and noting that in the approval he is also exercising his discretion with respect to balconies under Sections 4.7.3 (a) and 4.7.4 (a) of the C-3 A District Schedule.

Mr. Judd supported Mr. Beasley's proposed amendments and seconded the motion. He added, it is important to look at the big picture and said that impacts on transportation are taken into consideration. It is clear that the development of residential buildings in and near the downtown has a big impact, noting that in the last ten years the number of people walking and cycling has risen from 15 to 30 percent and the number of vehicles entering the downtown has decreased. This is unlike the rest of the region which has seen a considerable increase, and is largely due to increased residential density in and near Vancouver's downtown. With respect to Broadway, it is clearly in transition and much more can be done from a transit perspective. Mr. Judd noted that extension to the Millennium line is a high priority and will reduce the number of diesel buses.

Ms. Forbes-Roberts supported the application and stressed the project needs some work. She strongly supported the strengthening of the amended conditions put by Mr. Beasley with

respect to the design, additional greening and greater attention to the courtyard. This will be a key building on West Broadway.

#### Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 410287, in accordance with the Staff Report dated June 21, 2006, with the following amendments:

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in 1.1 to delete *by approximately five feet (1.5 m)*;

Amend 1.2 to add, after "architectural expression": *and use of materials*;

Amend the second sentence of the **Note to Applicant** in 1.4 to add, after "Storage rooms should": *generally*;

Amend 1.5 to add, after "detailed treatment": *and use of materials and landscaping*;

Delete A.1.10;

Delete the **Note to Applicant** in A.1.16;

Re-number A.1.11 - A.1.19 to A.1.10 - A.1.18.

Amend A.2.2 to read:

*Provision of standard ramp slopes, which should not exceed ten percent for the first 20 ft. and 12.5 percent thereafter, or alternative arrangements to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services, but in no case would this cause the location of the tower to move.*

Mr. Scobie suggested that it may be appropriate for the Director of Planning to ask Planning staff to advance to Council an amendment to the density provision of the C-3A District Schedule to include reference to sustainability strategy among the items for the Board to consider for relaxing height and density. The Urban Design and Development Planning Centre might also be requested to provide an updated summary of what public benefits have been achieved in C-3A projects to date, as an aid to the Board in considering development applications in this zone.

#### 2. 65 EAST HASTINGS STREET - DE410284 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE)

Applicant: GBL Architects Group Inc.

Request: To construct a 9 storey mixed-use development containing retail commercial at grade with 92 units of supportive housing. The housing component will consist of 25 units for tenants who need high levels of support, and 67 units for tenants that can that can live fairly

independently. The services provided are toward housing stability/maintenance rather than recovery from a disability or illness.

#### **Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Dale Morgan, Development Planner, presented this application. In April 2002, the Director of Planning issued a development permit for this site which subsequently lapsed due to lack of funding. Since that time financial support has been re-established to allow the project to proceed. Staff have identified no major issues and the main condition of approval relates to provision of an Operational Management Plan. Mr. Morgan briefly described the project and its immediate context. This proposal is very similar to the previous approved application except for a few minor changes in the program not affecting the form of development. For this reason, the current scheme was not reviewed by the Urban Design Panel which had supported the earlier application prior to its approval by the Director of Planning. The proposal also has the support of the Vancouver Heritage Commission.

The recommended design conditions are very minor and largely a reiteration of the previous conditions of approval. These are included as standard conditions in Appendix A of the Staff Committee Report dated July 5, 2006.

The current application is brought to the Board in an effort to ensure the success of the project and to obtain broad community support, noting this social housing project is one of the first to be considered since adoption of the Housing Plan in 2005. There was no response to notification but some input was received from two open houses at the Carnegie Community Centre where the response was generally positive.

Mr. Morgan briefly reviewed the two main conditions relating to an Operational Management Plan and security. In summary, staff strongly support the application and believe the facility will improve the quality of life for the future tenants and increase the supply of self-contained dwelling units for low income singles.

#### **Questions/Discussion**

Mr. Scobie noted that this application requires discretionary decisions with respect to unit sizes and building height, both of which rest with the Director of Planning rather than the Board as indicated in the report.

In response to a question from Ms. Forbes-Roberts regarding condition 1.2 which calls for confirmation of funding, Jill Davidson, Senior Housing Planner, explained the intent is that, in the unlikely event the funding from Vancouver Coastal Health Authority is no longer available, there is an orderly period of transition in which to relocate high-need tenants. Ms. Davidson also agreed with a suggestion from Mr. Beasley that it might be appropriate to make this condition subject to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Community Services with advice of the Directors of Social Planning and Housing Centre. Ms. Davidson also confirmed there would be no objection to adding the Vancouver Police Department to condition 1.1, as suggested by Mr. Scobie.

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

Stuart Lyon, Architect, said they are delighted to revive this project. He confirmed that given the program, the original design remains appropriate and very little change is required. He briefly described the design rationale and the small program changes that have occurred. A community kitchen is no longer in the program and that space has been converted to other uses, and the associated courtyard filled in. The outdoor space is now on the second floor, and



the number of units has been reduced from 97 to 92. The ground floor retail remains unchanged. Mr. Lyon confirmed they are able to address all the design prior-to conditions.

#### Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley regarding the heritage staff suggestion to use wooden window frames, Mr. Lyon explained there would be a durability issue but that appropriate profiles and colour can be achieved with aluminum or vinyl. As well, push-out style windows are being considered that will characteristically reflect the appearance of double-hung windows.

Mr. Braun questioned the size of the mechanical penthouse. Mr. Lyon agreed that attention can be given to reduce its size. With regard to Ms. Nystedt's question regarding sufficiency of space for staff in the building, Mark Smith, Triage, said it has been reviewed extensively. He noted the high staffing numbers referred to in the report reflect 24/7 staffing levels. As well, staff will spend a lot of time interacting with the residents in the amenity areas.

Mr. Scobie noted the recommended motion of approval is not specific about the break-down of the units in terms of levels of support. Mr. Smith explained the intent is to have no more than 25 - 30 high need tenants. However, the final distribution is not yet known because they have not yet determined the appropriate number of wheelchair accessible units which require converting three standard units to two wheelchair accessible units. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley as to whether the Board should be more specific on the unit allocation, Ms. Davidson recommended as much flexibility as possible given the expected lifespan of the project.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding the lower, easterly rooftop, Mr. Lyon explained it is inaccessible except for maintenance. He agreed that low maintenance greenery could be added but with no tenant access.

Mr. Lyon confirmed they have no concerns with the items identified in Appendix C.

#### Comments from other Speakers

None.

#### Panel Opinion

Ms. Long noted the Urban Design Panel is very supportive of this type of housing. She supported the staff recommendations. She noted the rear roof deck will be predominantly in shade so suggested any weather protection over the seating should be as light and clear in design as possible. She strongly supported a green roof on the lower component with the use of low maintenance materials. She found the mechanical penthouse large and out of character and thought a better alternative should be considered.

Messrs. Acton, Shearing and Scott and Ms. Nystedt strongly supported the application.

Mr. Braun suggested revising condition A.1.3 to require glass canopies which are much easier to maintain long term than fabric. He recommended restructuring the mechanical penthouse. He also urged that careful consideration be given to the lower roof given that traffic between neighbouring roofs can be an issue. He recommended approval.

#### Board Discussion

Ms. Forbes-Roberts stressed that this project is sorely needed. It is also a good contextual design that fits well in the neighbourhood. She added, the project is also a good example of

the type of partnership the City needs to do more of. She stressed, however, that the conditions recommended by staff are not to be taken lightly in terms of how the facility is managed given other similar projects will need to be built in the Downtown Eastside. She moved approval of the application with some minor amendments to the conditions.

Mr. Beasley agreed this is a very important project and this replacement housing is long overdue. He noted that the Housing Plan also allows for more market housing to be achieved in order to achieve a balance between secure non-market and market housing. He added, developers of market housing might look to this design as an appropriate solution for this historic area, noting it has achieved nearly 5.0 FSR in a streetwall form that addresses the street as well as achieving high levels of livability. It provides a good model for achieving maximum density without going to a tower form. He seconded the motion of approval and noted he will exercise his authority in the by-law to approve the height and unit sizes indicated in the application.

#### Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 410284, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated July 5, 2006, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1 to add, after "Social Planning" *and the Vancouver Police Department*;

Amend 1.2 to add, after "24/7 basis": *and based on the client need*, and to amend the end of the last sentence to read: *to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Community Services with advice from the Directors of Social Planning and Housing Centre*;

Amend the Note to Applicant in A.1.1 to add:  
*The applicant should investigate the development of a minimum maintenance green roof concept on all roof areas not being used for terraces*;

Amend A.1.2 to add, after "second floor patio": *with design development to include CPTED principles*;

Amend A.1.3 to add a Note to Applicant to read:  
*Consideration should be given to glass canopies.*;

Amend A.1.5 to add, after "measured", *to*.

#### 3. 287 DAVIE STREET - YALETOWN STATION - DE410450 - ZONE CD-1 (FOR ADVICE)

Applicant: InTransit BC

Request: To construct a rapid transit station with an at grade entry and below grade platforms and guideway.

Mr. Scobie noted that this proposal is before the Board for advice in accordance with the Access Agreement between the City and Canada Line Rapid Transit Inc. The Board has previously provided advice on the proposed station at 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, West King Edward, West 41<sup>st</sup> and West 49<sup>th</sup> Avenues.

#### Development Planner's Opening Comments

Anita Molaro, Rapid Transit Office, presented this proposal for the fifth Canada Line station to be reviewed by the Board, noting that staff have been working with CLCO and InTransit BC over the last two years on the alignment, station locations and station design. The City is also pursuing precinct planning around each of the stations and will be seeking a number of improvements to increase accessibility of the stations. The City will undertake detailed planning and land use review around each station as part of the station area planning, which is expected to begin next year. Ms. Molaro briefly reviewed the background of the project and the terms of the Access Agreement, referring to the Staff Committee Report dated July 5, 2006. Input from the Urban Design Panel was provided at a workshop at the early public consultation level.

The subject station comprises three components. The station entry house is located at the south end of Bill Curtis Plaza with an entry onto Davie Street and to the southwest towards the lane. The second component is an exit stair volume comprising two exits, one for the station and one for the parkade below. The third component is a relocated elevator for the parkade. The station itself is a centre platform configuration with the ticketing functions located one level below the street. At the southerly end of Bill Curtis Plaza the existing brick and timber structure which serves as the entry to the parkade below is to be replaced with the new station entry house. This is designed as a stand-alone structure with an inclined roof referencing the historic dock canopies in the area. The proposed system-wide material of frameless glazing and glass elevator will provide a high degree of transparency along with the metal canopies providing weather protection.

Referring to the Staff Committee Report, Ms. Molaro briefly reviewed the recommended conditions, noting the report generally reflects the ongoing discussions and arrangements with staff. With further design development to strengthen the uniqueness of this station within the system and the recommendations provided for the parkade structure, staff support the application.

#### Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. Judd regarding the parkade, Ms. Molaro advised there will be a net loss of 14 spaces overall.

Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding the exiting trees in Bill Curtis Plaza. Ms. Molaro explained there were six trees on the Mainland side, three of which have already been removed. One replacement tree will be planted, reducing the total number of trees on Mainland to four. There are five existing trees on the lane side of the plaza. Three will be retained and one replacement added for a total of four.

Ms. Forbes Roberts questioned the necessity to remove the existing brick and timber structure (the "folly") in Bill Curtis Plaza. Ms. Molaro advised its retention was considered but public feedback was that it did not necessarily need to be replicated provided the new station house was in the style of Yaletown. There was support for the proposed design.

In response to a question from Mr. Shearing regarding condition 1.4, Ms. Molaro said there may be an opportunity to bring more daylight to the concourse level once the structural issues within the station have been worked out.

With respect to the question of the permanence of this station as opposed to some other stations, Ms. Molaro explained that some of the other stations have overbuild potential whereas this station will stand alone.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie in reflecting Board concerns with the four previous Canada Line stations, there was discussion about placement of the ventilation grilles. Donny Wong, Engineer - Rapid Transit Office advised they are currently shown between the curb and the sidewalk on the other side of Davie Street. He noted there has been a preference to keep them away from storefronts as well as a need to consider drainage and loading. The applicant added the vents are not permitted in the street due to the potential for fuel spillage. Some discussion ensued about the problems associated with placing them in the sidewalk and alternatives that might be considered, including incorporation into a potential pedestrian bulge. The applicant was asked to elaborate in his presentation.

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

Graham McGarva, Architect, briefly reviewed the architectural issues, noting the imperatives of the Canada Line identity together with an appropriate response to the Yaletown context. He briefly described the design rationale.

Chris McCarthy, InTransit BC, noted there is a landscape architect on the design team for this station. The final placement of trees is still being worked out and the elevator housing in the plaza needs to be carefully considered to ensure existing trees are not damaged. In response to the discussion on the vents, Mr. McCarthy briefly described the "push-pull" system used to deal with ventilation and smoke extraction in the case of fire. He noted the small footprint of the station presents some challenges with little room to maneuver in terms of ventilation grille location, size or dimensions. While they can look at placing the vents in a pedestrian bulge a little further out into the street there is no ability to shift them significantly.

#### **Questions/Discussion**

Mr. Judd sought clarification on the exiting for the parkade. Bob Macdonald, Senior Parking Policy Engineer, briefly reviewed the proposed arrangement and noted there have been some security issues associated with this parkade that need to be resolved. He explained it is not just an emergency exit.

Mr. Scott asked what consideration had been given to treatment of the sidewalk. Mr. McCarthy said it will likely be replaced with existing City standard sidewalk material. Treatment around the entrance will be explored with staff. Allen Parker, InTransit BC, added they intend to work with City staff to accommodate what is reasonable in terms of landscaping and trees, noting that trees do not tolerate being very close to vents. There is also potential conflict with a bus stop that will need to be considered. In discussion, Mr. Beasley expressed some concern about the use of different sidewalk treatments.

Ms. Nystedt questioned having only an Up escalator given our aging population. Edward Leflufy, Canada Line Rapid Transit Inc., said the proposal is consistent with current North American standards. As well, there is a strong commitment to safety and it is believed the elevators in the stations provide the safest means of vertical travel with capacity for the number of people anticipated.

**Comments from other Speakers**

Albert Thompson, 283 Davie Street, did not support condition 1.4 regarding the location of the parkade exit and elevator. He said he understood it was to be located on the Mainland side of the street rather than the lane, as recommended by the neighbourhood advisory committee. He added he was also generally concerned that more of Bill Curtis Plaza space is being taken up by structures.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, Mr. Thompson explained the existing problems with access to Mr. Thompson's building's parkade and they do not want to add opportunity for further congestion in the lane. Ms. Molaro explained a number of options for the site plan were considered in the consultation process. She agreed that at one time the elevator was illustrated closer to the Mainland property line but through design development was located in the planted area in response to the desire of the community to preserve as much as possible of the open space of the plaza. Mr. Wong said he did not believe the lane to be a major desire line for people coming out of the parkade.

Lesley Adams, Yaletown resident, noted she has attended the community consultation meetings. She was concerned that decisions are being made only from an engineering point of view and urged that consideration be given to long term integration with Pacific Boulevard and the Roundhouse, possibly through complementing signage. In response to a request for clarification regarding the number of station exits, Mr. McGarva described the exiting arrangements and confirmed there are two means of egress from the concourse level.

**Panel Opinion**

Ms. Long said the Urban Design Panel would be generally supportive of the Staff Committee's recommended conditions with the possible exception of 1.7. She strongly supported the condition to reflect a stronger Yaletown character in this station and stressed that the City will need to pursue development of the public realm around the station. With respect to 1.7, she appreciated the need for continuity but with the amount of grating in the sidewalk and associated limited opportunity for street trees she was concerned that it will result in a rather hostile and atypical streetscape. She suggested that where engineering infrastructure impedes the public realm, the public realm should be enhanced to lessen the impact.

Mr. Shearing expressed disappointment that the continuity of the design for the Canada Line is overriding the need to integrate into neighbourhoods and provide a good public realm. He urged that, given the importance of Yaletown as a historic area of the city, the above-grade structure be reconsidered. He said the City parkade is a very important public facility in Yaletown and it is a mistake to take the most expedient approach. The stairwell must be moved over to the elevator shaft to unify the two pieces both in how they function internally and how they express themselves at ground level. He strongly supported the decision to move the structures away from the flow of the plaza into the landscaped areas. Mr. Shearing noted the sidewalk grilles have been an ongoing issue with the Canada Line stations and compromises have been made in all the locations to date. It is particularly unfortunate for this station because Davie Street is a main connector to the waterfront and the West End, with considerable foot traffic. The amount of area they take up on the sidewalk will not provide a good pedestrian experience. He urged that careful consideration be given to alternative placement of the grilles and stressed the need to be inventive and less utilitarian in the approach taken.

Mr. Scott was surprised there was not more public input at this meeting and he commended the applicant and staff for working to satisfy the concerns of the neighbours. He supported the recommended conditions. With respect to 1.7, he urged that some solution be sought for

dealing with the vents, possibly incorporating them into street furniture or planters. Any reduction in the impact of the vents should be sought in this location which has high levels of pedestrian traffic. He generally supported the proposal.

Ms. Nystedt appreciated the public consultation process that has taken place. She urged that issues that have arisen on this and previously reviewed stations are carried through as areas for attention in subsequent stations. She supported the conditions and reiterated her concern about the need to take into consideration the aging population and people with limited mobility. She added that while mass transit is, by definition, a sustainable initiative it is also important that the structures themselves exhibit and maintain sustainability principles.

Mr. Braun stressed the importance of condition 1.1, noting he failed to see any Yaletown essence in the current design. With respect to sidewalk treatment, Mr. Braun said he agreed with Ms. Long that the occasional unique solution to a unique area is not necessarily a bad thing.

### Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley noted there was considerable discussion with the community about where this station should be located. At the outset most residents were unhappy with the location but ultimately concurred after all the alternatives were shown to be unsuitable. The important aspects of the scheme were identified as keeping the station house as small as possible, out of the streets, and to not destroy Bill Curtis Plaza. The community was also concerned that exiting from the parkade and the station be resolved as to not adversely impact the Plaza.

Mr. Beasley said he believed the proposal is very close to addressing all these issues, with some exceptions. A major disappointment is that the station entry house, which was promised to be very close to the existing "folly" in its architectural treatment, is neither consistent with the folly nor the architecture of this historic area. He urged that it be redesigned, and he recommended strengthening condition 1.1 in this regard. Mr. Beasley said everything possible should be done to save the existing trees and he appreciated that the current design saves most of them. He expressed the hope that any replacement trees are large caliper specimens (5 - 7 inches) to be similar in scale to those existing. He said he appreciated that the pavilions are a good solution and are in the right location because on the Mainland side they would intrude on the open space and usability of the plaza. However, they do need more care and attention, possibly with landscaping at the top or incorporation into the public art. He urged the design team to consult with the artist to find a good resolution. In general, he thought the condition about the new location for the stairs to the parking was appropriate but it should not occur at the expense of the existing trees. Mr. Beasley did not support condition 1.2 and thought the plaza paving could be confused with glass block, with little benefit in terms of additional daylighting below. The main objective should be to maintain the integrity of the plaza. With respect to the vents in the sidewalk on the other side of Davie Street, Mr. Beasley said he was persuaded they have to be near the proposed location but suggested advantage be taken of the bulge and try to move them off the main pedestrian circulation route if possible. He moved support of the application and made a number of amendments to the conditions.

Mr. Judd supported Mr. Beasley's motion. With respect to the parking exit he said it is his understanding that it is not just an emergency exit. It should be located to improve wayfinding and reduce the number of lost parking spaces. He recognized the concern about the trees and urged that careful attention be paid to finding a good solution. He noted there may not be much option for the vents but suggested they might incorporate some public art while recognizing the need to leave enough space for people to walk around them. Use of the bulge might also be explored.

Ms. Forbes-Roberts supported the motion, particularly with respect to condition 1.1. She stressed the importance of responding to the Yaletown character issues.

**Motion**

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

THAT the Board support Development Application No. 410284, offering advice to InTransit BC in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated July 5, 2006, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.1 to read:

*design development of form and materials of the station entry house to reflect a stronger, distinct Yaletown character reminiscent of the existing elevator pavilion folly as contrasted with the other stations along the Canada Line; and*

Add to the Note to Applicant in 1.1:

*Provision of large scaled elevations and sections demonstrating high quality materials and detailing is required.*

Delete 1.2;

Amend 1.4 to add, after "parkade elevator": *provided this does not endanger an existing tree;*

Amend Condition 1.8 to read:

*provision of a public art component with the station site and consideration of planted roof treatments of the stair elevator pavilions that are separate from the station entry house;*

Add 1.9:

*design development of the sidewalk on the southwest side of Davie Street to minimize impact of vents including consideration of the vents and perhaps integrated planters in a pedestrian bulge. This might include public art;*

Amend A.1.5 to read:

*design development to minimize removal of existing trees and to ensure that new or replacement trees have sufficient caliper to fit with existing trees and have sufficient soil depths above underground structures;*

Delete A.2.6.

**4. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8.35 p.m.

---

C. Hubbard  
Raincoast Ventures

---

F. Scobie  
Chair