

**Date:** Monday, July 7, 2003  
**Time:** 3.00 p.m.  
**Place:** Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

---

**PRESENT:****Board**

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

**Advisory Panel**

S. Lyon Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
E. Mah Representative of Development Industry  
D. Chung Representative of General Public  
T. Durning Representative of General Public  
C. Henschel Representative of General Public

**Regrets**

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

**ALSO PRESENT:**

B. Adair Development Planner  
J. Barrett Development Planner  
V. Potter Project Facilitator  
A. Higginson Project Facilitator  
T. Brunette Heritage Planner  
K. Mulji Projects Engineer

**900 Main Street**

H. Hatch H.R. Hatch Architects  
P. Newell Ballenas Project Management

**651 Expo Boulevard**

J. Cheng James K.M. Cheng Architects  
B. Steinberg James K.M. Cheng Architects  
P. Webb Concord Pacific  
D. Rogers Costco

**Clerk to the Board:** T. Dunlop

---

Call to order 3:10 p.m.

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 June 9, 2003 be approved.

2. **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

3. **900 MAIN STREETREET- DE407398 - ZONE FC-1  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

**Applicant:** H. R. Hatch Architects

**Request:** To undertake exterior and interior alterations to the existing heritage building and change the use to restaurant, and to construct a six to nine storey, mixed use commercial/residential building, to include 59 dwelling units and three levels of underground parking.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

The Development Planner, Bob Adair, reviewed the site context and application, with the aid of a model. The proposal is to retain and restore significant portions of the building and change its use to restaurant/commercial. Mixed use is proposed for the southern portion of the site with retail at the base and 8 storeys of residential units. There is also a stepped back 6-storey building. Due to residential windows on the north façade of the American Hotel, the Applicant has created a pull back from the adjacent site with proposal of a courtyard to allow light and space.

At the June 26, 2003 meeting, Council approved the heritage status of the former bank building and increased the FSR, plus other relaxations on height and maximum retail frontage, via a Heritage Revitalization Agreement. Registration is required prior to DE issuance, as detailed in the preamble to the motion presented in the Staff Committee Report.

It was noted that staff support the proposal in principle and agree with the general massing as submitted. There are concerns however, regarding the streetscape and parking. Also, the expression of the principal building could be improved with stronger identification and more detail relative to the two new buildings proposed for the site. Condition 1.1 asks for simpler expression and the Note to Applicant suggests deletion of the 2 storey concrete base, which confuses the connection to the heritage building. Condition 1.2 asks for further detailed expression on the Station Street façade. Part of that would look at a 2-storey base and promote separate but compatible identities for the 2 structures. Also suggested is the addition of a screen wall to mediate between the 9-storey building and the 3-storey American Hotel. The loading bay off Station Street has a negative impact on the pedestrian experience. Staff recommends deletion of the loading bay. Loading from the street (on the Prior Street side) would provide the easiest loading access through the entrance shown. This then results in a narrowing of opening in the façade and improves the pedestrian experience in this area, as required in Condition 1.10.

Condition 1.5 requires ground elevation changes along Station Street. By deleting the concrete base, an additional 1ft 6ins is provided. Also, staff further suggested two storey bay windows and planting on City property could improve the pedestrian experience.

Condition 1.6 relates to the 9-storey structure. Glazing of adjacent buildings should more comfortably fit with the heritage building. Also, as a note to applicant, it was suggested that the amount of glazing on the area backing onto American Hotel be expanded.

Parking is referred to in condition 1.9. Currently, plans indicate a reduction in parking spaces to 66, but staff recommend 73 spaces on the basis of emerging standards for eastside residential buildings. However, it is not possible to excavate below the heritage building. This therefore means excavating under the rear portion of the former bank site, which would then provide the required number of parking spaces. Condition 1.7, regarding landscaping is in accordance with the proposed plan.

#### Questions/Discussion:

Mr. Lyon queried the matter of how garbage collection is handled. Mr. Adair advised that collection is via the basement level of the heritage building where there is an enclosure with dumpsters that may be wheeled up to street level.

Mr. Beasley referred to the interior of the heritage building and questioned whether the heritage requirements also relate to the kitchen. Mr. Brunette, Heritage Planner, advised that the kitchens would be located in the southeast corner of the heritage building, formerly occupied by the tellers' cages, and would meet requirements. A high degree of heritage integrity remains in the interior of the building, with significant portions of the original floors and tiles. There would also be no adverse impact on the substantially intact ceiling. Mr. Beasley also questioned the Development Planner on the number of seemingly deterministic conditions on architecture and the degree of staff's commitments to those conditions. Mr. Adair responded that the Urban Design Panel supported lowering the concrete base (condition 1.1) and staff also considered the expression of glazing on the building to be an important general condition (1.6), since it forms a "backdrop".

Mr. Beasley expressed difficulty with the latter condition and doubted the public value of another design change. Regarding the former condition (1.1), Mr. Beasley also questioned the public value of intruding into such an architectural issue. Mr. Adair replied that staff believed the best approach was to achieve a separate expression of three recognisable elements on the site, which would be less likely to overwhelm the heritage building. The Urban Design Panel and staff considered the proposed level of concrete would tend to merge the heritage building with the adjacent developments and by making the juncture more distinct, an identity of masses would result in greater prominence for the heritage building.

Regarding the amount of glazing on the 9-storey building, Mr. Adair maintained that it might overwhelm the heritage building and staff therefore proposed that it be toned down in terms of reflection, for both day and night conditions. Mr. Beasley then queried possible use of the roof of the heritage building. Mr. Adair advised that the heritage requirements include retention of the original wooden structure, which would be unable to bear the additional weight involved in any active use. It was therefore proposed to possibly treat the roof either with coloured gravel or low-level landscaping.

Mr. MacGregor raised the issue of possible relaxation of the loading requirements off Station Street. The Chair suggested this might be achieved by deletion of the note under A.2.4 if the Board were willing to consider a relaxation to zero. Mr. MacGregor also questioned how landscaping would be maintained and was advised that Landscape Condition A.1.9, tabled in a memorandum dated July 7, 2003 from Mr. Bob Adair, addresses the issue. The memorandum advises of an amendment to delete

Condition 1.7 and replace it with the new condition, A.1.9. Mr. MacGregor further noted that under Condition 1.9, the Note to Applicant states that up to four parking spaces will be allowed for residents' visitors. Following discussion of the implications for commercial use, it was suggested that of the 11 parking spaces allocated for commercial tenants and visitors, a maximum number should be assigned to commercial tenants and the remaining spaces allowed for visitor use.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding location of kitchen vents and exhausts and the possible visual and noise impacts on the adjacent buildings, Mr. Adair advised that there will be a vent shaft located in the corner of the 9-storey building. This will allow exhaust and odours to be vented to the roof of the 9-storey building. Mr. Scobie suggested that the applicant might wish to comment on the proposed at-grade planting beds along the Main Street frontage. This was in view of the suggested use of outside spaces for restaurant seating and possible site constraints if landscaping is also included. Mr. Adair commented that because the heritage building is set back, there would be sufficient room for both landscaping and outdoor restaurant seating.

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

Mr. Peter Newell advised that he foresaw use of the former bank building as a medium-scale restaurant, including some street use of tables and chairs to promote the idea of "taking back the street." This would be conditional upon the Engineering Services' agreement on the number of tables and umbrellas. Landscaping would be beneficial in two particular areas by protecting the face of the building, which would discourage graffiti. There had been a certain degree of concern by the applicant that landscaping and shrubbery might also serve to screen drug transactions but ground level planting would offer less opportunity for such activity. With regard to the roof and ceiling, Mr. Newell noted that the wooden ceiling beams form part of the protected heritage structure and any use of the roof would detract from the original building, as it would require strengthening of the interior trusses. In terms of the relationships between the old and new buildings, positive meetings with staff over the previous eight months have resolved most issues and only a few details remain outstanding.

#### **Questions/Discussion**

Mr. Beasley and Mr. Rudberg both enquired whether the required 4 ft. landscaping beds would detract from the potential outdoor seating area and frustrate its use for restaurant purposes, noting that greater use of the area for restaurant purposes might discourage potential illegal activities and graffiti defacement. Mr. Beasley also recommended that staff add a condition with language directed towards the use of graffiti resistant materials in locations that might be vulnerable to such vandalism. In response, Mr. Newell advised that the details of the landscaping had not yet been worked out but the strip could be 4 ft. in depth in places and would therefore be unlikely to create any difficulty; however, additional space for restaurant use would be welcomed if this proved acceptable to Engineering Services.

The Chair acknowledge an a memorandum dated July 7, 2003 from Bob Adair, Development Planner, specifically referencing Appendix C, which was left out of the staff report in error. The appendix provides comments from the Processing Centre Building and Fire Rescue Services. In response to questions relative to elevator access requirements, Mr. Newell advised of ongoing discussions with staff on the comments and informed the Board that the requirements would not frustrate the proposal. In further response to the Chair's suggestions of possible occupancy delays due to the heritage requirements, Mr. Newell advised that it was intended to complete heritage restoration work as the first phase. Initially, the restored building would be used for sales and marketing purposes. In completing the heritage restoration first and its strata conversion, strata titling may then be applied for on the remaining residential component of the project.

### Comments from Other Speakers

No public comments on this application.

### Panel Opinion

Mr. Lyon advised that the Urban Design Panel was very supportive of the revitalization project, particularly retention of the existing bank building. The Panel's comments centred on specific issues and the way in which the heritage building is dealt with in the overall design. A number of approaches were possible and the applicant appeared to have chosen an historical approach that recalled the way streets were initially developed. Different property owners developed their sites according to their means and this led to an assemblage of a variety of building styles over time. The Panel considered the position that different exterior finishes might actually strengthen the overall appearance. It was suggested that this concept might be further clarified. It was noted that the entrances to townhouses fronting on Station Street might benefit from a prior-to condition that requires fencing or hedging to provide privacy for windows facing the sidewalk. Mr. Lyon concluded with advice that the Urban Design Panel's concerns were supported by the conditions put forward by staff.

Mr. Mah expressed his strong support for the project but suggested deletion of condition A.1.11. Mr. Henschel supported the project and acknowledged the preservation of the heritage building, which he suggested might be given more grace by lowering and segregating the concrete base of the adjacent building. Mr. Durning advised of his support for the project and the Chair noted that all Advisory Panel members supported the recommended changes.

### Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley concurred with the Advisory Panel's view supporting the revitalization of the area as a result of the development and retention of the heritage building. He characterised the area as a special and undiscovered place that is well treed and will be further enhanced if a social housing project succeeds in being developed on the opposite side of Station Street. Mr. Beasley suggested some of the conditions might be overly prescriptive and had some difficulties with notes that appeared to be too directive to the applicant. He further suggested a need for more flexibility relative to the architecture unless some aspect of the public interest was in jeopardy.

### Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 407398, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 25, 2003, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1 to read:

*design development to create a simpler, more distinct exterior expression for the six-storey portion of the new development with a clear interface to the historic building; Integrating the concrete base will result in setting back the first and second floors of the six-storey structure approximately 1'-6" from the north and east property lines, thereby matching the setback of the upper floors (see condition 1.5 below). A consistent guard treatment at the perimeter of the fifth floor level is also recommended;*

Delete the first two sentences of the Note to Applicant in 1.1;

Delete the first three words of the third sentence and replace with "Integrating";

Delete the first sentence of the **Note to Applicant** in 1.2 and replace with:  
*Detail development of the proposed concrete and glass façade is encouraged.*

Delete Condition 1.6 and the corresponding **Note to Applicant**;

Delete Condition 1.7 and the corresponding **Note to Applicant**;

Amend the **Note to Applicant** under Condition 1.9 by deletion of the words "the commercial spaces should be available for residential visitors at all times with no" and substituting the words "No more than seven of the commercial spaces shall be reserved for commercial tenants";

Delete A.1.11 and the corresponding **Note to Applicant**;

Amend the **Note to Applicant** under A.2.4 by deletion of the first sentence;

Add a new Condition (A.1.15) to read:

*design development to minimise the opportunity for graffiti on exterior surfaces and apply graffiti resistant coatings where appropriate.*

4. **651 EXPO BOULEVARD - DE407454 - ZONE CD-1  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

**Applicant:** James K.M. Cheng Architects

**Request:** To construct a mixed-use project consisting of: at the Expo Boulevard level - a commercial component ("Costco Wholesale" [Costco]) of approximately 144,725 sq.ft., with two levels of underground parking for 680 vehicles; and at the Georgia Street and Dunsmuir Street viaduct level - four residential towers (23, 26, 30 and 32 storeys in height), and two-storey townhouses, for a total of 900 dwelling units, with two levels of structured parking for 713 vehicles, including 23 vehicles associated with the Beatty Street Drill Hall. Total parking is for 1,393 stalls.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

The Development Planner, Jonathan Barrett, reviewed the application, which he described as a complex project. There had been considerable effort by the applicant and staff to bring the application forward. Mr. Barrett provided an overview of the project and its relationship to GM Place. Site access was approved at the rezoning stage. Council has also approved the form of development in principle. In April 2003, the Urban Design Panel expressed non-support, noting major concerns with the residential towers. The applicant returned to the Urban Design Panel with a revised design for the towers and subsequently received unanimous support. Mr. Barrett advised of a staff dilemma on how to proceed with the application, based on the first proposal. Discussion during the current meeting would therefore be based on the first proposal, plus 15 major design modifications and an additional change noted in the appendix to the staff report.

Initially, it was thought that the character of the residential towers was dull and that they were sited too close together, thereby affecting livability. The first four of the recommended conditions address the floor-plates, mechanical structures on the tower rooftops and changing the form and increasing the height of the two smaller towers. Other changes relate to materials and the introduction of colour into

the project. The fifth condition (1.5) more closely corresponds with the rezoning by increasing the amount of townhouses around the base of the entire project. Two conditions address the Costco façade and seek visual improvements to otherwise blank concrete walls. Visual improvements are sought for all of the façades below the Dunsmuir viaduct, where there is considerable pedestrian activity between Stadium Station and GM Place. Another condition deals with the issue regarding the need to better reflect the existing Beatty Street escarpment.

Mr. Barrett advised of the condition requiring the possible use of patterned surface materials to differentiate between the highly used public accesses between GM Place and BC Place and the cul-de-sac residential areas of the complex. It was also proposed that the applicant explore negotiations with TransLink and the City of Vancouver regarding possible landscaping of TransLink's adjacent property alongside Stadium Station. Both new and temporary walkways will need to be provided during every phase of the project and the applicant has been asked to address issues as they might affect the non-market housing project. The matter of density of the non-market housing, located between the (Beatty Street) Drill Hall and southside ramp, also needs to be addressed.

Engineering items relate specifically to site access and egress across traffic lanes at the Expo Boulevard junction. Condition 1.14 seeks a 3 m setback and this will be more fully explored between the applicant and the engineering department. An increase in the dimensions of the walkways to GM Place was proposed by widening from 2.4 m to a minimum of 4.5 m to accommodate the considerable pedestrian traffic to and from the area during major events.

Mr. Barrett concluded that public aspects of the project were challenging, exciting and positive, with several public open space areas and 23 additional parking spaces for the Armoury. It also "tamed" and pedestrianised a hitherto unsightly viaduct area that gives the impression of a hole in the city fabric.

#### Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley raised a concern relative to condition A.1.22, which requires an affordable housing agreement. This condition appeared superfluous since condition 1.12 already addresses this as a condition of the site's rezoning. In response, Alison Higginson, Project Facilitator, noted that the by-law was enacted quickly before the November 2002 civic elections. This rezoning condition was deferred and is therefore recommended as a condition prior to issuance of the development permit.

A further concern regarding the interface of the (Beatty Street) escarpment and the future non-market housing component was raised by Mr. Beasley. He suggested additional wording is required to 1.11 to address temporary treatment of the open/unbuilt portions of the site relative to the non-market housing component in the phasing plan.

Mr. MacGregor suggested extension of the date in B.1.2 of the Standard Notes to Applicant. The date of compliance with conditions by September 30, 2003 was probably unrealistic in view of the complexities of the project. Mr. MacGregor also noted concerns regarding the degree of separation and safety of pedestrian traffic from the townhouse patio areas along the suggested 3 m wide access route adjacent the viaducts. He suggested greater separation might be achieved by way of an easement or encroachment agreement. In discussion, the applicant noted that the patios are stepped back and elevated approximately 1m above the sidewalk.

Mr. Rudberg referred to the site plan and discussed the movement of patrons between GM Place and Stadium Station. Mr. Barrett noted the various alternative access routes and stair/elevator connections and advised that there was provision for future additional access at the cost of the applicant. Mr. Rudberg also questioned aspects of the resident access and Armoury parking spaces via the ramp and internal road system. The applicant noted current discussions regarding possible provision of Armoury

parking underneath the greenspace rather than access via the residents' internal road. However, the discussions involve negotiations with the federal government and will require additional time to complete.

Mr. Henschel questioned whether any thought had been given to eventual elimination of the viaducts, lowering Georgia and Dunsmuir Streets to ground level. If this occurred in the longer term, the question of the interface of the whole project would become much more relevant than present considerations allowed. Mr. Barrett responded that although there has been some discussion of this scenario, the challenges posed by the SkyTrain infrastructure and GM Place access made such a major change unlikely in the foreseeable future. The Chair observed that Council has approved the project in principle and discussion of this scenario should therefore be considered academic.

Mr. Beasley raised the issue of pedestrian access to Costco from the Georgia/Beatty Street side and suggested that consideration be given to encouraging access more directly from the downtown area.

Mr. Mah questioned the methodology for determining Costco's parking requirements and how reductions had been achieved. Karima Mulji, Projects Engineer, noted that several incentives would be used to encourage employee car pools, and to use innovative approaches such as special carts within a four-block area and a pilot home-delivery project. These measures would reduce the overall parking requirements and reinforce policies designed to reduce automobile dependency. The Chair also suggested consideration of a change to the bicycle parking requirements, which are currently lower for wholesale than retail outlets.

The Chair questioned the treatment of the Costco façades and was advised by Mr. Barrett that Staff Committee believed they did not need to be markedly changed other than as addressed in Conditions 1.6 and 1.7. In discussion, some Board members expressed their concerns regarding the visual impacts and suggested they required further consideration with more articulation of the architecture along the major city access route.

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

James Cheng, Architect provided response and commentary on the project. He suggested the façade along Expo Boulevard should be considered in the same manner as any other city street. The Costco building is opposite the GM Place loading bay and underneath the viaduct but it will serve as a first piece in setting a new standard. The False Creek study suggested widening of the sidewalk on the southside of the boulevard and with the use of glass and landscaping, the Costco building will stimulate visual penetration of a presently dull area. Concord Development has transferred \$250,000 from its public art fund to enhance the escarpment area and connections to the plaza level. This might include a large, industrial-type canopy above the viaduct level that will illustrate the different character of the plaza. The applicants were in full agreement with staff and will cooperate to improve and further refine the Costco façade.

Peter Webb advised that there had been considerable thought to the phasing of the project and it was proposed to build it as a single, continuous project. The only question on phasing relates to the adjacent non-market housing site and issues remain under discussion regarding its temporary use for construction activities.

With regard to concerns about the patio setbacks for the townhouses, Mr. Cheng noted that the areas are set back substantially further than the property line and he compared the treatment of the intermediate zone with Marathon Realty's development of patios fronting the Seawall walkway around Coal Harbour. Mr. Cheng also advised of major changes now proposed to the floor-plates of the towers

which were now slimmer, and addition of townhouses along all public street sides, which improves the overall pedestrian scale.

In response to a question from the Chair regarding any difficulties with the conditions put forward by staff, Mr. Cheng suggested making arrangements for installation of a traffic signal at the southerly exit from the site, rather than attempting to comply with the 65m (215 ft.) unobstructed sight distance stipulated in 1.13. He also agreed that extension of the September 30, 2003 date contained in B.1.2 would allow more time to complete discussions with staff. Mr. Rudberg advised his department would be amenable to amending sight distance conditions or other alternatives, provided that tree planting does not unduly obstruct visibility. Mr. Cheng also responded to the Chair's question by advising that there were no difficulties relative to Appendix C, affecting the fundamental design of the project.

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

No public comments

#### **Panel Opinion**

Mr. Lyon reported that the Urban Design Panel reviewed the application twice and suggested that the design form and comments offered at its first review had been given without knowledge that Council had already approved the project's form of development in principle at the rezoning stage. In its second review, the Panel expressed concerns regarding the townhouse form, the Expo Boulevard terrace and gateway nature of the project. In response to a challenge to bring the street level down to Expo Boulevard from the viaducts, the applicant had proposed a stairway down to the Costco store entrance. The applicant also made considerable improvements to the towers with the application of colour and changes to the massing of the buildings. The Urban Design Panel subsequently unanimously approved the project.

Mr. Mah expressed his support for the project and extending the date under B.1.2 to January 30, 2004. He also suggested provision of additional access and egress to Costco at the Georgia/Beatty Streets location. Mr. Durning advised he would prefer that the project be more transit friendly. Mr. Henschel expressed satisfaction with the location of the site for "bog box retail" and supported Mr. Mah's comments about additional access to Costco. He praised the commendable refinements proposed by the applicant, particularly with respect to the towers.

#### **Board Discussion**

Mr. MacGregor observed that the project had undergone a detailed rezoning process and questions similar to some of those raised by the Advisory Panel and other Board members were also brought up previously. The project highlights the potential for other wholesaling opportunities in the downtown area. Although a secondary entrance to Costco might be desirable, he did not believe it is in the purview of the Board to make such determination given Council's approval in principle of the form of development and conditions it established. The site access would also be improved by addition of another bus line or streetcar.

Mr. Beasley commented that the project is very innovative and works well in promoting good urbanism. He remained troubled by the Expo Boulevard façade but expressed confidence that the applicants would work to address the concerns and improve the architectural articulation. Mr. Beasley also expressed discomfort with the generality of the colours and suggested they should be more "gutsy" and robust. As well, he was concerned about other aspects of the project, commenting that more detail was expected by this stage. Finally, Mr. Beasley encouraged staff to bring any difficulties back to the Board for further guidance.

Mr. Rudberg observed that the difficulties of the site from a number of perspectives and he noted the significant interface between the public and private realms. If the applicants were able respond to the challenge to allow more direct access to Costco from the downtown side, the Board would support a solution. However, he was also cognizant that this should not be a mandatory requirement. Mr. MacGregor ~~commented~~ ~~voiced his concern~~ regarding the access to Costco from the downtown area and he suggested that the Board not involve itself in details of the business operation. Costco has a standard design format for security and control purposes that provides for only a single access and egress point in its stores.

The Chair expressed concern with the project, noting that an unprecedented 8½ pages of items remained outstanding, as expressed in the Appendices A and B conditions recommended by staff. He suggested that the project might have been more appropriately dealt with as a preliminary application. The timelines for Board review and approval appeared to be driven by the developer and Costco. Although he was anxious about the extent of the Board's actions in considering approval of the application in its current state, the Chair also noted that he was confident that this applicant and the site owner would deliver a high quality development.

Mr. MacGregor observed that many of the issues and concerns noted by the Chair were dealt with during the rezoning process. Mr. Beasley advised that he was unaware of the applicant's timing issues and business commitments to Costco and that he was more concerned about the quality of their decisions. Mr. Rudberg thanked Mr. Barrett for the amount of detail presented and, in turn, Mr. Barrett acknowledged and thanked the staff involved for their considerable efforts in getting this project to this meeting of the Board, given the issues needing attention.

#### Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 407454, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated June 11, 2003, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.4 with addition of an item under the **Note to Applicant** to read:

*Glazing is to be very clear and transparent.*

Amend 1.6 to read:

*design development to the north and south Costco facades and adjacent areas to substantially improve their visual character and the adjacent environment.*

Delete 1.7 and replace with a new 1.7 to read:

*design development of the easterly Expo Boulevard-facing façade of the Costco and above-grade parking to: fully screen the above-grade parking; further evolve the vertical landscaped wall to more strongly reflect the original Beatty Street escarpment; to articulate the architecture; and bring more pedestrian interest all along the sidewalk;*

Add a Note to Applicant under 1.10, to read:

*This condition is not to delay issuance of the development permit*

Amend 1.11 to read:

*design development to provide a phasing plan that addresses all aspects of all proposed phasing including, among other things, temporary treatment of unbuilt/open portions of the site and the future non-market housing site and access systems;*

Amend 1.13 to read:

*design development to provide adequate unobstructed sight distance, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, as measured from the outbound lane at the southerly exit from the site onto Expo Boulevard and to confirm that the tree planting proposed does not obstruct the visibility for motorists exiting the site;*

Amend 1.14 to read:

*design development to delete the portion of the elevated (residential) parking structure encroaching into the 3m (10 ft.) Dunsmuir Viaduct "buffer zone", as required by the General Manager of Engineering Services;*

Delete the Note to Applicant in 1.14;

Amend 1.15 to read:

*design development of the permanent viaduct walkways to match, at a minimum, the width of the existing temporary viaduct walkways, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services;*

Amend A.1.11 by removing the last sentence from the Note to Applicant and adding it to the main condition, which then reads:

*provide separate Class A bicycle spaces for wholesale use and 6 Class B bicycle spaces for each residential tower and provide Class B bicycle spaces for wholesale use, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services;*

Amend A.2.19 by deletion of second sentence in the Note to Applicant under item (o);

Amend A.2.25 by addition of the words "arrangements to" prior to the words "provide a traffic signal...";

Amend A.2.26 to read:

*provide details of a pilot project to assist Costco members who choose to walk to the store, including provision of shopping carts, wagons and other pedestrian-serving conveniences, and of a Costco delivery service, all to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services;*

Amend A.2.27 to read:

*make arrangements, to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services and the General Manager of Engineering Services, to revise the existing viaduct agreements to be more consistent with more recent agreements (e.g., Cambie Bridge) to allow for the encroachments into the 3m buffer zone as accepted by the General Manager of Engineering Services (Costco parking structure), including provisions to ensure that any costs associated with temporary removal of encroaching structures, would be the responsibility of the owners of the building;*

Add a new condition (A.2.35) to read:

*arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services and General Manager of Engineering Services, for use of portions of City-owned Lot C Block 49 District Lot 541 Plan LMP42064, for Drill Hall oversized vehicle parking. This may include the modification of competing charges and interests;*

Amend B.1.2 by deleting the date September 30, 2003 substituting January 30, 2004;

**Motion**

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

THAT the Board add the following condition to its approval of Development Application No. 407454:

New condition (1.16):

*give consideration to provide additional, more direct pedestrian access from the Georgia/Beatty intersection to the Costco store.*

**5. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
T. Dunlop  
Clerk to the Board

\_\_\_\_\_  
F. Scobie  
Chair

Q:\Clerical\DPB\Minutes\2003\jul7.wpd