

Date: Monday, June 5, 2006  
Time: 3:00 p.m.  
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

**PRESENT:****Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)  
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager  
T. French Assistant Director of Planning  
T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

**Advisory Panel**

M. Long Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
R. Acton Representative of the Design Professions  
N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry (not present for 650 W. 41st Ave.)  
M. Braun Representative of the General Public  
D. Chung Representative of the General Public (not present for 760 Pacific Blvd.)  
K. Hung Representative of the General Public  
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public

**Regrets**

J. Scott Representative of the Development Industry  
R. Keate Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

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

A. Molaro Development Planner  
C. Robertson Planner, Rapid Transit Office  
D. Wong Engineer, Rapid Transit Office  
R. Jenkins Asst. Director - Current Planning  
A. Higginson Project Facilitator  
M. Lee Social Planner  
M. Thomson City Surveyor

**510 West 41st Avenue (Oakridge/41st Avenue Station)****499 West 49th Avenue (Langara/49th Avenue Station)****4099 Cambie Street (King Edward Station)**

A. Parker InTransit BC  
C. McCarthy InTransit BC  
E. Lefluffy Canada Line Rapid Transit Inc. (CLCO)  
N. Hotson Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden Architects

**760 Pacific Boulevard**

J. Cahill Paragon Gaming Inc.  
G. Cadman Boughton Law Corporation

Recording Secretary: D. Kempton  
\*C. Hubbard, Raincoast Ventures

\*Not present at the meeting. Minutes composed from notes and audio recording.

1. MINUTES

None.

## 2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

### Canada Line Stations - Background

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, prefaced her presentation of the three Canada Line stations under consideration today with a brief overview of the Canada Line project to date. She noted that beyond the extent of each station site the City will be pursuing a number of improvements in the areas referred to as station precincts. These improvements will increase accessibility of the stations by including connections for pedestrians, cyclists and transit transfers, and will support each station's fit into its neighbourhood. Following a precinct planning process, the City will undertake a more detailed plan and land use review around each station. In 2003, City Council established design principles for rapid transit projects, and authorized access to city streets and lands to Translink. In accordance with the Access Agreement between the City and CLCO, no building or development permits are required for transit related infrastructure. The stations are dealt with through a Design Advisory Process.

The three stations being considered today also impact the Cambie heritage boulevard (central median). Changes to this boulevard, either temporary or permanent, are administered through a Heritage Alteration Permit process. To facilitate construction and temporary changes, four amendments have been made to the boulevard to date through this process.

## 3. 510 WEST 41st AVENUE - DE410358 - ZONE CD-1 (FOR ADVICE)

Applicant: Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden

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

### Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ms. Molaro described the subject station location, access and ticketing and noted there will be knockout panels at the concourse level to provide for future below-grade connections to Oakridge Centre or to the north side of West 41st Avenue for transit transfers. This station is also required to anticipate future expansion of Oakridge Centre.

Referring to the Development Permit Staff Committee report dated May 24, 2006, Ms. Molaro reviewed the recommendations of the Committee and advised they reflect the ongoing discussions between City staff and CLCO. The recommendation is for support of the proposal, with the advice and comments provided.

### Questions/Discussion

Ms. Nystedt requested clarification with respect to the proposed knockout panels. Ms. Molaro explained there is one below grade and its future connection will be determined in the Oakridge planning exercise regarding the mall expansion, and a second which would service transit transfers to the north side of West 41st Avenue. This connection will not occur until the properties are developed. As well, depending on other development opportunities, a third connection to the east could also be incorporated.

Mr. Timm noted the below-track crossover at this station results in a circuitous route to get to the other platform, which emphasizes the importance of having a future entrance on the east side of Cambie Street. He questioned whether the requested knockout panel is sufficient to allow this to occur and how feasible it would be in terms of fare paid zones and ticketing, etc. Ms. Molaro said the knockout panel is the short-term provision and ultimately there is need to accommodate an entry hall and fare paid zone within the future development site.

Mr. Timm questioned whether the vents on the median could be centred, and whether those on the east side sidewalk could be moved away from the curb in order to have a more continuous edge to the sidewalk. The applicant was asked to address this in his presentation.

In response to a question from Ms. French regarding the trees in the boulevard, Chris Robertson, Planner, Rapid Transit Office, advised that some trees will be impacted by the station box construction; however, with the exception of those at the vent locations, the trees will be replaced, with no net loss.

Ms. Long questioned whether this station is considered to be temporary until the Oakridge expansion proceeds. Ms. Molaro said that a form of development has not yet been established for the expansion but there are a number of options that could be considered for this particular corner and the goal is to allow as much flexibility as possible. The below grade portion is fixed.

Mr. Scobie sought clarification regarding responsibility for dismantling or removal of the above grade station house when Oakridge Centre is expanded. Ms. Molaro advised CLCO will obtain the property rights from Ivanhoe Cambridge. The City is seeking provision in the agreement between those two parties to allow, as the expansion design evolves, for the ability to modify the station house in a way that meets the City's objectives for that frontage.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding the Access Agreement, Ms. Molaro confirmed that it does provide the ability to contract out of any or all City approval requirements under the Vancouver Charter, however, the City has retained the obligation for the Heritage Alteration Permit requirements.

Mr. Scobie requested the applicant to provide some commentary on the standard Engineering recommendations that are common to all three stations being considered today (i.e., security rationale for the exhaust/intake grilles, visual connectivity between the concourse and platform level, and garbage and recycling storage space, etc.).

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

Norm Hotson, Architect, provided a brief overview of all three stations. He noted the Urban Design Panel emphasized that all the effort should be put on the underground because the above grade portion will not be permanent. He briefly described the design rationale, noting they have tried to create a family approach to the architecture and to keep it simple.

The applicant team responded to the recommendations in the report that are common to all three stations and confirmed concurrence with 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, 1.5, 1.6 and 1.9.

With respect to the recommendations in Appendix A and B, Edward Lefluffy, CLCO, advised their understanding is that, in the spirit of the Access Agreement, they will agree to respond to the recommendations, not necessarily to meet them.

Regarding A.1.5, Mr. Hotson noted that having the elevator exterior to the station house was, in large part, to allow the station house to be smaller than it might otherwise be. The location of the elevator was determined by the functional plan; if it is internalized in a larger station it creates an unacceptable dead-end condition to get to the elevator. He noted the roof of the station house cantilevers to the edge of the elevator to provide weather protection.

Commenting on A.1.6, Mr. Lefluffy noted that experience on the Skytrain line has been that multi-purpose rooms with windows have been a problem from an operational point of view, but it can be reviewed. With respect to A.1.9, Mr. Lefluffy confirmed a security rationale will be provided, but noting that no specific provisions were included in the conditions set by GVTA. In discussion on this recommendation, Ms. Molaro noted that Police representative on the technical review team wanted clarification as to whether noxious fumes can be removed from the system. Mr. McCarthy advised they will provide a written response.

Mr. MacGregor raised a question about the location of the vents. Mr. McCarthy explained the design of the tunnel ventilation system is very complex and the configuration of fans and shafts has been carefully considered for each station type. All six vents are required and the two vents on the east side of Cambie Street are needed because it is a side-by-side station. In response to Mr. Timm's earlier question, Mr. McCarthy said the vents in the median cannot be centred but they can look at pulling them away slightly from the curb. Mr. Timm said he would like to see a 3 ft. separation between the curb and the vents. Mr. McCarthy said that they have tried to keep the main sidewalk free of vents on all the Cambie stations.

In response to a question from Ms. Nystedt regarding heating and ventilation, Mr. McCarthy advised the trains will draw air through the tunnel and ventilate the stations. The stations will be unheated.

With respect to A.1.10, Alan Parker, InTransit, said it will be looked at in design development but noted it could potentially increase the size of the station with attendant cost considerations, as well as potentially impact ventilation, particularly under emergency conditions.

Mr. LeFluffy advised recommendation A.2.6 is a problem for CLCO because Translink's current policy is not to install bicycle ramps in public stairs, although this policy is under review by GVTA. In response to a question from Mr. Timm, he confirmed the City should deal directly with GVTA if the City wants to see a change in this policy.

Mr. McCarthy confirmed that garbage and recycling will be handled on a station-wide basis. He also confirmed the elevator size will be the same as on the Millennium Line and will accommodate bicycles and gurneys.

Referring to station-specific recommendations in the report Mr. Parker confirmed that recommendations 1.4 and 1.7 will be considered in design development. With respect to 1.8, Mr. Lefluffy confirmed it will be taken into consideration and they will make whatever arrangements they can in their agreement with Ivanhoe Cambridge. In discussion, Mr. Lefluffy confirmed CLCO or Translink have no objection in principle to integrating the station in future but there are some technical issues relating to the ventilation system which require that the entrance is completely accessible to the open air (similar to Burrard). As well, Canada Line wants to have a level of identity in the architecture rather than being buried inside the mall. In response to a question from Ms. French as to whether the station house could be demountable, Mr. Hotson said it could easily be taken apart and it would be a small expense to remove part of it.

**Questions/Discussion**

In response to a question from Mr. Timm with respect to security, Mr. McCarthy advised every station entrance has a roller shutter gate.

Ms. Long noted there is clearly more design development required on the public realm with respect to incorporating bench seating, garbage, recycling, etc. Mr. Parker said they are now beginning to look at these issues; landscaping and seating will be reviewed with the City.

Ms. Nysted asked whether sustainability principles are being applied to the Canada Line. Mr. Lefluffy said they have taken into consideration the comments that arose on this issue from the review of the Olympic Station on May 23, 2006 and they are reviewing the sustainability features.

In response to a question from Mr. Braun regarding integrated retail, Mr. McCarthy advised there is provision for a small retail component within each of the stations at the concourse level. At ground and upper levels, each station is dealt with according to its particular location.

Mr. Acton requested clarification regarding the approach to the design of the exit stair. Mr. Parker noted there is a Building Code issue and it is still under discussion. The goal is to make it as transparent and street friendly as possible.

Mr. Acton questioned why the vents are flush when the Urban Design Panel recommended a sculptural approach. Mr. McCarthy noted the Panel was not unanimous in this recommendation and some members preferred the vents to be kept flush. He added, they are large elements so to raise them would result in significant obstructions.

In response to a further question from Mr. Acton, Mr. Hotson said they are reviewing the potential for capturing rainwater on the sloped roof and bringing it down through a trough detail through a rock element in the ground.

Ms. Hung sought clarification regarding graffiti removal. Mr. McCarthy confirmed there are criteria in the agreement with CLCO regarding the upkeep of the system to ensure graffiti is removed.

**Comments from other Speakers**

None.

**Panel Opinion**

Ms. Long said the Urban Design Panel expressed some frustration at the lack of information provided on the public realm and stressed it is as important as the architecture. With respect to the vents, Ms. Long questioned whether they could be expressed as a sculptural element and made to appear more about the place or the system. She said it would be helpful if their location could be adjusted to retain the trees. Mr. Long said lighting is critical, not only to the architecture but also to the public realm, yet the details are missing. The City should ensure it is treated appropriately both from a CPTED standpoint and for its architectural expression. The Urban Design Panel was also concerned about the lack of information on the underground component, noting the underground experience of these stations is more important than the above ground. Design development detailing of the underground should include incorporating public art and wayfinding elements. With respect to graffiti, Ms. Long recommended the system should use the same anti graffiti material used by the Park Board. In general, Ms. Long

said the Urban Design Panel was quite disappointed that so many aspects of the project are missing in detail, which makes it very difficult to review.

Referring to the recommendations, Mr. Acton questioned whether there would be opportunity to incorporate a public art component with the more utilitarian aspects. With respect to the elevator, Mr. Acton said he found the proposed solution less than satisfactory. He recommended extending the roof to make it a genuine cover. It would also be a nicer space if it was inside a glazed wall rather than behind a screen that looks like an afterthought. Mr. Acton supported the architect's suggested approach for dealing with rainwater off the roof, terminating into a boulder in the landscape.

Ms. Nystedt commented that what is being considered is something that will be here for a hundred years, notwithstanding what occurs on the surface. She said it will be a tremendous addition to the city and most of the recommendations being discussed relate more to the transient elements of the design. She stressed that the design development work should be a managed process, particularly given the concerns expressed by the Urban Design Panel. In general, Ms. Nystedt said it will be an exciting addition to the Oakridge community.

Mr. Chung was pleased to see planning for future developments around the station. With the exception of the elevator, Mr. Chung said he was satisfied with the design. He said it is unfortunate it is not incorporated into the station. Mr. Chung had no problem with the location of the vents provided they are lined up, but was concerned about preserving the trees. He thought the vents on the east side of Cambie Street would be better located in the sidewalk.

Ms. Hung stressed the importance of recommendation 1.6. Regarding 1.4, she said it would be preferable to minimize the number of columns to make pedestrian and traffic flow as easy as possible. She added, she thought the columns should have more weight and prominence than shown, bearing in mind the redevelopment of Oakridge could be some years away. Ms. Hung strongly recommended that the elevator should be integrated into the station house. She suggested recommendation A.2.6 might be amended to allow for consistency with emerging GVTA policy. With respect to the vents, Ms. Hung said she would prefer to see those on the east side of Cambie as shown, abutting the street, as long as they do not interrupt the cadence of street trees or street lighting.

Mr. Braun said the station housing is an attractive structure but recommended integrating the façade of Oakridge into the material palette of the station in some way. Mr. Braun recommended locating the vents in the centre of the median. With respect to the exit stair, Mr. Braun said he hopes it does not end up looking like a flimsy box.

#### **Board Discussion**

In response to a question from Mr. Timm regarding the location of the vents, Ms. Molaro advised it has been observed that pedestrians avoid them in the sidewalk on Dunsmuir Street. For this reason it was considered preferable to locate them out of the main walking area on the sidewalk.

Ms. French congratulated the applicants for their efforts to resolve all the complex issues. She supported the staff recommendations, with some amendments. Ms. French said while she did not believe the elevator necessarily needed to be internalized, it should provide a good sense of comfort to the users. With respect to the vents, Ms. French supported the staff recommendation.

Mr. MacGregor seconded the motion and said it is an excellent concept. He said it provides a major functional element that will ultimately be integrated with the Oakridge redevelopment, and he noted that all four corners of this intersection will be redeveloped in the near future. He added, he did not want to see the above ground structure dominating the area and limiting future development. Mr. MacGregor agreed that lighting is an important aspect of the design. With respect to the vents, he agreed it is important to move them out of the main walking area.

With respect to A.2.6, Mr. Timm said bicycle access is an issue that staff should pursue separately with the GVTA. Regarding the vents, Mr. Timm said he believed those in the median should be moved away from the curb to soften the visual impact when driving down the street. He recommended an amendment in this regard, which Ms. French and Mr. MacGregor accepted.

### Motion

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

THAT the Board SUPPORT Development Submission No. 410358, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 24, 2006, with the following amendments:

Amend the Note to Applicant in 1.2 to add: *and efforts should be made to relocate vents in the centre median away from the curbs;*

Amend 1.4 to add: *and to substantially improve the shelter and comfort associated with the elevator;*

Amend the Note to Applicant in 1.6 to add: *Also demonstrate a potential for future relocation of the access to integrate with the facing redevelopment.*

Delete A.1.5.

#### 4. 499 WEST 49th AVENUE - DE410274 - ZONE RS-1 (FOR ADVICE)

Applicant: Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden

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

### Development Planner's Opening Comments

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, presented this application for the Langara/49th Avenue Station located at the northeast corner of Cambie Street and 49th Avenue. The platforms are located in the street right-of-way and the station entry house is combined at grade with the substation structure to the east of the station entry. Impacts on the Cambie heritage boulevard include two vents and an exit stair in the boulevard.

Ms. Molaro briefly described the design of the station structure and the recommendations of staff, as set out in the Staff Committee Report dated May 24, 2006. She noted the proposal

generally reflects the ongoing discussions between the proponents and staff. The staff recommendation is for support of the application, with the advice provided.

#### Questions/Discussion

Mr. Timm questioned why the station is not lowered to be flush with the sidewalk. Ms. Molaro advised there is a recommendation to work to eliminate the steps and ramp.

Ms. French asked about the lot to the north that will have station components beneath it. Ms. Molaro described the footprint of the structure and advised there is a recommendation for the applicant to demonstrate the developability of the neighbouring site after the station is built. She noted there is a concern that the existing house on the site is undersized for the RS-1 zoning so it is important to know what the limitations might be to future maximization of its potential under the zoning. Mr. Lefluffy advised that Canada Line is in the process of acquiring this site and it will ultimately be sold to an independent third party. The below ground structures would be addressed by a right-of-way or easement. Mr. Scobie added, it may be of interest to a future owner to seek variances to the zoning, noting it would be a potential hardship if the lot is encumbered by below grade structures. He suggested consideration might be given to limiting a future owner from seeking variances.

Mr. Timm expressed concern that the design of this station requires a disabled person who is proceeding south to ride three separate elevators. The applicant team was asked to respond in their presentation.

The applicant team was also asked to respond to a question from Mr. MacGregor as to whether there is still room for a walkway if the trees are replaced on the east side of the property.

Mr. Scobie questioned the relationship of this station and powerhouse to the easterly adjacent property, which he said seems to be facing a somewhat unneighbourly relationship with the proposed substation. He questioned whether consideration had been given to granting the neighbour an easement to assume responsibility for and incorporate this site's side yard into their rear yard to allow them to produce a more satisfactory relationship. Alan Parker, InTransit, advised they have studied the relationship of the 49th Avenue elevation to the adjacent property. Ms. Molaro advised staff are concerned about the dominant expression of the substation and would like to see more effort made on its design to soften its bluntness, possibly reducing the height and using higher quality materials. She said it is not anticipated that the balance of this block will be redeveloped to a higher density.

#### Applicant's Comments

Norm Hotson, Architect, advised they have spoken at length with the neighbour to the immediate east and they are looking at reducing the height of the powerhouse to 4 m. They are also considering reducing the height of the venting on the 49th Avenue side. Mr. Hotson said turning over the side yard to the neighbour is an interesting suggestion, although there is some exiting that will need to be considered. He said they are exploring different material options for the substation and possibly including green walls on the public façade of the building, which the neighbours supported. The neighbours have also requested a new fence and planting in the side yard. With respect to grading, Mr. Hotson said it was set to have a smooth entry from the sidewalk to the elevator. This caused the main entrance doorway to the station house to be somewhat elevated, requiring some steps. This has now been reconsidered in favour of lowering the slab so that the main entry is level, sloping slightly to access the elevator.



With respect to Mr. Timm's earlier question about the need for southbound persons with disability to ride three separate elevators, Mr. Hotson said this is the result of the functional plan and there may be an alternative arrangement. Mr. McCarthy added, the intent is to bring people into the fare paid zone before they descend to lower levels.

Mr. McCarthy advised there are five vents at this station.

With respect to the existing large trees, Mr. McCarthy said there will be an arborist's report to determine if they can be retained.

#### Comments from other Speakers

None.

#### Panel Opinion

Ms. Long supported most of the staff recommendations. With respect to 1.8, she agreed it is important to improve the interface with the single-family neighbourhood. She said every effort should be made to keep the large evergreen trees as well as providing additional landscape buffers, noting also that the Serbian Spruce recommended by staff as a possible replacement species may not be adequate. Ms. Long supported the applicant's proposal for a green wall but cautioned that it should not be English ivy, which is invasive. Ms. Long advised the Urban Design Panel was concerned about the lack of a final public realm design and will look to the City to ensure it is developed to a level and scale that is suitable for this neighbourhood. With respect to recommendation 1.10 regarding sidewalk surface treatments, Ms. Long thought it would be nice to have some special paving treatment because there is a fair amount of hard paving on the Cambie Street side in this area.

Mr. Acton said he found some of the architect's ideas for ongoing design development to be quite interesting. Mr. Acton questioned whether the sloping roof design is appropriate in this location, suggesting perhaps a flat green roof might better suit the residential neighbourhood.

Mr. Shearing supported reducing the height and lowering the substation, and strongly supported incorporating a green wall. With respect to recommendation 1.9, Mr. Shearing noted the recommendation for high quality materials should apply to the substation as well as the station house entry area. He was disappointed in the presentation material, particularly the lack of context drawings. He supported the staff recommendations.

Ms. Nystedt supported the staff recommendations and appreciated the efforts being made to make this station fit in the neighbourhood.

Mr. Chung questioned whether the station design was appropriate for a residential neighbourhood. He also thought greater attention should be given to issues of crime and safety because this station will be quieter than most. Mr. Chung was concerned there was no plan in place for the exit stairwell, and he urged that everything be done to reduce the circuitous route for disabled passengers.

Ms. Hung said she believed the applicant team had demonstrated they will be able to address the issues raised to better fit in the residential context, noting they have worked well with the neighbours to address their concerns. Ms. Hung had no concerns with the application as presented, except to note that the emergency exit stairwell on the heritage boulevard will need careful detailed design.

Mr. Braun said it is important for the design to fit well in the residential neighbourhood and he recommended the use of a residential-type architectural concrete if it is not entirely covered with greenery.

#### Board Discussion

Mr. Timm said his biggest concern was the neighbourliness of the design, particularly with respect to the house to the east, and he was satisfied the issues are adequately addressed. He supported the suggestion of turning over the side yard to the neighbour and thought it should be explored. Mr. Timm was concerned that the emergency stairwell exit should not become an above grade structure on the heritage boulevard. He supported the staff recommendations and he moved support, with a minor amendment to A.2.1. Mr. Timm emphasized the importance of removing the stair at the property line on the corner, and reiterated his disappointment with respect to the layout of the station in terms of accessibility for people with disabilities.

Ms. French offered some further amendments to the recommendations, which Mr. Timm accepted. She seconded the motion.

Mr. MacGregor said he was encouraged to see the progress being made on the design. He strongly supported removal of steps on the station frontage.

#### Motion

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

THAT the Board SUPPORT Development Submission No. 410274, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 24, 2006, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.4 to add: *and to substantially improve the shelter and comfort associated with the elevator;*

Delete A.1.6;

Amend A.3.1, to add to the items listed in parentheses: *as well as the equipment associated with the traction power substation*, and after the word "neighbourhood" to add: *particularly the easterly adjoining property;*

#### 5. 4099 CAMBIE STREET - DE410273 - ZONE C-2 (FOR ADVICE)

Applicant: Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden

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

#### Development Planners Comments

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, presented this application for the Cambie-King Edward Station located at the northwest corner of Cambie Street and West King Edward Avenue. The site, currently containing a mini mall, comprises five lots, of which the station house will use the two southerly lots. The entry to the station is at the corner of King Edward and Cambie and the platforms are located in the street right-of-way. The station is a side platform, stacked configuration with ticketing functions occurring at the street level. This station is

required to anticipate future adjacent and overbuild development. One large vent is proposed at the northerly tip of the Cambie heritage boulevard. Road geometry adjustments will widen the boulevard at this intersection and, in part, accommodate the double sized vent. Ms. Molaro briefly described the station design and reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated May 24, 2006. She noted that one of the most important concerns with this station is the integration of the station house with future development on the balance of the site.

#### Questions/Discussion

Mr. Timm sought clarification about the setbacks and the need to accommodate the vents on Cambie Street. In discussion, Ms. Molaro agreed there would be little disadvantage to stepping back the storefront to the same line as the station.

In response to a question from Mr. Shearing about the adjacent property, Edward Lefluffy confirmed that CLCO owns the lots comprising the previous mini mall as well as the adjacent site to the north which was needed for construction staging.

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor, Ms. Molaro confirmed the proposed vent on the Cambie heritage boulevard will not interfere with the existing Sequoia trees.

Mr. Chung asked about the potential for a future connection from the northeast across the street. Ms. Molaro advised staff considered the potential ridership would not warrant another entry, nor would there be opportunity in the future development of that site.

Ms. French sought clarification regarding the potential for overbuild on this station. Ms. Molaro advised there is opportunity to build over the station box.

Mr. Scobie asked about the dedication requests in recommendation A.2.1 and whether the dedication for the lane should be sought now and the remainder, which relate to the future development site, sought later whenever a development application is made. Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, said Engineering Services would prefer to secure all the dedications now, noting it is not believed they would have an impact on CLCO's use of the site.

Mr. Scobie noted the CPTED comment in the report seems to be contrary to recommendation 1.7 with respect to the elevator. Ms. Molaro agreed it is a balance between safety and security and accessibility.

#### Applicant's Comments

Norm Hotson, Architect, noted the station occupies approximately one and two-third lots of the five. He said this station is unique in that the fare zone is at street level. It is also distinct because it is designed for overbuild, assuming the typical C-2 response of one floor of retail and three storeys of wood frame above. Mr. Hotson advised the large vent in front of the retail frontage has now been moved to be adjacent to the curb line (similar to the east side of Cambie on the Oakridge station). This better serves the retail frontage and provides for greater flexibility. Mr. Hotson said the steps shown in the sidewalk will be reconsidered. Regarding the elevator continuity, Mr. Hotson said it would necessitate moving the TPS and enlarging the station, amounting to an additional cost of two million dollars. He agreed it would be desirable to have only one elevator to get to any level in the station, but noted that only half the trips would require use of the second elevator. In summary, it is a major cost issue as well as, in part, a technical issue.

**Questions/Discussion**

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie concerning the wall projecting out beyond the Cambie frontage, Mr. Hotson said they are considering cutting the wall back to the face of the station.

Mr. MacGregor asked about the proposed relocation of the vents. Donny Wong, Engineer, Rapid Transit Office, advised there will be no impact on the bus stop. As to whether the vents could be moved further south, Alan Parker, InTransit BC, said there is an issue with locating them close to the station entry because if they are functioning in emergency mode the smoke could impact people exiting the station. Mr. Shearing asked whether consideration had been given to incorporating the vents into the adjacent property. Mr. Hotson said locating them just north of the station in an east-west configuration had been considered, but they would take away retail frontage and likely require a shaft to the roof, which would severely limit the future development of that site.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding the fare gates, Mr. Parker said that, as with the Millennium line, all stations will have provisions for future fare gates.

Mr. Shearing asked for clarification about the overbuild potential. Mr. Hotson said the station roof is designed to take three storeys of wood frame construction. The height of the station is 5 m, which is slightly higher than a typical C-2 development and might require a height relaxation for three levels of residential use above. Mr. Lefluffy added, CLCO is satisfied the design does not compromise future development potential.

Ms. Long questioned why the entrance is not closer to the corner of Cambie and King Edward. Mr. Hotson explained the functional requirements relating to the stairs, the elevators and assembly area, and said they found the best solution was to create a small plaza at the corner. Mr. Parker added, there is also the issue of the proximity of the entrance to the vents.

In response to a question from Mr. Acton about the potential overbuild, Ms. Molaro advised the neighbourhood is opposed to increased density on the site beyond what is already permitted under the C-2 zoning. Mr. Wong added, staff concluded a three-storey wood frame addition would be a fair assumption. Ms. Nystedt expressed concern that, regardless of current visioning, this site could become a prime area for increased density as the city evolves in the decades to come. Ms. French advised the design responds to what is likely to occur in the next 30 to 40 years, noting that increased density could be accomplished on the remainder of this site without the need to rest on the roof of the station. In discussion, Mr. McCarthy noted that because the station is a stacked configuration it does not lend itself to extending eastward. The system is designed to expand to a ridership of 15,000 people per hour per direction.

**Comments from other Speakers**

None.

**Panel Opinion**

Ms. Long concurred with most of the comments in the report. She emphasized there is a lack of design development of the public realm. She agreed with the applicant to consider eliminating the steps at the corner of King Edward and Cambie. She also agreed with their proposal for dealing with design development of the retail interface. Ms. Long urged that all the public realm is usable and animated.

Mr. Acton said he liked the overall form and presence of the station. He supported the sense of arrival and the approach to the handicap access to the elevator. Mr. Acton said he agreed

with a suggestion by Mr. Timm to set back the neighbouring retail. Notwithstanding the fact that this site is being developed for the next thirty years, Mr. Acton was concerned that the development potential only allows for the cheapest possible form of development.

Mr. Shearing said it is unfortunate the neighbouring building and its potential connection to the station has not been explored in greater detail, which would assist in a better understanding of the overbuild issue. Mr. Shearing strongly supported moving the vent further to the street edge because of the importance of maintaining a continuous retail frontage. He concurred with the staff recommendations.

Ms. Nysted supported the staff recommendations.

Mr. Chung supported relocating the vents to maintain the uniform retail frontage. He found this station to be one of the better designs and he thought it would fit well into the neighbourhood. He supported the staff recommendations.

Ms. Hung commented that much thought has gone into the design of this station and she had no significant concerns. She recommended support.

Mr. Braun supported the staff recommendations. He recommended that CLCO should sell the land now to maximize efficiency.

#### Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor said the station design fits well in the neighbourhood. Commenting on the discussion about density, he said this intersection ultimately should have much greater density. He moved support of the staff recommendations, with some amendments. With respect to the elevator, he said he was not convinced by the need for continuity which he thought would create more problems in the station configuration.

Mr. Timm said this is a very good example of how all stations should be integrated with adjoining development. He supported the entry wrapping around the corner, noting it also locates it close to the bus stop on King Edward Avenue which is a major transfer point. He also agreed with the elevator as proposed.

#### Motion

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

THAT the Board SUPPORT Development Submission No. 410273, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 24, 2006, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.2 to delete "and location of trees to be replaced" and replace with *and ensure the protection and preservation of the nearby existing trees*;

Delete 1.7;

Amend A.2.1 (a) to add: *at the time of a development permit for this site*.

The Board took a brief recess and reconvened at 7.35 p.m.

#### 6. 760 PACIFIC BOULEVARD - DE408507 & DE408622 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

- Applicant: Paragon Gaming Inc.
- Request: To extend the time-limited approval of the Casino Class 2 use in Building C at the Plaza of Nations until July 31, 2013 and to extend the time-limited use of 138 parking spaces in Building B to coincide with that date.

The Chair drew the Board's attention to two distributed memoranda dated June 5, 2006. The first provides an update on the notification response and the second, a correction to Condition B.2.1. In addition, two pieces of correspondence were distributed.

#### Opening Comments of Staff

Rob Jenkins, Assistant Director, Current Planning, introduced this application to extend the time limited development permit from December 3, 2008 to July 31, 2013, and to extend the time limited use of 138 parking spaces in Building B to coincide with that date. In 2004, Council approved an amendment to the Plaza of Nations CD-1 zoning to include Casino Class 2 as a permissible use. The Plaza of Nations was intended to be a temporary location for four years, enabling the proponents to secure a site and construct a new permanent facility elsewhere. Prior to enacting the amending by-law, a covenant was registered on the land, restricting the casino operation for up to four years. The development permits were also time limited to four years. The covenant requires that any application for an extension should be referred to City Council for consideration.

The Edgewater Casino has been unable to operate on a profitable basis and has entered into an agreement for Paragon Gaming Inc. to purchase all existing and outstanding Edgewater shares and has been given until June 9, 2006 by the Supreme Court of B.C. to advise the Court whether or not it will complete the purchase. If the purchase is completed, Paragon intends to make improvements to the Edgewater operation to increase its viability. Paragon has therefore requested that the two development permits related to the Casino Class 2 use be extended until July 31, 2013. Paragon is not applying to increase the gaming capacity. Paragon also intends to secure an alternative permanent location.

On May 29, 2006, Council advised the Development Permit Board that it supports the Board's consideration to extend the time limited permit, and requested that the Board consider this matter by June 9, 2006. Details of Council's resolution are included in the Staff Committee Report dated May 31, 2006. With further reference to the report, Mr. Jenkins briefly reviewed the staff analysis. With respect to the provision of parking, Engineering Services is not aware of any problems of parking and access to the casino. Condition A.1.2 seeks a parking and a traffic study, to be completed by December 3, 2008.

In summary, the Staff Committee recommendation is to approve the application, subject to the conditions contained in the report. Staff believe the requested extension will enable the casino operator to improve the economic viability of the casino and in turn provide the operator enough time to meet the commitment to the City to find a new location for a permanent facility. A number of public benefits would also result, including continued and potentially increased jobs, continued and potentially increased revenues for the City, as well as benefits related to the social responsibility and job creation programs.

#### Questions/Discussion

Mr. MacGregor sought clarification concerning the date of compliance indicated in condition B.1.1. Mr. Thomson noted that while typical response time is six months, there is every indication the applicant wishes to proceed as quickly as possible and staff wish to ensure the

conditions are satisfied promptly. Mr. Scobie noted that relatively minor items remain to be addressed.

Mr. Scobie noted that this application only deals with the matter of use, whereas the original development permit included some building development. In response to a question from Ms. Nysted, Mr. Scobie advised the Board is not involved in the proponent's lease renewal arrangements.

With respect to the time extension, Mr. Scobie noted the request is for seven years whereas the previous four year limit was considered to be appropriate. Mr. Jenkins explained the request is a 4-1/2 year extension from 2008. Given the schedule for achieving the process described, staff believe the request is realistic.

Reference was made to a recently signed Memorandum of Understanding which Mr. Jenkins confirmed staff consider satisfactory, noting it appears to be in the spirit of the earlier document.

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

John Cahill, Paragon Gaming Inc., introduced the applicant team. He noted they have been considering the Edgewater Casino for the last 90 days and think it an exciting opportunity to enter the Vancouver market. Mr. Cahill described the need for the requested time extensions. He also provided some background information on Paragon Gaming Inc. and described their goals for this operation. He said they intend to stabilize existing performance, commence program enhancements and re-launch the casino with a stronger identity and greater range of services. Mr. Cahill described the timeline and process and said they believe the extension to 2013 is realistic.

George Cadman, Legal Counsel for the proponent, explained they have presented to staff today a letter of agreement that appends a Memorandum of Understanding which all parties have agreed to enter into. He noted they have had extensive discussions with counsel for Community Gaming Management Association and there is agreement in principle. He advised Paragon's Memorandum of Understanding will be enhanced and much more specific than the earlier document, adding that it likely goes beyond what Council was looking for. With respect to the timing referred to in condition B.1.1, Mr. Cadman said they contemplate that if the Board approves the request then they will begin work with the City's legal staff as soon as possible. Subject to all regulatory approvals, they anticipate being in a position to close the purchase in late June or early July 2006, which would more than meet the July 31, 2006 timeframe. Mr. Cadman stressed the application is not seeking an expansion but to extend the life of the permits for the temporary use at this space while they locate a permanent site.

#### **Questions/Discussion**

In response to a question from Mr. Timm regarding the plans for investing \$5 million in the programming, Mr. Cahill said the main area of enhancement will be to expand the existing food and beverage facility into a regular restaurant that operates with its own identity as a destination restaurant. There is also a list of deficiencies from the original development permit that will be addressed, including exterior landscaping and signage. There is also work required to reconfigure the gaming floor, without increasing total gaming capacity beyond that approved by Council. In discussion, it was noted that none of these items is included in the subject application and would require separate development applications.

Mr. Scobie sought clarification as to how performance would be monitored to ensure a further extension is not requested in the future. Mr. Cahill stressed it is not feasible for Paragon to

remain in this facility for a long period because it does not make financial sense. He also noted they are not looking for the City to forego its future discretion in this regard. He said they recognize there is need for considerable collaboration between the City, the BC Lottery Corporation and Paragon and they are willing to go through the normal process. In discussion, Mr. Cadman agreed they could entertain reporting back to the City, although noting that one of the difficulties is that to achieve the benchmarks is at least a tripartite process. Therefore, the benchmarks will need to be looked at very carefully and not necessarily imposed as part of this application without some consideration and flexibility. Mr. Scobie said the intent of such reporting would be to more formally acknowledge the progress being made for relocation towards the requested end date for the permits.

Ms. Nystedt was concerned that the request is to double the original four year time limit which previously was considered adequate. Mr. Scobie suggested the original four year term may not have been considered rigorously by staff or Council and it has now been determined that it may not have been sufficient time to find a permanent location for the casino. Mr. MacGregor added, at the time the main focus of Council was whether or not to have the facility and not the timing, and the proponent's request of four years was accepted.

Discussion ensued about how the proponents believe they can succeed where others have failed. Mr. Cahill said they believe the existing facility can be optimized, even as an interim proposition. He noted that Paragon occupies a niche in the gaming market and they are well aware of Vancouver's high and exacting standards for process which they fully intend to meet.

#### Comments from other Speakers

Susan Spratt spoke on behalf of the Canadian Autoworkers Union which represents the over 400 members at the Edgewater Casino as well as the workers at Planet Bingo. Ms. Spratt said they also speak for the over 250 people who work at the casino who are not members of a union. She said they were very pleased when Paragon contacted them to discuss their vision for working in a transparent and open relationship with the union and the workers at the Edgewater Casino. Ms. Spratt said they believe this is a viable plan and a necessary extension of the application. She added, if it is unsuccessful it would have a very negative impact on the 650 current employees.

Wendy Thompson, Community Gaming Management Association, apologized for her letter (Appendix F, p.12 of 12 of the Staff Committee Report) being undated, which she confirmed was written on May 30, 2006. Ms. Thompson spoke to issues that surround Planet Bingo at 2655 Main Street where bingo has been played since 1956 and currently is a blend of electronic and paper bingo. Bistro Bingo and Planet Bingo are unique in the City of Vancouver. They are commercial enterprises operated by members' charities as a non-profit entity, for the benefit of the community. Annually, they generate \$18 million in gross revenue, with a payroll of \$2.6 million. There are over 100 staff and close to \$6 million is generated to the member organizations. The BC Lottery Corporation's involvement in the industry has led to new facility standards and requirements. Their 50+ year old building does not meet those standards or their customers' expectations. Ms. Thompson said her association supports the subject application. She advised they have entered into a new agreement with Paragon for a new bingo operation in the very near future. She said they are well aware that, as a group of charitable organizations, they need to remain competitive in the gaming field. To do so, they need a new facility to become a branded community gaming centre in order to continue to fund essential programs and services in Vancouver. Ms. Thompson urged the Board to support the requested extension.

#### Panel Opinion



It was noted that this application was not reviewed the Urban Design Panel, although the Panel did review the original application. Ms. Long said that while the Panel had some concerns with the original submission because the casino itself is a very internal function, it was thought it could help to animate the Plaza of Nations. The inclusion of the East End Community Agreement was also considered to be very positive. Ms. Long said that although she is not necessarily personally in favour of casinos she is in favour of a good quality development which helps to build community in whatever way it can. She noted a fair amount of commitment has been shown by Paragon, which is very positive. Her main concern was that the area remains animated and having more people there is very helpful. In summary, she supported the requested time extension.

Mr. Acton said it has been demonstrated there is a series of unique circumstances for the extension request. He said he found the applicant's presentation compelling, and the timeline seems reasonable and the rationale well thought out. Mr. Acton said he was encouraged that Paragon are being more proactive than the current owners with respect to facilitating public activities in the plaza. He supported the application.

Mr. Shearing questioned whether the timeline is sufficient given the necessary steps that need to be taken to secure another location. He suggested the applicant might be returning to ask for another extension, and thought a method of monitoring progress would be to their benefit as well as the City. He recommended approval.

Ms. Nystedt did not support the application because her interpretation was that the initial casino was approved on an experimental basis for four years and they are now requesting to double that time. She did not believe the proposal had received sufficient public input, notwithstanding Council's position, and she opposed its approval.

Ms. Hung said that since there will be no expansion to the gaming operations she did not believe there would be additional social impacts. She recommended approval and thought Paragon had demonstrated its success in the gaming industry. She also noted the Plaza of Nations is somewhat a no-man's land at present so as long as any negative social impacts are mitigated she supported approval of the extension.

Mr. Braun said he was unable to make a recommendation one way or the other. He said he appreciated that Council has endorsed the requested extension and acknowledged the casino does provide benefits in terms of job creation as well as financial contributions to charitable organizations. He also noted this area has changed considerably in the last four years and will continue to change in the next three years so that the entire north shore of False Creek will be residential, which he thought should be taken into account. He thought the extension to 2013 was reasonable and may even be too short. He suggested the Board should make it clear there will be no further extensions and he urged the applicant to start working now if they intend to relocate.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. MacGregor stressed that the issue for consideration is only the extension of the permit, adding that if the Board does not approve it the casino will go out of business, jobs will be lost and the area will take a backward step. It is Council policy to have commercial use in this location. Mr. MacGregor said he believed the timeline requested is realistic, noting it is a four and a half year extension of the original permit. He added, there are public benefits to be gained by completion of the benefits package approved originally. The applicant is also committed to make better use of the plaza and promote public activities, which will be good for the area. He said he had no hesitation in approving the application. He moved approval with two amendments to the staff recommendations.

Mr. Timm said he did not believe that progress reporting on locating a permanent home for the casino would serve a useful purpose, noting the onus is on the applicant to meet the time limit. If it is not met, it will be for the Development Permit Board to decide at some future date whether or not there should be a further extension. Mr. Timm noted it is a policy decision of Council to support the extension and the Board's role is to consider whether the conditions of approval are adequate to address potential impacts on the community. The Board is not considering whether or not it supports gaming. Mr. Timm said he therefore did not believe the Board was in a position to reject the application. He seconded the motion of approval.

Ms. French said she found the advice of the Panel to be helpful. She agreed with Mr. Timm that the Board's role is not to revisit the question of gaming. She commented she was not impressed by the performance of the casino to date and looked forward to Paragon moving to a more diligent and responsive operation of the facility. Ms. French said she thought the timeline was reasonable and agreed that formal reporting of progress is not necessary, noting it is in Paragon's interest to pursue a permanent location. It will be for the Development Permit Board and/or Council of the day to decide whether or not to favourably consider a request for more time. Responding to Mr. Braun's comment about adjacent development becoming residential, Ms. French noted there was a review of the Plaza of Nations Land Use Policy last year and Council confirmed the casino use in the plaza was relevant for the foreseeable future. She supported the requested time extension.

**Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE an extension to the time limit placed on the Casino-Class 2 use at the Plaza of Nations (Edgewater Casino) and the provision of parking to serve the Casino, as per Development Application Nos. DE408507 and DE408622, to July 31, 2013, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 31, 2006, with the following amendments:

Amend B.1.1 to change the date to *December 21, 2006*;

Amend B.2.1 to read:

*These permits are for a time-limited approval ending on the earlier of:*

- (a) relocation of the casino operation to premises other than the Plaza of Nations; and*
- (b) July 31, 2013.*

7. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

---

D. Kempton  
Assistant to the Board

---

F. Scobie  
Chair