

Date: Monday, March 17, 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)  
D. Chung Representative of General Public  
C. Henschel Representative of General Public  
J. Leduc Representative of General Public

**Regrets**

J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions  
E. Mah Representative of Development Industry  
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry

**ALSO PRESENT:**

J. Barrett Development Planner  
A. Molaro Development Planner  
A. Higginson Project Facilitator  
V. Potter Project Facilitator  
A. Di Nozzi Assistant City Surveyor  
P. Pinsker Parking & Development Engineer  
A. Mak Translator

**600 Beach Crescent**

P. Busby Busby & Associates  
B. Hemstock Phillips Wuori Long Inc.  
N. Negrin Concord Pacific Group

**5025 Willow Street**

P. May Grant & Sinclair Architects  
H. Ahking Vancouver School Board

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

The Chair announced the resignation of Michael Mortensen who has represented the general public on the Board's Advisory Panel since February 2000. Mr. Mortensen has been recently appointed to the position of Project Facilitator in Development Services. City employees are ineligible for membership on the Advisory Panel. Mr. Mortensen was thanked for his contribution to the Board's past deliberations.

## 1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of March 3, 2003 be approved.

## 2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

## 3. 600 BEACH CRESCENT - DE407194 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Busby & Associates

Request: To construct two residential towers (tower 1N at 24-storeys and tower 1O at 11-storeys) with townhouses for a total of 166 dwelling units (118 in the 24-storey and 48 in the 11-storey). An amenity facility consisting of a swimming pool is provided. Underground parking for 276 cars is provided, accessed from the cul-de-sac off Granville Street.

### Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Jonathan Barrett, presented this complete application, noting that the Guidelines for the Beach Neighbourhood are very specific with respect to uses and built form. He briefly described the site with the aid of a context model. Some modest variations from the guidelines are sought with respect to the floor plate for tower 1N and number of storeys for tower 1O. These variations are supported by staff. The applicant has also chosen not to provide vehicular access from Beach Crescent. Engineering Services supports the proposed single access off the cul-de-sac. Mr. Barrett briefly reviewed the recommended prior-to conditions, noting the concerns are very minor. A significant and commendable aspect of the proposal in terms of environmental sustainability is the applicant's intention to achieve the standards required for LEED silver certification. The Staff Committee recommends approval of the application, subject to the conditions outlined in the report dated February 19, 2003.

### Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding condition 1.5 regarding the break in the 3-storey built form facing the park. Mr. Barrett said staff have no preconceptions as to how this should be addressed and await the architect's suggestions.

Mr. Scobie questioned the inclusion of condition A.2.13 given that it relates to vehicular access to the neighbouring site. Mr. Barrett agreed it is inappropriate as a condition of approval for this application. He noted it was intended to provide early advice to the applicant.

### Applicant's Comments

Peter Busby, Architect, confirmed they have no problem with conditions. With respect to consideration item 1.5, Mr. Busby briefly described what they are trying to achieve in terms of making a connection into the park. Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect, briefly reviewed the design of George Wainborn Park. There was a conscious decision to express the geometry of the park in the break in the townhouses and this has also been carried through into the design of the courtyard. Mr. Busby explained that the architectural solution is that the structural grid that defines the townhouse elevations would continue over the opening which is flanked with

two-storey units. To satisfy condition 1.5, Mr. Busby said it will be emphasized in some way as a location for overlooking the park. With respect to the LEED status for the project, Mr. Busby said the developer intends to explore achieving LEED silver although may not proceed to certification.

In discussion with respect to condition 1.6, it was noted there is an error in the model and there is no difference in grade level from the adjacent site.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding Appendix C, Mr. Busby confirmed they have no concerns with the points raised by Processing Centre - Building and Fire & Rescue Services.

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

None.

#### **Panel Opinion**

Mr. Lyon noted the Urban Design Panel unanimously supported this application. The Panel had no reservations about supporting the 3-storey base as opposed to the higher base indicated in the guidelines. There was no consensus regarding the treatment of the base: some questions were raised as to whether the framing device was worthwhile but others found it to be a clever solution. There was some discussion about whether the lower tower should have the same expression as the taller tower, and questions raised about treatment along the park edge. Mr. Lyon noted that Mr. Busby's response to condition 1.5 is in keeping with the Urban Design Panel's discussions. He added, the Panel very strongly supported the applicant's intent to seek LEED silver standard for the project.

The other Advisory Panel members also strongly recommended approval and commended the developer for seeking LEED silver standard.

#### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Rudberg noted the applicant has responded very well to the guidelines for this neighbourhood and it is a fine project. He also complimented staff for a good analysis of the proposal.

Mr. Beasley said the proposal is a good architectural solution. He also endorsed the intent to seek LEED silver standard as a market identifier that will differentiate this project. With respect to condition 1.4, Mr. Beasley said he hopes that the detailed design around the circulation on the park side and how the edge is treated reflects the Board's previous deliberations and the public/private relationship it is trying to achieve on the other side of the park.

Mr. MacGregor supported the resolution.

#### **Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 407194, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 19, 2003, with the following amendment:

Delete Condition A.2.13.

4. 5025 WILLOW STREET - DE406997 - ZONE RS-1  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Grant & Sinclair Architects

Request: Interior and exterior alterations and the addition of approximately 31,463 sq.ft. (three-storeys) to the east side of this existing non-conforming secondary school (Eric Hamber Secondary School), thereby requesting relaxations of height, front yard, and floor space ratio.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

The Development Planner, Anita Molaro, presented this application for a renovation/addition to Eric Hamber Secondary School located in the central portion of the block bounded by Willow Street, West 33rd Avenue, Oak Street and West 37th Avenue. She briefly reviewed the site context. The primary entry to the school is on Willow Street. The proposed addition will replace portable classrooms that will be removed, and the proposal is to accommodate the student capacity set for the school by the Ministry of Education (1700 students). Current enrolment is 1572 students. An existing parking courtyard will be in-filled with the proposed addition and the parking lost by the courtyard will be relocated into an expanded parking area on the southeast corner of the site. Parking for the school is to accommodate staff requirements. The height of the proposed addition is 10 m which is within the permitted relaxable height of 10.7 m in the RS-1 zone. This relaxation is supported by staff noting it does not significantly impact on views.

Ms. Molaro noted that the most significant issue with respect to this application is the traffic impact resulting from the drop-off and pick-up activities of the students. This currently takes place along Willow Street, with significant congestion occurring on the street as well as the lane behind the single-family houses on Willow Street. Willow Street is frequently completely blocked in both directions during morning and afternoon peak times, with traffic also backing up along West 33rd Avenue. The School Board recently held an information meeting with the neighbours to help understand their concerns and try to find some solutions. The School Board has committed to the neighbours to implement a Good Neighbour Policy, as indicated in Appendix F and E of the Staff Committee Report dated March 5, 2003, to work with the adjacent neighbours to address their concerns. This includes the establishment of a school contact and to work with the neighbours in developing a plan to manage the traffic situation around the school. Recommended condition 1.1 further requests modifications to the traffic management plan to provide commitments to address the pick-up and drop-off congestion. This would include street improvement measures such as curb modifications to Willow Street and to consider the establishment of a sheltered area along West 33rd Avenue with a connection to the school to provide another focus area for the parents and students to pick-up and drop-off other than along Willow Street.

Staff acknowledge that the traffic impacts generated by the existing school are significant. With the commitments sought within the Traffic Demand Management Measures and the commitment of the Vancouver School Board with its Good Neighbour Policy, in conjunction with the improved communication between the school and neighbours, Staff believe that improvement to the traffic and pedestrian generated problems will be achieved and sustained for the current and anticipated student enrolment. Staff recommend approval of the application subject to the conditions contained in the report.

**Questions/Discussion**

Mr. MacGregor requested clarification regarding student enrolment. Ms. Molaro advised the existing portable classrooms accommodate 180 students. The proposed addition will accommodate all the existing students (including those in the portables) plus a 128 increase in student capacity to a maximum of 1700.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley regarding on-site parking, Paul Pinsker, Parking & Development Engineer, explained that students have access to the Park Board parking lot (21 spaces) accessed off Oak Street, next to the playing fields to the west of the school. However, significant access off Oak Street, being a major arterial road, is not encouraged. A 2001 traffic study projected the percentage of students driving to and from school to be six percent of the student population, which equates to about 100 vehicles. Apart from the 21 spaces in the Oak Street parking lot, student vehicle parking occurs on the streets. The school is

targeting for the six percent to be reduced to five percent by 2011, and four percent by 2021. Mr. Pinsker said it is hoped that, with the measures that will be promoted at the school, there will also be a reduction in the use of private vehicles by staff. All but about a dozen staff vehicles are currently accommodated on site.

Mr. Pinsker advised that Eric Hamber has the highest number of students driving to school in the city. He noted the Parking By-law provides for open spaces on school grounds to take precedence over parking, so that by-law requirements may be relaxed if vehicle parking would be at the expense of playing spaces. Mr. Pinsker added, Engineering Services is seeking a more stringent Traffic Management Plan, as a condition of approval, to improve the current predictions for reduction in vehicle use. The Parking By-law requirement for high schools is 1.25 spaces per employee which does anticipate some student vehicle use. Ms. Molaro noted the parking requirement for this site is 115 spaces and the proposal is to provide 99 on the site and 21 on the adjacent Park property.

In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg concerning the amendments sought to the Traffic Management Plan, Mr. Pinsker acknowledged that many of the measures proposed are very good. However, Traffic Engineering staff believe the target for reducing the number of vehicles can be improved. As well, the drop-off situation needs a lot of attention, especially diverting drop-off activity away from Willow Street to West 33rd Avenue. If these measures are unsuccessful, consideration will need to be given to widening portions of Willow Street. Mr. Pinsker noted that Willow Street is already substandard width for school access and this is a very long block. Two locations are proposed for bicycle parking, some of which will be enclosed. Approximately two percent of students currently cycle to school and it is hoped this percentage will increase with the improved bicycle facilities. In discussion, Mr. Pinsker said it would appear there is a greater than typical use of cars by parents dropping off students at this school. This may be because a large number of the students come from some distance away.

Mr. Beasley sought clarification about the existing large coniferous street at the southwest corner of the existing parking lot. Ms. Molaro agreed the new parking lot layout could be modified to preserve this tree, although it may require an increase in the number of small car spaces.

Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding the policy for on-site parking. Mr. Pinsker reiterated that the Parking By-law recognizes there is a trade-off between parking and green spaces/play field spaces for schools and most secondary schools in the city have little drop-off activities occurring on-site. He noted that reduced parking has been supported in some instances on downtown developments.

Mr. Henschel questioned whether the amount of parking could be increased in the Park space off Oak Street. Ms. Molaro noted the shared use of this parking area is by agreement between the Park Board and the School Board. Expanding it significantly would need to be explored with the Park Board. As well, Oak Street is not considered to be desirable as a major access street.

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

Henry Ahking, Vancouver School Board, said the proposed addition provides an opportunity to provide solutions to existing traffic and parking problems. This school site is unique in that it has limited frontage on Willow Street and a higher than average percentage of parents who drive their children to school. However, the School Board does not believe that parking will be an issue, noting the Traffic Management Plan indicates how some of the traffic can be mitigated further. Car pool spaces have been designated on site for use by students. As a policy, the School Board does not provide student parking on site; however, in practice, students have been parking on site when there are surplus employee spaces. Mr. Ahking said the School Board recognizes that traffic and parking is always an issue at all schools. At the information meeting held with the neighbours on January 30, 2003, the School Board proposed a process to seek solutions to mitigate the traffic measures. Mr. Ahking stated he believes the conditions recommended in the Staff Committee Report are onerous because it is clear the traffic problems will not be resolved before the beginning of construction. He therefore requested that the process be allowed to evolve over the coming year, with specific Traffic Management Plan solutions to be arrived at prior to occupancy, noting that construction is expected to be completed by the end of 2004.

With respect to student capacity, Mr. Ahking explained that the capacity of all 18 Vancouver secondary schools was at one time a total of 31,000 students. Current enrolment is about 26,000 and in the foreseeable future (ten years) the numbers are predicted to remain fairly stable. Mr. Ahking stressed they do not anticipate adding additional portable classrooms after the proposed school addition and the long term plan is for all students to be accommodated in permanent buildings. Mr. Ahking explained that Eric Hamber School has a large catchment area to accommodate 1700 students, which is based on the potential number of secondary students within this catchment area. Currently, 660 secondary school students within the Hamber catchment area attend VSB schools other than Hamber and 665 students come to Hamber from outside the catchment area. There is no walking distance limit established for secondary schools. Mr. Ahking stressed that the inclusion of secured bicycle parking in the plan will go a long way to encourage students and staff to cycle to school.

Patrick May, Architect, said the existing large tree is in the middle of a future driving aisle and preservation of the tree would result in the loss of about 8 - 10 parking spaces. Some of these spaces might be recovered if the number of small car spaces is increased.

#### Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor concerning the possible expansion of the parking area on the Park Board property, Mr. Ahking said it has not been pursued in this particular location. He noted the Park Board has been unreceptive to a similar proposal at another school site.

Responding to a question from Mr. Rudberg with respect to student enrolment, Mr. Ahking confirmed that potential students would be refused admission once the capacity of 1700 is reached. Admittance is based on available resources, namely physical space, staffing and program availability. He confirmed he would have no objection if a limit of 1700 students is included in the Good Neighbour Agreement. He said they can also provide assurance that the contact person named in the agreement will be on site, noting that some of the issues relate not only to traffic and parking but student behaviour. He also confirmed that there is budget allocation to deal with the traffic management measures.

Ms. Leduc sought clarification regarding the rationale for extending the catchment area in order to achieve the 1700 capacity. Mr. Ahking advised that while adjustments resulted in the catchment area being slightly increased, the adjustments were made for reasons other than to make up the capacity. These were consideration for the safety of children crossing streets and the desire to keep elementary feeder school students together when they move up to secondary school. Ms. Leduc asked what measures the school has taken to date to persuade parents not to drive their children to school. Mr. Ahking said the meeting with the neighbours has made it apparent that the students' parents need to be educated and the Good Neighbour Policy will commit to educate parents of new students every year.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning condition 1.1, Mr. Ahking confirmed that, with the exception of the timing, he was satisfied with the requirements.

Responding to a question from Mr. Henschel as to whether there are successful drop-off and pick-up arrangements at other schools, Mr. Ahking said similar issues arose at the addition to Killarney school where they have been able to relocate drop-off and pick-up areas. The ongoing consultation with the neighbours at Killarney has also worked very well.

In response to a request for clarification from Mr. Rudberg concerning the current standards on Willow Street, Mr. Pinsker advised it has the typical residential street width of 28 ft whereas the normal standard for streets adjacent school or park is 36 ft. Any future widening would occur only on the school side of Willow Street. While the street is designated Resident Parking Only, stopping is permitted.

### Comments from Other Speakers

Frances Lin, 15-year resident on Willow Street, advised she also represents most of her neighbours in opposing the application. Concerns include traffic congestion, safety of the street and the lane, disturbance by students and illegal parking. She noted the Staff Committee Report fails to identify vandalism which is a major issue for many of the neighbours. Ms. Lin distributed photographs of the neighbourhood to illustrate the cause of their concerns. As a member of the Good Neighbour Policy team, Ms. Lin stressed that to date no solution has been reached to the traffic and vandalism problems in the neighbourhood. She and her neighbours are also very concerned about the loss of trees, noting a number of mature trees on Willow Street and West 33rd Avenue were lost due to vandalism and disease, and only after eight months of complaint did the School Board replace one of them. She was opposed to the proposed loss of a mature tree in favour of new parking spaces. With respect to the proposal for a layby on the west of Willow Street at West 33rd Avenue, Ms. Lin said she and her neighbours do not believe it will work. The concern is that the existing layby is currently used by students on weekends and late at night, causing noise and disturbance. Ms. Lin described the serious traffic congestion that occurs in the Willow Street lane. She also noted that graffiti is not removed, despite complaints to the school. Based on past experience, Ms. Lin said they have no confidence that problems will be addressed by the school administration. A letter of opposition to this application was sent to the Mayor on February 26, 2003 but to date there has been no response.

Mr. Scobie noted that Mayor Campbell would not be able to personally answer many of the questions posed in the February 26 letter because they are matters under the jurisdiction of the School Board. As well, the Mayor and City Council do not involve themselves in decisions on development applications, the authority for which rests with the Development Permit Board. Comments on the application are more appropriately addressed to this Board which will take the concerns into account in reaching its decision.

Ms. Lin responded to questions from Board and Panel members.

Andrew Mak provided Cantonese translation for the following four public delegations:

Ken Suen, resident of Willow Street, suggested the No Parking section of West 33rd Avenue be changed to No Waiting. He stressed that between 7 a.m. and 9 a.m. and 2.30 p.m. and 4.00 p.m., heavy traffic congestion occurs in the lane behind Willow Street. He suggested that during these times only local residents be permitted to use the lane and that traffic regulations are strictly enforced. Mr. Suen was also concerned about students jaywalking across Willow Street and air pollution created by parents waiting in cars with the engines running as well as smoking cigarettes beside their vehicles. Garbage is also a serious issue. He suggested that students be restricted to the school grounds during lunch times.

Winnie Lee, a new resident in the area, explained the problems she has encountered, including heavy traffic congestion on Willow Street and in the lane before and after school hours. Problems also occur on Saturdays when Chinese School takes place and on Sundays during sports events. Ms. Lee was also concerned about students who park in front of her house during lunch hour, creating garbage and noise. Noise and street racing also occurs late at night. She suggested that the school extension should be closer to Oak Street and away from the Willow Street residents.

Chan Low, resident of Willow Street, expressed concern about the traffic congestion and students' vehicles blocking the street. He described the vandalism that occurred to his house and suggested that property values in this block are decreasing because of the traffic problems. He noted that sometimes he is unable to get out of his house from the front or the back due to traffic congestion. He suggested the Resident Parking Only be strictly enforced and violators towed.

Kitty Tu noted the school is non-conforming with respect to yards and parking and suggested the situation should be improved rather than made worse by the proposed extension. She suggested the City is making things easy for the School Board. She described how the students negatively impact her life, starting in the afternoon and continuing until late at night, causing noise and garbage as well as street racing on Willow Street. In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor, Ms. Tu said she believes the situation has become worse over the ten years she has lived in the area.

Vicky Woo, Willow Street resident and former Eric Hamber student, read a letter she sent to the City in February. She was concerned about noise, garbage, vandalism and traffic congestion.

Aurora Sutherland, Co-Chair of the Good Neighbour Committee, was concerned about the amount of due diligence done by staff, noting that she has never been contacted by staff to find out if there has been any improvement in the traffic situation since January. At the January public information meeting, a school representative promised that upcoming continuing education classes would be staggered. However, this has not occurred, as evidenced by the recent class schedule published by the VSB (distributed to Board and Panel members). With respect to the proposed school addition, Ms. Sutherland noted that several relaxations are requested. She was very concerned that the music classes will be moving closer to Willow Street, causing more disturbance to the residents. She suggested that locating the addition on the Willow Street side of the school will cause parents to continue to drop their children in this location. With respect to the impact of Eric Hamber students on the neighbours, Ms. Sutherland noted she previously lived next to Kitsilano Secondary School but was not subjected to the same problems. She questioned whether Eric Hamber school could be trusted to have some control over an increased student population, given they are unable to do so currently with fewer students. She urged that the school be required to commit to and demonstrate one year of school traffic improvement and changes before approval is granted. She said the neighbourhood would be willing to support the addition if the school showed improvement in traffic, vandalism, loading and garbage, over a one year period.

Jim Weimer, resident of West 33rd Avenue, did not believe that refusing the school extension would enhance property values. Eric Hamber is one of the top academic schools in the city and an asset to the community. He said he considers the proposal to be a renewal of outdated and underused school facilities. However, it must be done in a way that addresses existing concerns and minimizes any new problems. He stressed it is the students' parents who are the fundamental cause of the twice daily traffic snarls. The traffic situation is the greatest real concern but it should be solvable. It needs to be addressed, but should not be dependent on this development. Mr. Weimer circulated a copy of a flyer prepared by the Student Council and distributed to drivers in an attempt to get parents to change their behaviour. He suggested the situation could be improved with better signage and a few more No Stopping Zones. He said the parking problem should be solvable but the traffic problem could be hazardous. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, Mr. Weimer confirmed that he believes the school administration and School Board staff are acting in good faith with the Good Neighbour Committee.

Doug Pearson, resident of Willow Street, read a letter of concern from Mrs. Groff of 869 West 33rd Avenue. Mr. Pearson questioned why the school is expanding. He said the Good Neighbour Policy is an excellent program but it has only been in place for a month whereas the neighbours have been complaining about the problems for two years without any response.

Wilma Suen, member of the Good Neighbour Committee and former Eric Hamber student, urged that this application be treated in the same way as any other. She said their concern is that public money should be spent wisely and they do not believe that this is a wise project. She suggested the need for the Hamber expansion is the result of School Board policy mistake. However, if the expansion is necessary, it still must be built in a manner that has the least impact on the neighbourhood. She suggested the decision to expand the catchment area is the problem. Ms. Suen also thought that locating the extension on the east side of the site will increase traffic on Willow Street. She did not believe the traffic management plan would work in the long term. She advised that at the last Good Neighbour Meeting the neighbours were informed that a contract has already been awarded to build the extension, without development permission. She urged that the neighbourhood as a whole be considered rather than approving applications on a case by case basis.

In response to a question from the Board concerning the construction contract, Mr. Ahking advised there has been a request for proposals but a contract has not been awarded and will not be until the appropriate time.

Darcy Mainwaring said the traffic situation around the school is intolerable and the residents are asking for the City's help. He stressed it is not only an inconvenience but a safety issue.



Frank McLeod, resident of Willow Street, added his comments about the severe traffic problems. He suggested that expanding the catchment boundary only encourages more people to drive to school. He was also concerned about the impact on property value and loss of mountain view.

### Panel Opinion

Mr. Lyon noted the Urban Design Panel was charged with reviewing the building itself, its context in terms of the existing school and how well the program has been fit into the design. The application was strongly supported by the Panel who found the building very efficiently and tightly handled, using up courtyard space rather than spreading out on the site. The minor relaxations were supported and the Panel thought the building would improve the street edge.

Mr. Chung noted the building itself is not a problem. He thought it fit well and he found the height acceptable. He commented that the issue of traffic has always been a concern of this Board, for both private and public developments. He suggested that approval of the application should be subject to a number of conditions to address the issues. He recommended that the City prepare a traffic report and that it be integrated in the development permit because it is evident the traffic problems have not been solved.

Mr. Henschel thanked the delegations for their thoughtful presentations and said he found the photographs especially helpful in understanding the magnitude of the problems. He noted, however, that the problems are pre-existing and he did not believe this proposal would add a great deal to the situation. Nevertheless, the School Board has committed to try to solve existing problems and he encouraged them to follow up on that commitment. He suggested the School Board work with the City and the Park Board to explore creating a new roadway to the south of the school, between the school and the park with a drop-off zone where parents can wait, or some other approach to solve the problem, before proceeding with the development. He also recommended that the school prepare a graffiti, vandalism, smoking and garbage management plan to deal with the impact on the neighbourhood. He noted the current program does not provide an area for students to congregate between classes which encourages them to go onto Willow Street. He urged that an on-site area be considered in the scheme.

Ms. Leduc commented that the increased catchment area appears to contradict City policy which attempts to have residents live and work in the same area. She noted that a whole elementary school could be removed from the catchment area which would avoid children being separated from their friends when they go to high school. As well, perhaps the desirable programs at Eric Hamber could be transferred to another school. Transporting children across the city, creating more and more traffic congestion, is a serious issue that the City and the School Board need to resolve. Students who are travelling more than 10k are very unlikely to ride bicycles or use the bus. Ms. Leduc said she believes there should be strict enforcement of both dropping off and parking on Willow Street and other solutions have to be found. She was very concerned about the neighbours' statements about the behaviour of the students, noting the school seems to be completely unable to control or manage it. She agreed the school must come up with a plan to manage the impacts of the school and the students on the neighbourhood because the current situation is unacceptable. She noted that other secondary schools seem to be able to manage it satisfactorily. She said the development permit should not be issued until the conditions outlined in the report are met, including a plan to manage student behaviour.

### Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley thanked the residents for their presentations which he found very helpful. The photographs as well as Mr. Weimer's analysis were particularly helpful. As to whether or not the school should upgrade from portables to a permanent building, Mr. Beasley said he believes the School Board has made a judgment and it is in the interest of the quality of education that this conversion takes place. The residents who have questions about the use of public money for this purpose or expanding school capacity to 1700 need to address those questions to their elected School Board. The Development Permit Board must accept that it is the judgment of the School Board to make this investment. Mr. Beasley said he believes the extension is supportable but he agreed with the Advisory Panel that there have to be solutions to the parking and access problems, to some degree tied to this development application. It is appropriate for the Board to make adjustments to the Traffic Demand Management measures and for the Board to emphasize and provide some level of security for the community about the Good Neighbour process. Congestion in the lane, as well as parking and access on

Willow Street, must be addressed and the School Board has to go beyond the traffic impact study in the long term to deal with these problems. Better solutions must be found on this very large site that do not depend on the surrounding roads for drop-off and parking. This goes beyond this development application but should be a continuing endeavour for the School Board. The administration of the school should also acknowledge the concerns of the residents with respect to student behaviour, and initiate an ongoing program to address the situation. Mr. Beasley noted, however, that it is the students themselves who have taken the only pro-active action so far, which is an indication that the majority of students are acting responsibly and only a small number of students are negatively impacting the neighbours. He commended the Student Council for its initiative.

Mr. Beasley said he believes his proposed amendments to the conditions will cover the concerns that have been raised by the residents. He stressed that he hopes the School Board and the school administration will go further in the areas which are beyond the mandate of the Development Permit Board.

Mr. Rudberg said the issues of capital expenditures and catchment areas are policy decisions of the School Board and the Development Permit Board can only work within these existing policies in considering the development application. The traffic congestion is clearly intolerable and this application has provided an opportunity for the residents to bring the situation to the City's attention. Mr. Rudberg said he was not convinced, however, that this addition to the school will materially change the current situation, which will continue to be bad unless some fairly drastic intervention occurs. He said it is his expectation that a workable traffic management plan needs to be in place before the development permit is issued, as called for in the conditions. On behalf of Engineering Services, Mr. Rudberg stated his department is committed to work with the applicant and the neighbourhood to undertake some major interventions with regard to how the traffic flows in and out of this neighbourhood, including additional signs, prohibitions and follow-up enforcement. As well, the traffic management plan must have the ongoing support of the school administration. He stressed that it will be necessary for Engineering Services staff to act aggressively, with the support of the School Board, the neighbourhood and the Police.

Mr. MacGregor supported the resolution. He stressed that the application is for a very modest development and it is approvable. The issues all relate to traffic. With respect to the access off Oak Street and the potential expansion of the Park Board parking lot, Mr. MacGregor said the traffic plan should include discussions with the Park Board to explore opportunities to mitigate impacts on the neighbourhood. With respect to the vandalism and other impacts on the neighbourhood, Mr. MacGregor said the administration of the school, with the help of the neighbourhood, can deal with the very small number of students who are responsible. Overall, the responsibility must be with the school administration to work with the neighbours. Meeting every two months during the school year, as called for in the revised Good Neighbour Policy, should identify problems early.

Mr. Scobie provided some clarification with respect to the RS-1 zoning. He noted that in recent years more onerous limitations have been applied to single-family dwellings in the RS-1 zone. At the same time, however, Council acknowledged that the new restrictions not only resulted in much of the existing housing being non-conforming, but compliance was also not practical for schools and other non-residential uses. Provision for relaxation was therefore deliberately included to allow for schools and other non-residential uses to be dealt with under the RS-1 zoning without requiring full compliance with regulations that were conceived as being applicable and appropriate for single-family dwellings. Mr. Scobie stressed that the relaxations sought in this application were very much anticipated at the time Council established the more restrictive regulations. With respect to the comments provided by the residents, Mr. Scobie said he agreed that the photographs were extremely helpful in making the traffic situation very clear. The conditions in the lane are particularly bad and unlivable and must be addressed in the traffic management plan. He agreed with Mr. MacGregor that this is a modest proposal in terms of its scale, but it has provided an opportunity for the residents to bring to the City's attention the long-standing issues in the neighbourhood. He urged that the school find ways to manage the activities of the students who are causing the problems, and the parents who may not fully appreciate the impact of their actions on the neighbourhood. He urged that the School Board take the opportunity to become a more tolerable neighbour to the residents because the school is currently not functioning in a neighbourly fashion.

**Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 406997, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated March 5, 2003, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1 to add, after "...and curb modifications to the west side of Willow Street": *and changes to or differing management of the lane east of Willow Street;*

Amend the Note to Applicant in 1.1 to add after "A School contact": *on-site*, and add to the end of the fourth sentence: *and consideration should be given to expansion of the parking at this location;*

Add 1.2:  
*confirmation by letter that the School Board will meet the commitment in its letter dated 12 February 2003, appended as Appendix F, with changes to policy #4 to add, after "the school shall designate": an on-site contact; amend policy #5 to read "every September" rather than on an annual basis; amend policy #7, amend "every six months" to "every two months during the school year";*

Add 1.3:  
*design development to adjust the parking layout, if possible, to save the large coniferous tree at the southeast corner of the existing staff parking lot where the parking lot is to be expanded.*

**5. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8.25 pm.

C. Hubbard  
Clerk to the Board

F. Scobie  
Chair

/ch

Q:\Clerical\DPB\Minutes\2003\mar17.wpd