

Date: Monday, June 9, 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)
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry (present for Item 3. only)
E. Mah Representative of Development Industry
C. Henschel Representative of General Public

Regrets

D. Chung Representative of General Public
J. Leduc Representative of General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

R. Segal Development Planner
E. Fiss Development Planner
D. Robinson Project Facilitator
A. Higginson Project Facilitator
M. Thomson City Surveyor

1169 West Cordova Street

J. Cheng James K.M. Cheng Architects Inc.
J. Wolf James K.M. Cheng Architects Inc.
C. Phillips Landscape Architect

7000 Mont Royal Square

M. Huggins Burrowes Huggins Architects
A. Grant PCI
A. Croft PCI
K. Perry Landscape Architect

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of May 26, 2003 be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 1169 WEST CORDOVA STREET - DE407402 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: James K.M. Cheng Architects Inc.

Request: To construct a 24-storey residential tower development with a total of 55 units including eight townhouses and three floors of underground parking for 161 cars.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Ralph Segal, presented this complete application, noting it will be the first of the final three towers along the Coal Harbour waterfront between Bute and Thurlow Streets. He briefly reviewed the site context and noted the intent of the Harbour Green Neighbourhood Guidelines is that this tower's massing is similar to that of the westerly tower (the Carina). Referring to the Staff Committee Report dated May 14, 2003, Mr. Segal briefly reviewed the five main issues identified by staff and the conditions recommended to address the concerns.

With respect to the intrusion into the Bute Street-end View, the Coal Harbour Official Development Plan (CHODP) identifies Bute Street as having an expanded view through the street-end plaza. Staff recommend that the northwesterly corner of the podium be pulled back in response to the CHODP.

The proposal complies with the Guideline recommended height of 230 ft., with the exception of a small area providing rooftop stair access from the penthouse unit. Golden Properties Ltd., owners of the Board of Trade building to the south, have confirmed in a letter dated May 21, 2003 (on file) that they have no objection to this 8 ft. overheight. Condition 1.2 seeks a reduction in width of the stair access enclosure to more closely comply with the guideline height.

An increase beyond the Guideline floor plate of 6,400 sq.ft. to 6,998 sq.ft., a 9.3 percent increase, is proposed. Mr. Segal noted that other towers in the neighbourhood have received floor plate size increases of about 3.5 percent, and the maximum relaxation was a 6.6 percent increase. In reviewing the view impact study, however, staff concluded that the proposal performs quite well, due largely to the absence of enclosed balconies in this tower which diminishes view obstruction. Enclosed balconies are not included in the floor plate size calculation. Staff therefore support the proposed floor plate but stress that it should not be considered a precedent for the remaining two towers for which the Guidelines recommend larger floor plates and greater height.

The application seeks to relax the easterly podium setback from 41 ft. to 31 ft. on Cordova Street, and from 64 ft. to 41.5 ft. on the Park side. Mr. Segal noted there will still be a very generous view slot on both sides, so that public and private views are not substantially compromised. As well, the guideline which seeks to create greater street enclosure and street and park definition is improved by reducing the gap.

With respect to the Cordova Street podium, the guidelines call for a residential character with individual street entries, as has been achieved on the developments to the west. Staff consider the proposed facade treatment lacks residential character and recommend improvement in the design.

With respect to the By-law requirement for the provision of Family Housing Units, because this proposal contains predominantly very large units, the number of units that can be included in the overall allocation of Family Housing Units is limited. A concern has been raised by staff that the total family unit requirement will not be achieved on the remaining parcels and Condition 1.9 recommends that the applicant demonstrate how this will be achieved.

While there are a number of issues for which design development is being sought, Mr. Segal advised that staff support the proposal, noting it performs well and is a very refined piece of architecture. The Staff Committee recommendation is for approval, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley expressed concern about aspects of the proposal that are contrary to the guidelines, noting the base treatment seems to be fundamentally different than the two buildings to the west. The guidelines call for a base treatment of primarily three storeys, whereas this application proposes two storeys. Mr. Segal explained the proposed two-storey height is about 28 ft. to the upper parapet, to a maximum of 31 ft. Directly opposite, across the plaza, the Carina's facade is at three storeys, ranging from 33 ft. to about 35 ft. Mr. Beasley also noted that, with the exception of two entries on Cordova Street, the proposal does not respond to the guideline calling for front doors on the street and plaza edge. Mr. Segal advised the application proposes double french doors, with dining/living rooms oriented to the view, but not front door entries. This guideline was met in the neighbouring developments. Mr. Segal noted there has been an attempt to break up the facades to give the appearance of entries, although they are clearly not front doors to the units. There is a condition which seeks to diminish the extent of blank wall at the park interface and to improve residential character but not specifically to require front doors. Mr. Beasley noted that one of the prime urban design objectives for this neighbourhood was to achieve a very strong townhouse rhythm at the sidewalk level and create a domesticity that would help differentiate it from the Downtown further to the east and south. Given the number of variations from the guidelines that are fundamental to the urban design intentions for the area, Mr. Beasley questioned whether this application should have been submitted as a preliminary. Mr. Segal advised that staff believe the issues can be addressed with design conditions, with the cooperation of the applicant.

In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg regarding Staff's support of the guideline variations, Mr. Segal said staff believe that the strong two-storey expression and higher floor-to-floor height results in an overall podium massing that is within about 5 ft. of a three-storey expression. He noted there is a condition calling for stronger residential character on Cordova Street. Staff also concluded that the breaking up of the facades with the french doors achieves an expression that approaches the guideline recommendation.

Mr. MacGregor sought clarification as to the rationale for supporting increased floor plates. Mr. Segal advised the enclosed balconies on the Carina comprised about 3.5 percent of the floor plate (maximum permitted is 4 percent), and received a 3.5 percent increase in floor plate. Similar relaxations were allowed for other buildings in the neighbourhood. Mr. Segal noted that, if this building included the maximum permitted number of enclosed balconies, the floor plate would be diminished by about 280 sq.ft. This would reduce the floor plate from a 9.3 percent average to 4.9 percent. However, no enclosed balconies are proposed. With respect to the height of the podium massing, staff believe the guidelines provide some flexibility in support of the proposed 2-storey townhouses. In discussion with respect to condition 1.8, Mr. Segal agreed the increased landscape area is required only for emergency access, not for maintenance.

In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg with respect to the balconies and the floor plate size, Mr. Segal explained there will be a note on the development permit that enclosure is not permitted. He confirmed that the extent of floor plate relaxation supported by staff on this application will not be entertained on the future two towers because it would have far greater repercussions on those larger buildings. In discussion, Mr. Rudberg expressed some concern about the incremental increases in floor plates that are occurring in this neighbourhood.

With respect to the provision of family housing units, Mr. Segal confirmed that 25 are proposed in this building, leaving a balance of 88 to be provided on the remaining two sites. In discussion, it was noted that the Housing Families at High Density Guidelines permit family units only up to the 8th floor. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, Mr. Segal confirmed that any additional rowhouses would be included in the family unit count.

Some discussion ensued regarding the Bute Street-end view, as defined in the CHODP and the Harbour Green CD-1 Neighbourhood Guidelines, and it was noted the diagrams are inconsistent as to whether any intrusion by the podium is permissible. Staff have determined that the requirements of the ODP By-law should take precedence, and not to allow any intrusion into the view cone.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding the easterly podium setback relaxation, Mr. Segal confirmed there has been no response from the owners of the Renaissance Hotel. However, the view impacts on the Renaissance were carefully considered. It was concluded that, while there is a slight diminishment of the view gap, it remains very generous. It also results in an improved, wider mountain view than would be achieved in a guideline solution, although with slightly less water view. On balance, staff felt the proposal was a reasonable trade-off.

Applicant's Comments

James Cheng, Architect, said the proposed floor plate size is equal to or less than the floor plates of all the other buildings in Coal Harbour, based on square footage, noting the confusion that arises from the exclusion of enclosed balconies and storage areas from the calculations. Mr. Cheng added that, at the rezoning stage, some of the floor plate studies were flawed, so that it is not possible to achieve the allowable FSR and heights within the prescribed floor plates.

Mr. Cheng referred to the Organizing Principles described in the CD-1 guidelines and the diagram which clearly shows the towers placed outside the view cone, with the street base zone allowed to protrude. Mr. Cheng stressed that he believes the public view objective is being achieved in this proposal. He noted the intent is for townhouses to define the park edge and the park is a symmetrical design with townhouses on both sides. Therefore, pulling back the corner, as requested in condition 1.1, diminishes the symmetry and overall design of the park entry. Mr. Cheng asked the Board to consider that, given the design and the alignment, the street base zone will not have a significant impact on the street-end view cone and the public view has not been compromised.

With respect to the rooftop stair access, Mr. Cheng pointed out that the Carina received a 14 ft. height increase beyond the guideline recommended height. Since the original urban design intent was for matching towers, they felt that greater height on this tower would also be appropriate. However, after discussion with the upland property owners it was agreed to maintain the original guideline height. The most affected neighbouring property owner has now confirmed support the proposed roof access and slight height increase, noting the intent is to provide a green roof that will offer improved outlook from their building. Mr. Cheng noted the building contains very large, fully air-conditioned units which requires the volume of mechanical penthouse proposed.

With respect to condition 1.4, Mr. Cheng noted the proposed podium height of 28 - 30 ft. matches a typical 3-storey height in two storeys. He noted the guidelines suggest three storeys, perhaps stepping down to two storeys if there is view impact. In this regard, the proposal takes into account the views from the Renaissance Hotel, the lobby of which is higher than the top of the proposed townhouses. With respect to the townhouse character, Mr. Cheng acknowledged the proposal is not traditional rowhouse character. He explained they are trying to introduce some diversity in the townhouse forms, noting that different interpretations are possible. He said they are willing to adjust the design with greater architectural articulation to create a front door appearance and provide direct access to a common walkway. He noted that Canada Post will not provide an address for townhouses that do not front a street. As well, they wanted to keep the smaller modules facing the park, with the Cordova Street units providing a transition between the office precinct and the park and residential neighbourhood.

Regarding the condition to fill in the proposed centre gap, Mr. Cheng said the opening between the townhouses is proposed as a relief to provide light and some view into the internal lobby and to break up the facade. Mr. Cheng said they believe the water feature in the gap is a positive element and asked that the Board delete this condition.

With respect to the provision of Family Units, Mr. Cheng said the original 177 units relates to the entire five sites in this precinct and he noted that in other areas a percentage of units is specified rather than a total number. Since Coal Harbour is developing with larger unit sizes, the number of units is decreasing, but the number of required family units remains unchanged. Mr. Cheng also noted that families are choosing to live above the 8th floor. He confirmed the family units will be addressed in the next two projects by the provision of smaller units at the lower levels but he suggested that perhaps specifying a number may not be the best approach when unit sizes have not been defined.

Questions/Discussion

With respect to the base treatment, Mr. Beasley noted that this proposal is 5 - 6 ft. lower than the development on the other side of the plaza. He stressed that this plaza portends to be one of the most important small public spaces in the downtown and the guidelines intended to achieve a balance on either side. Mr. Cheng noted the plaza is approximately 180 ft. wide so that most people will not perceive the difference in height. John Wolf, Architect, added

that this site's grade is higher than the Carina by 2 - 3 ft. so the respective cornice lines are quite close. In discussion, Mr. Cheng agreed that it is the height of the base that is important rather than the number of storeys.

Some discussion ensued with respect to the Bute Street-end view and the diagrams provided in the CD-1 Guidelines and the CHODP. Mr. Segal advised that staff concluded that the ODP should prevail, noting the text of the ODP calls for a minimum 5 degree splay. The angle shown is on axis with Bute Street and has an opening of about 42 degrees. In discussion, Mr. Cheng said he would be agreeable to a condition which called for bringing the corner in line with what is legally allowed.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding Appendix C, Mr. Cheng advised the issues raised by the Processing Centre - Building and Fire & Rescue Services have already been addressed.

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Lyon advised the Urban Design Panel was generally quite delighted with this scheme and it was unanimously supported. The Panel supported the proposed increase in floor plate and height. Mr. Lyon confirmed that the issues raised by the Panel have been addressed in the recommended prior-to conditions. With respect to the Bute Street-end view, the Panel thought any intrusion into a required view cone would be inappropriate. Regarding the Cordova Street frontage, the Panel recommended increased animation to provide more interest, providing more openings on the second floor and not necessarily adding more units. The north-facing gap was seen as a good amenity to the lobby and the building interior but there was a suggestion to consider replacing the water feature with a townhouse along this edge to improve the amenity of the walkway. Mr. Lyon noted the parking access has been cleverly handled but it results in a fair amount of vehicular circulation on the site itself. The Panel questioned whether the amount of paving could be reduced, which is addressed in condition 1.8.

Mr. Hancock said he liked the project very much. It is very handsome and well proportioned. With respect to the floor plate size, Mr. Hancock said he was convinced by the applicant's direct comparison with the adjacent properties, notwithstanding issues of precedent that the Board may have to consider. The views around the tower are well handled with the shoulder section removed. Mr. Hancock said he had some concerns about the townhouse expression and the lack of front doors and noted that Cordova Street will improve over time. He had no concerns about the height, and liked the water feature in the recess and the small break in the townhouses. With respect to the Bute Street-end view, Mr. Hancock noted the Board can only do what can be done legally; however, he said he believes that framing the park symmetrically, both in plan and height, is more important than preserving the view.

Mr. Mah said he believed relaxations for family units and floor plate overages should be acceptable for this project as a stand-alone and not dependent upon actions to be taken against future projects. Standards should be applied as consistently as possible to avoid setting unintended precedents. Nevertheless, Mr. Mah said he accepted the applicant's argument that floor plates should be assessed on a gross size basis rather than taking into account various exclusions, which could be misleading. He supported condition 1.9 and accepted the applicant's comments to deal with the balance of the required family units in the next two sites. He noted that other developments in this neighbourhood have many townhouse frontages off the street, particularly Cordova Street. He expressed disappointment that this is not continuing with this building and possibly setting a precedent for the next two buildings. He recommended adding a condition for more street entry townhouses being incorporated into the project, particularly off Cordova Street. Mr. Mah had no problem with the two-storey townhouse forms. He stressed the importance of condition 1.4, to reduce the blank wall on the Cordova Street side. He recommended amending condition 1.1, subject to legal requirements, and deletion of 1.2, 1.3 and 1.6. He recommended approval of the application.

With respect to condition 1.1, Mr. Kavanagh noted that in this particular location the sense of the view changes orientation at Cordova Street, so that any notion of symmetry is not necessarily appropriate. As well, the park is being defined by its edge and the townhouses in this application. An appropriate balance therefore must be found, within the legal parameters. He recommended deletion of 1.2, 1.3 and 1.6, and the deletion of "and maintenance" in 1.8. He found the water feature provided good animation at this edge. With regard to the townhouse treatment, Mr. Kavanagh said he believed this architect is quite capable of doing what is required, adding it would be interesting to see what else can be done within the definition of townhouse. He recommended approval.

Mr. Henschel supported the applicant's rationale for the Bute Street-end view and agreed that the symmetry of the park has greater importance. He added, however, that the perception of symmetry will be challenging with the difference in colours and materials of the buildings on the each side of the park. Mr. Henschel said he believed the Cordova Street facade needed a great deal of work and stressed that the character of this street will change over time. He strongly supported the water feature and recommended deleting condition 1.6 calling for its removal.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley said he had been very concerned about the proposal because he felt the base of the building was compromising the basic intent of the guidelines and the Official Development Plan for creating a successful residential community. However, given the advice of the Panel and the response of the applicant to the issues, Mr. Beasley said he was prepared to support the application. He was convinced by the rationale for the proposed floor plate size, and said the issue of the view corridor should be addressed within what is legally allowable. He said he believed the massing on the east side of the plaza needs to be very similar (not necessary the same number of storeys) to the massing on the west side of the plaza because it is symmetrical in its basic massing and shape, noting there are few opportunities in the city to realise that kind of symmetry. As well, it is one of the most important entrances to the entire northerly waterfront park system. Mr. Beasley said he was very troubled by the base of the Cordova frontage. As the guidelines very clearly state, it is very important to have a rowhouse expression around the building with front entry doors into individual units. It is the amount of front doors that create a sense of safety and security on the street in a high density neighbourhood such as this. Mr. Beasley moved approval of the application, with amendments to the conditions, subject to which he said he believed the project will achieve the excellence it aspires to, and respond to the Guidelines.

Mr. MacGregor expressed some concern about the floor plate sizes in this neighbourhood. He supported the rationale for this proposal but stressed that the issue will need to be carefully considered in the next two applications. With respect to the family housing units, Mr. MacGregor noted it was the intent of the ODP to establish the total number of family units rather than a percentage. Questioned whether the applicant would be willing to enter into an agreement to provide the balance in the next two buildings, Mr. Cheng confirmed they are willing to work with the City to meet the goal but suggested that restricting family units up to the 8th floor may no longer be appropriate. In discussion, Mr. MacGregor agreed the definition could be reviewed by the Director of Planning at the request of the applicant, but cautioned that the by-law will be interpreted strictly on the remaining sites. With respect to the street-end view discussion, Mr. MacGregor noted that at the rezoning stage the park was configured specifically to respond to the street-end view. He suggested the issue of symmetry of height at the edge will become moot once the trees in the park mature beyond 28 ft. He agreed there needs to be a review of the calculation in the by-law and the ODP and he supported Mr. Beasley's recommended amendment to 1.1 in this respect. He did not, however, support Mr. Beasley's recommended condition to match the height of the townhouses on either side of the plaza.

Mr. Rudberg was also concerned about the incremental increases in floor plate sizes in this neighbourhood and stressed the issue will be reviewed very carefully when the remaining two applications are considered. He concurred with Mr. MacGregor in not supporting Mr. Beasley's recommended condition to adjust the height of the plaza-fronting townhouses. He felt the heights were fairly close as proposed and any difference would not be perceived in a 180 ft. wide plaza. He supported all the other recommended conditions and amendments.

Mr. Scobie expressed some concern that there had been no response to notification from the Renaissance Hotel, noting their earlier concerns at the rezoning stage.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 407402, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 14, 2003, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1 to read:

design development to define the northwest corner townhouse edge to satisfy the Bute Street-end view in response to the Coal Harbour Official Development Plan;

Delete 1.2;

Delete 1.6;

Amend 1.8 to read:

design development to reduce the width of paving in the east setback area north of the garage ramp to the minimum required for emergency access in order to increase landscape area;

Add a new condition:

design development to introduce individual front entries to all the townhouses on Cordova Street and on the plaza and Park frontages in response to Section 3.5.1 (a) Street Base Zone of the Guidelines;

Add a new condition:

design development to introduce additional townhouses on Cordova Street to strengthen its rowhouse character through provision of identifiable units in response to Section 3.5.1 (a) Street Base Zone of the Guidelines;

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

It was moved by Mr. Beasley to add a new condition:

design development to the Bute Street-end plaza-fronting townhouses to closely match the height of the westerly podium Carina townhouses in response to Section 3.4.2 (a) Street Base Zone of the Guidelines;

LOST

(Mr. MacGregor and Mr. Rudberg opposed)

**4. 7000 MONT ROYAL SQUARE - DE407381 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE AFTER PRELIMINARY)**

Applicant: Burrowes Huggins Architects

Request: To construct Phase 3 of the residential portion of the overall Champlain Mall redevelopment project comprising 45 stacked and non-stacked townhouses and a four-storey multiple dwelling building containing 71 units, for a total of 116 dwelling units, all over one level of underground parking.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Eric Fiss, presented this application for the fourth and final phase of redevelopment of the Champlain Mall site. Referring to the Staff Committee Report dated May 28, 2003, Mr. Fiss drew the Board's attention to some typographical errors on p.5 and p.8. He briefly reviewed the history of the redevelopment which began in 1998. The preliminary application for the entire site was approved in principle in 1999 and earlier phases have been approved and are now built or under construction. Phase 2 included a change in the form of development which transferred some of the density from the apartment building to the townhouses. That application was approved by the Board and the form of development was approved by Council. A similar change is sought in this final phase which also has more ground-oriented units. Staff support this change because it allows the development to achieve one of the preliminary conditions to increase the diversity of unit types and form of development across the site. Overall, the total number of units is within five percent of what was originally conceived for the entire site and the density (FSR) is slightly less.

In its first review of this proposal, the Urban Design Panel identified several conditions that needed to be addressed, including the relationships between buildings, the tightness of the units in the centre of the site, and some issues about the way the ground oriented units addressed the public open spaces. The Panel also expressed concern about the livability of some of the units. Staff reviewed these concerns with the applicant and agreed upon the manner in which they could be addressed. The subsequent revisions were considered by the Urban Design Panel in its second review of the scheme when it was unanimously supported. Mr. Fiss briefly described the recommended prior-to conditions outlined in the Staff Committee Report. He advised that staff believe the application also addresses issues raised at the preliminary stage. In summary, staff support the application and recommend approval, subject to the conditions and to Council's approval of the final form of development.

Questions/Discussion

With respect to the child care facility which was a requirement at the preliminary stage, Mr. Beasley pointed out that this has been provided off-site, in the Champlain Heights Community Centre, by this developer.

Mr. Beasley questioned whether the existing trees on the eastern edge of the site can be preserved, also noting the fairly significant difference in elevation that exists between the adjacent school property and this site. In discussion, it was noted there is an issue relating to Fire Department access at this edge, and the architect, Mike Huggins, said that saving all the trees would involve reconfiguring some of the townhouses in order to accommodate a wider landscape buffer.

Mr. MacGregor questioned whether condition 1.7, to reduce the roof overhang, would exacerbate moisture penetration. Mr. Fiss said staff believe the roof should be pulled back to maximize daylight access unto the units but he agreed that without careful detailing, water penetration could be a problem.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie concerning condition A.2.1, Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, agreed the reference in the Note to Applicant should be to stormwater detention rather than storage.

Applicant's Comments

Mike Huggins, Architect, advised that fire access has been a challenge on this site. He reiterated the problems involved in retaining the existing trees at the easterly edge, noting that most of them are on the property line which leaves only 2.8 m to the front yards of the townhouses. He agreed they can preserve seven or eight of the trees, but not all of them without altering the footprint. Mr. Huggins confirmed they can cut back the roof, as called for in condition 1.7, and noted that a drain will be required if the outer edge is exposed. He assured the Board they can address the issue of moisture penetration.

Mr. Huggins advised they have reviewed the Staff Committee Report and find the conditions acceptable.

Comments from Other Speakers

Marion Bollhorst expressed concern about the amount of density and parking on this site. She explained that traffic in the vicinity is already very congested, especially on McKinnon Street. She thought the provision of less than two parking spaces per unit was inadequate and would lead to residents parking on the adjacent streets.

Mr. Fiss noted that while the total number of units has increased since the preliminary stage, the total floor area has not increased and some of the units are smaller than originally envisaged. The number of required parking spaces is calculated by a formula that takes into account the number of units and gross floor area. Mr. Fiss noted the applicant is providing more than the required number of total parking spaces. He stressed that parking was an important issue at the rezoning stage and the conclusions at that time took into account that traffic patterns generated by a residential development are much different than a commercial development, having less impact on the neighbourhood. Traffic Engineering is satisfied with the amount of parking being provided. Mr. Thomson explained that the decisions made at the rezoning stage were based on a review of similar developments in east Vancouver, including Collingwood Village where it was found that a substantial number of residents use public transit. Mr. Thomson added that Engineering Services now believe that the current minimum standard is in excess of demand, based on the Collingwood Village data.

Mr. Rudberg noted that the Board is guided by the zoning when considering development applications. He reiterated that the amount of parking being provided is in excess of the projected demand. He pointed out that concerns regarding traffic congestion and excess speed can be investigated by the Neighbourhood Transportation Branch to

determine whether traffic calming measures are appropriate. He recommended that Ms. Bollhorst contact the Branch to initiate such a neighbourhood traffic study of McKinnon Street.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Lyon reported that the Urban Design Panel reviewed this application twice. The first review generated concerns about the tightness of the buildings on the site, particularly the proximity of Building 5 to the townhouses, the relationship of the units at grade to the surrounding streets, and the complexity of the form. The roof overhang at the interior corner of Building 6 was not a major issue for the Panel. The Panel unanimously supported the application when it was reviewed a second time and was satisfied that the revisions addressed the earlier concerns.

Mr. Hancock commented that this project has received a lot of scrutiny over the years and the density on the site has been long established. He recommended approval, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

Mr. Mah also recommended approval.

Mr. Henschel also supported the application. He recommended adding a condition to improve the livability of all the units in Building 6, not just those in the corner. He suggested there could be more windows, noting the units are very small and deep.

Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor noted the overall site density is less than originally envisaged. He commented that the site has evolved from a commercial development that was not very successful to one that is very successful and lively. The library is one of the busiest branches in the city and is serving the local community well. He suggested the proximity of services to the residences will reduce the amount of traffic in the area. Mr. MacGregor moved approval, with amendment to A.2.1.

Mr. Beasley stated that this application completes a lengthy development permit process that has dealt with many of the general issues. He said he was persuaded that preserving the existing trees at the easterly edge is not practical. Rather, a landscaped edge that provides adequate screening will be with new planting. Mr. Beasley noted that traffic was a major concern at the preliminary stage. However, the traffic study concluded the overall traffic would not be much different than before given the number of cars that came to the site at all hours to the previous commercial development. He said he believed the amount of parking is adequate, noting the total floor area on the site has not increased. As well, there is a greater probability that residents of smaller units will not be car owners. Mr. Beasley urged Ms. Bollhorst to review the traffic study with staff, adding there is also the possibility of introducing traffic calming measures if they are found to be justified. He seconded the motion of approval and said he thought it will be a very good project provided the elevation issues are carefully handled.

Mr. Rudberg said the issue of parking relates more to the quality of the design of the underground parking so that residents are comfortable to use it. Provided residents feel safe and secure, it will be used and there will be no overspill parking on surrounding streets. Mr. Rudberg noted that many of the issues relating to this site were addressed in the rezoning and preliminary stages. He said he was satisfied that this application has responded well and he looked forward to seeing the project completed.

Mr. Scobie said he was pleased to see this project coming to a successful conclusion.

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. 407381, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 28, 2003, with the following amendments:

Amend A.2.1 to replace "storage" with "detention".

5. OTHER BUSINESS

1673 Bayshore Drive - DE404739

This application was approved by the Board on June 24, 2002. One of the conditions called for amendments to an existing right-of-way on the adjacent Bayshore Hotel property because it is larger than necessary and includes areas that need not be subject to public access rights. Mr. Thomson, referring to Mr. Rudberg's memorandum to Mr. Scobie dated June 3, 2003 (on file), explained that this condition has proved far more difficult and onerous to fulfill than had been envisaged. Legal Services has confirmed there is no risk to the City if the condition is not fulfilled.

Motion

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

THAT the Board DELETE Condition A.2.5 as a condition of approval of Development Application Number 404739.

In discussion, it was agreed the Board might consider adding to its procedures that, in instances such as the foregoing, where a condition is imposed that is subject to the satisfaction of an official who subsequently concludes it is unnecessary, then that official may remove the condition if a telephone poll of Board members indicates support.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7.00 pm.

C. Hubbard
Clerk to the Board

F. Scobie
Chair

/ch

Q:\Clerical\DPB\Minutes\2003\jun9.wpd