

Date: Monday, May 13, 2002
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)
L. Beasley Director of Current Planning
J. Forbes-Roberts General Manager of Community Services
D. Rudberg General Manager of Engineering Services (excused 1399 Chess Street due to conflict of interest)

Advisory Panel

W. Franci Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions
J. Ross Representative of Development Industry
J. Leduc Representative of General Public
M. Mortensen Representative of General Public
R. Bruce Scott Representative of General Public

Regrets

P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry
D. Chung Representative of General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

E. Fiss Development Planner
A. Higginson Project Facilitator
D. Rudberg General Manager of Engineering Services
M. Thomson City Surveyor
R. Hargraves Assistant City Surveyor
J. Hall Neighbourhood & Transportation Engineer
B. Macdonald Parking Engineer
A. Mak Translator

Item 3 - 1399 Chess Street - DE406382 - Zone I-2

S. Kemp Omicron
T. Timm Deputy City Engineer, City of Vancouver
P. Bremner Facilities Development Engineer, City of Vancouver

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 April 15, 2002 be approved.

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of April 29, 2002 be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 1399 CHESS STREET - DE406382 - ZONE I-2
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Omicron Consulting Group

Request: To construct a City Works Yard containing general office, storage, repair and maintenance and operations buildings, and related activities.

The Chair introduced Andrew Mak who will provide translation services for the benefit of Chinese members of the public who do not understand English. Mr. Mak will translate the opening comments of the Development Planner and the applicant, and provide English translation for any public delegations who wish to address the Board in Cantonese.

Mr. Rudberg declared a conflict of interest with respect to this application. The City of Vancouver Engineering Department is the applicant and has retained Omicron Consulting Group to design the proposed new City Works Yard. Mr. Rudberg withdrew from the table and advised he will remain available to respond to questions.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Eric Fiss, presented this application for a new City Works Yard to replace the existing outdated Cambie Works Yard and consolidate some other smaller works yard functions elsewhere in the city. The Works Yard will contain eight Engineering Branches, including Sanitation, Equipment, Water Works, Sewers, Streets, Electrical and Traffic, Parking and Stores. The proposal also includes a fuelling station and car wash for City vehicles, including Police vehicles. The site will also contain a surface parking lot.

Mr. Fiss noted the subject site is part of a larger site from which it will be subdivided. The larger site will include two new city streets: Street "A" along the western portion of the proposed Works Yard, and Street "B" along the southern portion of the Works Yard, to the north of the existing rail yards. There will also be an extension of Chess Street to complete the loop around the Works Yard. The larger site also contains a temporary fire training facility at the foot of Chess Street. An application has been received for a permanent training facility for Fire & Rescue Services in this location (not part of the subject application).

Mr. Fiss briefly described the site context. It is within False Creek Flats which has been used for a variety of transportation and industrial uses since the early 1900s. To the immediate north of the site is a

warehouse/food wholesale district along Malkin Avenue, to the north of which are two blocks of the Strathcona residential neighbourhood just south of Prior Street. To the west of the site is an area which has been designated as a future park to serve the Strathcona neighbourhood, beyond which is the approved TechPark.com development (not yet under construction). The intent of the I-2 industrial zone is to provide for industrial opportunities or activities that serve a useful or necessary function in the city. The area has been an industrial zone for some time, previously M-1/M-2. The recent change to I-2 downzoned it slightly, reducing the permitted density and maximum height. Mr. Fiss briefly reviewed Council policies with respect to the city's industrial lands, including the Industrial Lands Policy (1995), False Creek Flats Preliminary Concept Plan (1996), False Creek Flats Urban Structure Plan (March 2001) and False Creek Flats Area Specific Development Cost Levy (April 2001). In addition, in November 2001, Council authorized the implementation of LEED™ (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) for several of the buildings and development on this site.

A number of issues were considered by the applicant in the overall planning of the site, including site safety, functional efficiency, and neighbourhood impacts (noise, dust and traffic). Consideration was also given to the proposed new park and the streetscape around the site, as well as planning for future expansion of some of the buildings on the site.

Staff reviewed this application and concluded that while the proposal complies with the regulations of the I-2 zoning there could be some modest design modifications to uphold the highest standards of the Council policy in terms of the public interface. Staff recommend a number of design conditions to address these issues, as outlined in the Staff Committee Report dated May 1, 2002. Mr. Fiss briefly reviewed the conditions, noting that condition 1.6 is for the Board's consideration because some of the traffic measures are not within the Board's jurisdiction and require Council approval. Engineering Services has committed to continue working with the neighbourhood with respect to traffic mitigation (Appendix F) to determine the measures necessary to prevent neighbourhood impacts. In summary, staff support the proposed use, density and height. The Works Yard provides a useful and necessary function and its use is consistent with the land use zoned for the site and the impacts on nearby residents have been minimized in the design. The proposed architectural expression is of high quality and the proposed LEED™ certification targets for sustainability are commendable. Staff recommend approval of the application, subject to the detailed refinements set out in the report.

It was noted that two versions of Appendix F are attached to the report. Mr. Fiss confirmed that the memorandum dated May 3, 2002 supersedes the April 25, 2002 memorandum.

Engineering Services' Comments

At the request of Mr. Beasley, the May 3, 2002 memorandum (Appendix F of the report) was addressed by Engineering Services. Jim Hall, Neighbourhood & Transportation Engineer, reviewed the measures that will be taken to mitigate traffic impacts, noting the traffic consultant's report indicates that most of the traffic generated by this development will be to the south and the west. Close attention will be given to any traffic going north into the Strathcona area. Complaints have already been received about existing industrial traffic using Malkin Avenue and shortcutting along Atlantic to reach the semi-actuated light at Prior Street. A request has been made for a new light at Prior and Malkin to prevent truck traffic using the Strathcona neighbourhood, and consultation with the neighbourhood traffic committee will continue. Mr. Hall described Council policy for identifying neighbourhood traffic impacts which determines the work program to deal with the most urgent first. Bob Macdonald, Parking Engineer, advised there will be sufficient parking spaces on the site to ensure there will be no overspill into the adjacent community.

Mr. Mak translated the foregoing commentary.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley asked how the measures outlined in the May 3, 2002 memorandum compare with the comprehensive traffic plan which has been called for by several of the Strathcona community groups in the correspondence appended to the Staff Committee Report. Dave Rudberg, General Manager of Engineering Services, said what they are proposing, particularly around the intersection of Jackson and Prior, is not a comprehensive traffic plan. There have been two previous comprehensive traffic plans for this neighbourhood and a number of measures have already been implemented. In response to the significant demand for neighbourhood traffic plans throughout the city, Council established criteria to determine which neighbourhoods should be dealt with first. According to this policy, a number of other neighbourhoods rate higher than Strathcona. Therefore, to initiate the comprehensive traffic plan requested by the neighbourhood at this time would be contrary to Council policy. While Engineering Services can address the impacts from this development, it would be unwilling to circumvent Council policy by advancing this neighbourhood ahead of several others. There are a number of smaller studies being undertaken in the Strathcona neighbourhood. Mr. Rudberg said the community is requesting a larger traffic study which deals not so much with this development but with what they perceive are existing problems, including traffic around some schools and traffic shortcutting through the neighbourhood. Mr. Rudberg suggested the Board would not require a private developer to undertake a larger transportation study to deal with existing problems not related to the development site.

At the request of Mr. Beasley, Mr. Hall described how the movement of traffic from "A" street through Malkin to Prior/Jackson and north will be managed to prevent intrusion into the neighbourhood. Measures being considered for the Prior/Jackson intersection include a right-in/right-out diverter or a right-in/all-out to allow residents to go south. These measures would make it impossible for additional traffic to be generated around the schools to the north. Mr. Hall agreed that similar measures could be installed at the Prior/Princess intersection. Traffic calming devices have already been implemented in the neighbourhood, so that Jackson Street is currently the only through street. Hawks Avenue is closed to the north where there is a community garden. As well, the Greenways group is looking at additional traffic calming measures for Hawks Avenue that will be implemented before completion of the Works Yard, subject to Council approval. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning traffic monitoring, Mr. Hall explained that any diversionary measures are installed on a six months trial basis which includes monitoring, in consultation with the neighbourhood and approved by Council. After this time, following a report back to the Strathcona Residents' Traffic Committee, a neighbourhood survey will be conducted to determine if the measures should be made permanent, subject also to Council approval.

With respect to noise mitigation, Scot Kemp, Architect, noted the sheds at the northwest corner of the site are designed as acoustic barriers. The movement of noise is also limited by the existing large warehouses immediately to the north. Tom Timm, Deputy City Engineer, noted the Vancouver Coastal Health Authority is requesting some further work to be done to satisfy acoustic regulations and he confirmed Engineering Services intends to meet these conditions.

Mr. Beasley observed that a potential benefit of the traffic mitigation measures being considered would be better management of existing industrial traffic in terms of its impact on the neighbourhood. Mr. Hall agreed it could result in an overall improvement over what currently exists, noting there have been complaints about truck traffic using Atlantic Street to access Prior Street, which the traffic light at Jackson should alleviate. The proposed diverter at Prior/Jackson would address concerns about shortcutting along Jackson Street between Hastings and Prior. As well, some of the existing traffic heading north to Prior will now be able to go west along the new street "B". Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, noted the Staff Committee had considerable discussion about traffic impacts and subsequently concluded it was not an issue in considering this development application. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning any unforeseen shortcutting that may occur, Mr. Hall confirmed that several adjacent streets will be monitored following installation of any diversionary devices.

With respect to public consultation and notification process, Alison Higginson, Project Facilitator, noted the application was submitted December 17, 2001, following which an initial notification was made. The notification area was determined in discussion with the applicant, based on the notification area previously used in Works Yard consultation with the neighbourhood in October 2001. Responses to this notification suggested the notification area needed to be expanded. Therefore, after the application for the proposed new fire training facility was made, approximately one month later, a joint notification was made to give the neighbours the context of the Works Yard and the Fire & Rescue Services centre. This increased the notification from the initial 75 addresses to more than 450, including several local community groups. Several members of staff and the applicant subsequently attended a meeting of the Strathcona Residents' Association to discuss the impacts of the application. Mr. Kemp noted the City also hosted an Open House for the neighbours in May 2001. A further notification was made in October 2001, providing an update of the process prior to submission of the development application.

Mr. Ross questioned whether a Good Neighbour Agreement would be appropriate for this application. Mr. Thomson noted that in recent instances where a Good Neighbour Agreement has been implemented the concerns were much more related to unknown traffic impacts, and the applicants were being asked to make a commitment to live up to the programming that they had identified. The subject application, however, proposes a functional industrial use that is well planned, with known factors including the number of employees and amount of equipment on the site. As well, City Works Yard employees will be directed as to how they enter and exit the site. Mr. Ross questioned whether there should be a liaison committee that includes members of the community, to deal with issues as they arise. Mr. Thomson responded that in instances where the Good Neighbour Agreement has been used, there was concern in the neighbourhood that the applicant would not live up to his commitments. In this case, Mr. Thomson said he believed the Staff Committee is confident that this applicant will meet its commitments. Mr. Scobie also pointed out the consideration condition 1.6 refers to a liaison function to deal with traffic impacts. Mr. Timm added, he believes Good Neighbour Agreements are appropriate when the proposed use is out of context (eg., a large church in a residential neighbourhood). The subject site is in an industrial area and the level of traffic that will be generated by the Works Yard is completely in keeping with what might be expected from almost any other kind of industrial activity on this site. Mr. Timm stressed that Engineering Services is committed to liaison and ongoing good neighbourliness in this community. Mr. Scobie added, the Good Neighbour Agreement is used when the City is dealing with an applicant over which the City has no direct control in terms of what occurs after a development permit is issued. The City Engineering Department is always accountable to the community via City Council, as are all City departments.

In response to a question from Mr. Scott regarding the proposed new street "B", Mr. Thomson confirmed it will connect to Chess and Station Streets and it will be made available to the public. He noted that a condition of the TechPark.com development was that they dedicate the south 66 ft. of their site for a road but this has not yet occurred. Since about 1993, however, the City has held a right-of-way over the south 12 metres and this will be opened as a public road. When the TechPark.com development proceeds and the full 66 ft. dedication occurs, it is likely a sidewalk will also be included at that time. Street "A" will connect Malkin Avenue and Street "B".

Ms. Leduc questioned the relationship that exists currently with neighbours of existing City Works Yards. Mr. Timm advised that issues have arisen at the Cambie Yards relating to odours from the asphalt and aggregate plant and noise from the Police dog kennels, both of which do not apply to the new Works Yard. Another concern about the use by City trucks of the neighbouring residential streets was addressed by way of traffic mitigation measures. Mr. Hall said there is nothing to prevent traffic from going north at the Manitoba Yards intersection. One complaint has been received about City trucks using adjacent residential streets and directives are given frequently to remind drivers to turn on Marine Drive.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie as to why this application is not approvable outright, Mr. Fiss explained the use is conditional. The I-2 District Schedule specifies Works Yard use under transportation and storage and, as such, requires the approval of the Development Permit Board, taking into account the intent of all applicable Council policies and guidelines as well as the submissions of any advisory groups, property owners or tenants.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Timm introduced the applicant team and briefly described the history of the project. A number of existing works facilities throughout the city are being eliminated due to redevelopment, including the Cambie Yard which will be redeveloped as part of the Southeast False Creek sustainable community. It is therefore necessary to have sites that are available as industrial land for the long term, and the False Creek Flats area has been designated by the City as industrial. The Manitoba Works Yard will remain in place in South Vancouver and the proposed new Works Yard will be the only yard in the northern part of the city. Mr. Timm stressed the works yard use is one of the city-serving industries that Council considered in terms of preserving industrial lands in the city, and this site was acquired in 1993 for this purpose.

Mr. Kemp briefly reviewed the design rationale, noting it is the result of an extensive investigation that considered twenty different schemes. The main design objective sought to maximize the efficiency of the site and minimize impact on the adjacent neighbours. They also sought to create an attractive facility that makes a positive contribution to the neighbourhood. Mr. Kemp briefly described the various functions that will occur on the site. Traffic and acoustic studies were commissioned and the recommendations were included in the design. He noted the commitment to sustainable design and the intent to seek LEED™ certification (silver level) for the two main buildings, and said they fully support all the recommendations of the Urban Design Panel.

Mr. Timm advised they generally agree with all the conditions recommended by the Staff Committee. With respect to condition 1.4 concerning treatment of the staff parking area, Mr. Timm said there may be a misunderstanding with respect to stormwater retention vs. detention. He explained the intent is to provide for stormwater detention, and requested an amendment to the condition accordingly. Similar amendments also apply to standard conditions A.2.5 and A.2.6. Mr. Timm also requested deletion of the timeline attached to registration of the agreement in the Land Title Office, as called for in A.2.6. Regarding condition 1.6, Mr. Timm said they have no concern about working with staff to implement the traffic demand management strategies, etc., but expressed concern about the approval being subject to provision of the measures, given that these measures will not be provided before permit issuance and construction. He requested an amendment of the condition.

Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Ms. Leduc about industrial land in the city, Mr. Beasley noted a detailed analysis was conducted of all the industrial lands in the city and it was determined which ones could be let go without endangering the basic industrial infrastructure. The conclusion of the analysis was that the city has more than adequate industrial lands for the kind of industry to be expected in the heart of a metropolitan area like Vancouver, acknowledging that much industrial activity is now moving to the suburbs where land is cheaper and accessibility is better.

Mr. Franci sought clarification that condition 1.2 will address the Urban Design Panel's concerns with respect to the perimeter wall. Mr. Fiss advised that discussions with the applicant are ongoing which take into account the comments of the Urban Design Panel, including options for transparency into the site without mitigating acoustical privacy, and varied surface treatment. He said staff are confident the applicant can address the concerns raised by the Panel.

In response to a question from Mr. Mortensen concerning the LEED certification that will be sought, Mr. Kemp explained the two main buildings were chosen because it was felt they would provide the maximum opportunity to obtain the greatest benefit. They will, however, include as many other sustainable features as they can in the rest of the site.

Mr. Scobie sought confirmation from the applicant team that they are satisfied they have addressed concerns that the process has not met community expectations. Mr. Timm said they did not believe or anticipate that this project would have significant impacts north of Prior Street, which is the main arterial route serving this industrial area. It was, however, recognized and acknowledged that the two residential blocks south of Prior Street immediately abutting the industrial community would have some impact, and this was the focus in the early community consultation. Mr. Timm said he believes the concerns raised by the Strathcona neighbourhood north of Prior Street relate to a general concern about traffic in the area. It was not anticipated that this project in an industrial area would become a trigger for those concerns or that they would be tied together as they have been by this community. It was only after the initial notification and Open House that it became evident there was likely a broader concern in the community, which led to expanding the boundaries for the subsequent notification.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding Engineering Services' staff review of this application, Mr. Thomson confirmed that Engineering Services, as the applicant, has not impeded the recommendations that have come forward from Engineering staff in assessing the application. The conditions as presented are precisely what the reviewing bodies identified and subsequently adopted by the Staff Committee.

Mr. Beasley noted that many of the conditions are to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services. He questioned whether the Director of Planning should also be included so the public can be confident there is no conflict of interest. Mr. Timm suggested the Board may wish to consider an additional condition that the Director of Planning will provide an overview to the adherence of those conditions to ensure that they are addressed in the usual manner.

Mr. Mak translated the foregoing commentary, following which the Board and Panel took a 5 minute recess.

Comments from Other Speakers

Geoff Gowe, President, Strathcona Community Centre Association, presented a letter and petition signed by 300 community members, all in opposition to this application. Mr. Gowe, representing 11 community organizations, said they are not opposed to the location of the proposed works yard but believe a full traffic study needs to be in place before the permit is granted. They are not satisfied that their concerns are being taken seriously by City staff, nor do they believe that any traffic problems will be addressed to their

satisfaction once the project is built. Mr. Gowe acknowledged there are other traffic problems in Strathcona but stressed that their request is based on the impact of the proposed works yard which will exacerbate the existing traffic problems. The two new streets and the extension of Chess Street will also have a major impact on traffic patterns.

In discussion, Mr. Rudberg stressed that Engineering Services does not want the Works Yard to be a burden on the neighbourhood and they intend to monitor the traffic situation. He noted that any truck traffic shortcutting through the neighbourhood would be subject to enforcement through the normal process. He stressed that the measures that will be implemented at the Jackson intersection will not just involve Jackson Street; the other streets will also be monitored and any change in traffic patterns will be addressed. Mr. Rudberg said their concern is that the community wants Engineering Services to undertake a comprehensive study, not only to address what is happening now but what might happen in the future, noting it is very difficult to predict based on the future development in the area. He reiterated that the intent is to implement the measures as discussed, work with the neighbourhood and, if there is some impact generated by the works yard, it will be addressed. With respect to the new roads, Mr. Rudberg stressed the road alignment has already been approved by Council and will not be revisited.

Mr. Beasley noted that Council has already directed Engineering Services to conduct a traffic study of the new False Creek Flats streets system and its impact on the overall city street system. Therefore, the general issue of the street system and how it is managed in the context of the existing streets, should be handled through that process. Mr. Rudberg confirmed the broader study of the Flats should be initiated this year. It will likely be a 6 - 8 months process, with conclusions and recommendations available sometime in the middle of 2003. After further discussion, Mr. Beasley stated he believes it would be inappropriate to postpone approval of this development on the basis of a complete re-think of the traffic in the area, noting the False Creek Flats study will be undertaken in the near future, in consultation with the community. He suggested, however, that it might be appropriate for Engineering Services, as part of the measures outlined in Appendix F, to take an overview of the whole neighbourhood at the same time that the impact of traffic from the works yard is considered. Mr. Beasley said this would be consistent with what is usually required of private developers seeking conditional approval.

Richard Page, Raycam Co-op Association, said they believe there will be a lot of negative impact in the community as a result of the extra traffic. He said the calming measures will displace traffic away from Prior Street north into Strathcona. He suggested the residents of Strathcona are paying for the shortsightedness of previous governments and the lack of an overall transportation policy. He noted the two main east-west arteries - Hastings and Prior - are overused and unsafe now. He urged that before the works yard is developed there must be a comprehensive, accountable process that takes into account the needs of the community and the impacts on the community.

Barbara Lee, 400 Prior Street, said the truck traffic is already very heavy in the area. She was opposed to the location of the works yard because facilities in the west side of the city are being closed and consolidated on the east side. She stressed that Strathcona, the oldest neighbourhood in the city, should have its residents' concerns taken into account. Ms. Lee was also concerned about contamination in the works yard.

Mr. Rudberg noted the use of the site is very low and is not expected to increase. With respect to contamination, Mr. Timm said there is nothing to cause concern for the residents. There will be a gas station at the eastern end of the site and some holding bins for street garbage before its is hauled out. The rest of the site will largely be for storage of street maintenance equipment.

Sang Lee, resident of Atlantic Street, addressed the Board in Cantonese and Mr. Mak translated his comments. In the past, the noise from the rail yards was a major concern for the residents. He questioned whether

Engineering Services consulted the residents with regard to the neighbourhood traffic plan. They are very concerned about noise from the industrial uses. He stated the City previously promised that this area would be zoned for comprehensive commercial use instead of industrial. Mr. Sang said they were not advised of the Open House and were not consulted about the traffic problems.

Steve Brauers, resident of Atlantic Street, was very concerned about the close proximity of heavy industrial traffic to the residences on Prior Street. He did not believe the proposed traffic measures would be effective. With respect to the road system, Mr. Brauers said the community does not believe they are well considered links. It does not take into account the physical environment in which the traffic travels.

Kathy Klaussen, resident of Atlantic Street, said that initially her entire neighbourhood was not happy about the city works yard in this location. However, they recognize that it has to be dealt with and they are now trying to find ways to ameliorate the traffic impacts it will generate, as well as from the TechPark when it gets developed. Ms. Klaussen questioned why the residents of the east side do not receive the same consideration as those on the west side, noting the very small lot sizes in this neighbourhood resulting in homes being very close to the traffic.

Mr. Scobie commented that every neighbourhood has complaints about traffic and the City is not oblivious to the concerns about what may happen over time in this industrial False Creek Flats area, as has been confirmed by Council through a series of decisions that it should be for long term industrial uses. Mr. Beasley observed that little of the city's industrial land has been on the west side and it is being phased out.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Francl noted the Urban Design Panel's discussion about this project was not concerned with traffic impacts. Its use, which was considered to be relatively light industrial, was supported on this site. The main areas of concern related to the design and presentation of the perimeter wall and the landscaping of the staff parking area at the southwest corner of the site. Mr. Francl said he was satisfied the issues will be addressed by the applicant. The quality of the buildings themselves was considered exemplary and the sustainable design effort was commended. With respect to the traffic issues, Mr. Francl said it appears that problems will be addressed as they arise, which is an uncomfortable situation for the neighbourhood. He said he hoped Engineering Services could present a more complete scenario of what the impact will be on the neighbourhood; there is an obligation to predict the impact and not simply deal with it on a situational basis. The Urban Design Panel supported the project and recommended approval.

Mr. Hancock noted the city needs these facilities and on the whole this piece of land is not a bad location for it. The entrance to the property is from the south side on the new street and the traffic can be easily diverted away from the neighbourhood. Acoustic issues have also been dealt with very well by buffering the north side of the property with building structures. Mr. Hancock said he liked the architecture which is very representative of the use and is likely much better than typically found in most industrial uses. In general, Mr Hancock said he had no reservations about recommending approval of the application. He supported the conditions recommended in the report. Given the City does have some control over its employees and where they drive the trucks, Mr. Hancock said he believes traffic management on an ongoing basis is a reasonable approach.

Mr. Ross commented that given the potential of this site in terms of what could be built, this proposal is positive for the neighbourhood because it is well below the permitted density, under-utilizing the site and introducing some attractive buildings. Implementing LEED into the design is commendable. With respect to the concerns expressed by the neighbourhood, Mr. Ross said he believed the impacts, not just of this development but what will happen as a result of it, are addressed in condition 1.6. He said he was confident there will be a process that will correct and finetune the concerns as they arise. Traffic calming measures can be made to work. Mr. Ross supported the application.

Ms. Leduc said it appears that the community has accepted, for the most part, that this project will proceed. There is clearly no problem with the design. Ms. Leduc said she was, however, concerned about the traffic impacts and that it has not been looked at in the context of a very small community in an historic neighbourhood. This neighbourhood deserves to be protected as a jewel in the city. Ms. Leduc said she was also not totally confident about the consultation process, noting the neighbours seem to be quite reasonable and undemanding. She said she agreed with them that with the new roads, this project is more than just a city works yard. She said she would be reluctant to see the project proceed when the neighbours do not feel they have been consulted and do not believe they will be heard. It would be worth taking a little longer to deal with some of the issues. Ms. Leduc said she would not want to see this project go ahead until the traffic situation has been dealt with to a much greater degree than it has, with more consultation with the community to give them some level of comfort that they do not have now.

Mr. Scott said the development of the Flats is long overdue, noting the rail entrance to the downtown is currently quite shabby and badly in need of improvement. Strathcona is a wonderful neighbourhood and the best neighbour it could have on this site is the City of Vancouver. The parks as well as the large warehouses offer a good acoustic buffer against any noise impacts. Mr. Scott said he could not see where noise and traffic will affect the livelihood of the Strathcona neighbourhood. He supported the application.

Mr. Mortensen said he supported the use and considered it to be very light industrial, as is the proposed new development to the west. Therefore, the bigger picture for the neighbourhood in terms of the industrial lands is an evolution to lighter industrial uses. The acoustic buffering appears to address any noise issues. Traffic is a serious issue for all cities and the City of Vancouver should not be burdened with finding an overall solution. The proposed new street to the south perhaps offers the best solution for this site, taking traffic the furthest away from Strathcona. Traffic has to be dealt with incrementally based on what is in place, and the congestion the city is experiencing is a fact of life. Mr. Mortensen said the development is supportable. He urged the Board to include condition 1.6 which offers the residents some comfort that their concerns about traffic will be dealt with. He said he was confident the City will be a good neighbour.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley said it is a foregone conclusion that this area will be industrial, and there has been considerable effort over the last few years to ensure there is infrastructure in place so that it can function in the context of a dense residential area as well as ~~protected~~ *protecting* very treasured neighbourhoods. He also agreed it is prudent of the residents to be vigilant as more industrial development occurs in the area. While the new street system has already been approved, the residents' comments about its impacts are very appropriate. Fortunately, Council has already instructed Engineering Services to undertake an assessment of this street system on the larger city street system. The submissions received regarding this application, as well as this meeting's minutes, should be put forward to be considered in that review. Mr. Beasley said he believes this is where the larger issues raised by the neighbours will finally be addressed. It is not really a matter of whether or not this area gets a "comprehensive neighbourhood traffic plan", which may not happen for many years, but this is a study of what the impact of this new street system will have on the neighbourhood.

In terms of industrial allowances this proposal is a small development - about one tenth of what is permitted on the site. If it were developed to its full capacity the issues for the neighbours would be very difficult to deal with. The City is also concerned about the impact of the adjacent high tech development where it is hoped there will be the opportunity to rethink some of that street system and how it connects in with the rest of the city grid over time.

Mr. Beasley said he still believes this application does have some responsibility for mitigating traffic created by the works yard on this neighbourhood. Furthermore, Engineering Services has a greater responsibility than

perhaps a private developer simply because it is a City department and it should model behaviour in this respect. Mr. Beasley said he believes Mr. Rudberg's memorandum (Appendix F) is, in effect, a Good Neighbour Agreement. However, it does need to be strengthened in several respects, one of which is to ensure that instead of a piecemeal approach that there is a more comprehensive perspective brought to it. As well, it should include reference to the treatment of Hawks Avenue to address concerns raised by the community gardeners, noting that these gardens have been an important revitalization activity in the neighbourhood that should not be negatively affected. Mr. Beasley said he believes the new streets will take some pressure off Prior Street and he was confident that monitoring and more traffic solutions for Atlantic Street will be part of the commitment made by Engineering Services, including public consultation.

In other respects this is a very well designed and landscaped project. Mr. Beasley said he was confident the noise and pollution issues have been addressed. He was also pleased to see the inclusion of LEED certification. Finally, anything that is to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services should have an overview by another City official to assure the public there is equitable treatment of the approval.

Ms. Forbes-Roberts said she believes the motion covers quite well all the concerns raised by the delegations and the Advisory Panel. She stressed that this is industrial land and always has been in the history of the city. While the new streets are approved and fixed, it must be acknowledged that traffic is very clearly a concern in this neighbourhood and has been for the last twenty years. Two approaches are needed. Firstly, an overview to understand the overall effect of the redevelopment of these industrial lands on the neighbourhood (which Council has already directed Engineering Services to do). At the same time, we have to be aware of the incremental approach as well since it is not always known how things will play out, and the conditions allow this to happen. Ms. Forbes-Roberts said Engineering Services could help themselves by not looking at this in an ad hoc manner but comprehensively, not necessarily ahead of other neighbourhoods which need a full traffic plan, but to acknowledge the overall impact of the changes in the industrial land that are expected, in the context of this development which is proceeding first. The impact of this development on the community needs to be acknowledged, noting there is a fair amount of impact now in this area and some of the moves being proposed may well help.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 406382, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 1, 2002, with the following amendments:

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in condition 1.4 to change "retention pond" to "detention system";

Include and amend 1.6 to read as follows:

THAT the Board ADVISE the General Manager of Engineering Services that its approval of this development application is based upon provision of the measures included in Appendix F and including traffic calming measures for Hawks Avenue so it cannot be used by industrial traffic, all in the context of an overall review of traffic patterns created by the new works yard - this to be undertaken as described and in a timely fashion, to address impacts on the surrounding community; and further, subject to the applicant working with Engineering Services staff to implement traffic demand management strategies, including a monitoring program, a designated liaison as described on p.11 of the report, and a construction period traffic and parking strategy;

Add 1.7:

that in all conditions that are to be completed to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services, the Director of Planning provide oversight that these conditions are appropriately met;

Amend A.2.5 to change "retention" to "detention";

Amend A.2.6 to change "retention" to "detention" and delete "prior to permit issuance" from the **Note to Applicant**.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6.45 pm.

C. Hubbard
Clerk to the Board

F. Scobie
Chair

/ch

Q:\Clerical\DPB\Minutes\2002\may13.wpd