

Date: Tuesday, May 23, 2006
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

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

Advisory Panel

M. Long Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
R. Acton Representative of the Design Professions
N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry
M. Braun Representative of the General Public
D. Chung Representative of the General Public
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public

Regrets

J. Scott Representative of the Development Industry
K. Hung Representative of the General Public
R. Keate Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

R. Segal Senior Development Planner
D. Robinson Project Facilitator
A. Molaro Development Planner
M. Thomson City Surveyor
D. Wong Engineer, Rapid Transit Office
W. Pledger Manager, Rapid Transit Office

833 Seymour Street

J. Bingham Howard Bingham Hill Architects
D. Nelson Howard Bingham Hill Architects

525 West 2nd Avenue - Olympic Station

E. Lefluffy Canada Line Rapid Transit Inc.
A. Parker Intransit BC
C. McCarthy Intransit BC
D. Harding Stantec Architecture

Recording Secretary: D. Kempton (833 Seymour Street)
*C. Hubbard, Raincoast Ventures (525 West 2nd Avenue)

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

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of April 24, 2006 be approved following correction of minor typographical errors and with the following amendment:

- p.7, third bullet, to reword to read:
There are 15 single family properties in the 2800 block of Wall Street which face many of the same noise issues, four of the 15 dwellings are rented.

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of May 8, 2006 be approved with the following amendments:

- p.2, first paragraph under the heading **Development Planner's Opening Comments**, change "west" to *east*;
- p.6, second paragraph, change "mountable canopies" to *demountable cornices*;
- p.6, eighth paragraph, last sentence, amend to read:
Although she applauded the efforts of the architect she could not support the development because of her concern that the overall downtown entertainment district transportation problem is of paramount concern;
- p.7, sixth paragraph, first sentence, delete the word "canopy" before the word facade.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 833 SEYMOUR STREET - DE410152 - ZONE DD (PRELIMINARY APPLICATION)

Applicant: Howard Bingham Hill

Request: To construct a 42 storey building with a 7-storey podium including ground floor retail, 3 cultural amenity facilities, commercial offices, 383 residential units and a 35 storey residential tower above plus underground parking proposing a total of 275 parking spaces.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ralph Segal, Senior Development Planner, presented this preliminary application to develop the former Capitol 6 Theatre site located mid-block on Seymour Street between Robson and Smithe Streets and adjacent to the Orpheum Theatre. Referring to a context model and a scale model of the project, Mr. Segal briefly reviewed the site context.

The proposal was considered by City Council on July 21, 2005, and an amenity bonus resulting in a total FSR of 18.79 was approved in-principle. The approximately 250,000 sq.ft. bonus area results in a significant residential tower above a 7-storey podium with amenity facilities, retail and commercial use. Council also endorsed a height of 413.2 ft. Since that time, the height has been calculated at 413.9 ft. which will need to be reduced to 413.7 ft. to comply with the Cambie/12th Avenue view cone. This reduction is sought in condition A.1.1. While this site is

located in the 300 ft. height zone of Downtown Area C, the Board can exercise its discretion to approve heights up to 450 ft. Mr. Segal reiterated that Council had no objections to the height proposed on this site.

An important consideration has been whether a massing could be achieved that does not unduly compromise surrounding development in terms of shadowing and views. Mr. Segal noted the tower shaping minimizes the shadow impacts on Granville Street and across the lane to the west. While this site is not within the Downtown South, the floor plates of the lower portion of the tower (8,800-9,000 sq.,ft.) exceed the Downtown South Guidelines, although the tower floor plates at the top are only 5,700 sq.ft. The office buildings situated a half block to the north have floor plate sizes ranging from 13,000-18,000 sq.ft.

Mr. Segal reviewed the conditions of approval, noting that the overall form was arrived at through a detailed urban design assessment. A parking and loading relaxation is being sought, which staff support. He said that staff believe the proposal is well advanced for a preliminary submission and is a handsome project that will add to the vitality of the downtown. However, because of the complexity of the project, the Staff Committee recommends that the complete application is returned to the Board for decision. The Development Permit Staff Committee recommends approval in-principle, subject to the conditions outlined in its report dated April 26, 2006.

Questions/Discussion

Ms. French questioned whether the complete application would have issues that require the Board's decision. Mr. Segal noted the loading issue may need to be decided by the Board if the matter is not resolved between the applicant team and staff. Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, advised that redesign of the loading will result in a significant reconfiguration of the ground floor commercial space including a possible reduction of that area, as well as the floor above, due to clearance issues. In discussion, it was noted that if the Board recommends that the complete application is dealt with by the Director of Planning, the Director may still refer it to the Board if necessary.

Ms. French sought clarification regarding the proposed specialty sidewalk treatment on Seymour Street and condition A.2.7 (iv) which requires standard Downtown South sidewalk treatment. Mr. Thomson advised that if the Board wished the specialty sidewalk treatment to be considered, the matter could be referred to the General Manager of Engineering Services for possible referral to Council. Mr. Scobie suggested a note could be added to the condition, indicating that the policy stands but notwithstanding the policy and the condition, the applicant could apply to have the concept revisited.

Ms. Nystedt expressed concern regarding the applicant's request for a residential parking requirement relaxation along the lines of the Shangri-la development and the aggregation of applying the standard of parking adjacent to the entertainment corridor. Mr. Thomson advised that Engineering Services does not support the use of Downtown South parking standards at this location; however they are supporting a residential parking relaxation to a standard that has been applied to approximately four other rezonings in the Downtown District. Mr. Thomson said that standard is under further study with the expectation that recommendations will be referred to Council by year end to modify the Parking By-law and use this as the new residential parking standard for the Downtown District. He advised that, under the new standard, the number of residential parking stalls required would be 281. Engineering staff support a relaxation for this proposal to that amount from the 388 residential parking stalls required by the current Zoning.

Mr. Scobie questioned whether condition A.1.19 was consistent with past practice by requiring provision of resilient flooring, a handicapped accessible washroom and kitchenette within the indoor residential amenity area, in lieu of an outdoor children's play area. Mr. Segal responded that Social Planning staff determined that, despite the number of two bedroom units in this development, it would be more adult-oriented and less likely to attract families because of its downtown location, adjacent to the entertainment district. Doug Robinson, Project Facilitator, also advised that, based on recent downtown development application approvals without children's play areas, specifically the Woodward's and Jamieson buildings, Social Planning staff were not inclined to pursue it in this application.

Referring to condition A.1.3, Mr. Scobie noted that the Development Permit Staff Committee supported the recommendation from Engineering staff to relax the Downtown District parking requirements and apply a modified Downtown District parking standard, as was applied to 1120 West Georgia Street. Mr. Scobie advised the Board members that they are being asked to adopt and apply a new parking standard in advance of that modified parking standard being considered by Council. Mr. Thomson noted that there will still be a parking deficiency in this application once the modified standard is applied since the applicant is proposing 275 total parking spaces and the modified requirement would be 422 total parking spaces.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding condition 1.4, Mr. Thomson advised the Staff Committee did not intend to change direction from that recommended by Council. He suggested that the Note to Applicant in condition 1.4 should be deleted.

Ms. French noted that condition A.2.2 should also be revised. Mr. Scobie suggested replacing the words "an airspace parcel" with *a legal interest*.

Mr. Timm questioned whether the Higher Building Policy would apply to this site. Mr. Segal advised that the ODP allows the Board to use discretion for additional building height up to 400 ft. Buildings between 300 and 400 ft. do not require a full Higher Building Panel review and this building is just under 400 ft. measured from the parapet to the highest habitable floor. The total height, including all appurtenances and mechanical overruns, is 413 ft. Mr. Segal noted it is a very high quality building in terms of its architecture and that Council had no objection to the height, as indicated in its decision (Resolution C in Appendix F, page 23 of 23 of the Staff Committee report).

Applicant's Comments

John Bingham, Architect, provided an overview of the broader aspects of the project, which began in 2003. He said the nature of the residential and institutional uses together has contributed to the complexity of the project; however, the integration and circulation issues have been well handled.

Mr. Bingham advised that the density transfer resulted in extensive shadow studies and the building has been designed and oriented to have minimum shadow impact on Granville Street. He also noted that the building design had to facilitate the loading and access needs of the Orpheum Theatre. Mr. Bingham noted that the Urban Design Panel supported the proposal and offered good insight into how to evolve the design to the next level.

With respect to the conditions in the report, Mr. Bingham identified an issue regarding sustainability. He said that 29 LEED points have been identified and the applicant is being asked to add another 4 points; however, in the past year there has been a fair amount of construction cost increase, and to commit beyond the 29 LEED points may create a financial burden on the developer.

Mr. Bingham also expressed concern about the requirement for separate elevator access to the bicycle parking below the P2 level. He advised that forty percent of the bicycle parking is below the P2 level and although they can provide elevator access to the lobby and separately out to the lane, they would prefer to seek approval from Engineering Services for a modified approach.

Mr. Bingham said that the specialty sidewalk treatment proposed for Seymour Street would help to identify the building and create a break in the monotony of the street. He said they wish to pursue it.

Doug Nelson, Applicant Team, said they have been working with City staff to resolve the loading issues. With respect to parking, Mr. Nelson said he is confident the issues can be resolved to meet the modified standard and to the satisfaction of Engineering Services.

Questions/Discussion

With respect to the bicycle parking access issues below the P2 level, Mr. Scobie questioned whether the Board would need to relax the Parking By-law in order to allow the freight elevator to be used for access. Mr. Thomson responded that section 3.2.1 (i) of the Parking By-law allows the Board to relax the provision for bicycle parking below grade and to deal with the related access issues. However, he noted that in many existing developments Strata Corporations have barred bicycles from the main elevators because of damage caused by loading and unloading them from the elevators.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding Appendix C and the Processing Centre-Building By-law and Fire comments, Mr. Bingham said that the applicant team has a Code Consultant who has been involved in a lot of the process and is working with the Building Department. He said that the issues identified are minor and can be accommodated.

Mr. Scobie drew attention to a memorandum dated May 23, 2006, from Doug Robinson, Project Facilitator, which included 13 letters of support for the proposal and indicated no response to the neighbourhood notification.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Ms. Long said the Urban Design Panel comments were expressed well in the conditions outlined in the report with the exception of Appendix A, A.2.7(iv) and A.2.7.(vii) which reference the streetscape and the Downtown South Guidelines. The Panel thought the streetscape expression was reflective and playful and part of the overall building expression and public realm. The Panel considered the proposed sidewalk treatment to be an integral part of this development and was very supportive of the standard treatment being changed in this one block. The Panel also hoped the applicant could develop the streetscape expression all the way west and around corner on to Smithe Street. Ms. Long noted the Panel also thought a sidewalk curb cut would improve the character of the entire block. With respect to lane improvements, Ms. Long said the Panel suggested the use of brick or granite blocks within this lane right-of-way.

Mr. Acton supported the conditions outlined in the report and said he appreciated that they were clear and concise. He recommended support for the requested parking relaxation. With respect to the children's play area, Mr. Acton said that the issue should always be taken into consideration and the decision should be made by the Board whether they want to insert the

condition or not. In this application, Mr. Acton said that the top of the seven-storey podium seems like the perfect place for a children's play area and he recommended that one should be included in this project. With respect to bicycle storage and access, Mr. Acton acknowledged that it can be difficult to meet the by-law requirement, although it can be met with some compromises. He suggested the provision of access to bike storage via the freight elevator is a compelling reason for the Board to use its discretion in the matter. Mr. Acton said if the loading issues can be resolved to the satisfaction of Engineering Services, then he would support the complete application being referred to the Director of Planning for decision rather than returning to the Board.

Mr. Shearing commended the applicant team for a complex project that is being well executed and well handled. He supported the proposed building height noting Council's approval of the height at 413.2 ft. and that the tower itself is actually less than 400 ft. Mr. Shearing also supported the proposed sidewalk treatment. With respect to loading and parking issues, Mr. Shearing said that if redesign of the loading caused a reconfiguration of the retail space on the ground floor he would see that as an improvement. If the loading issues were resolved, Mr. Shearing said he would support the complete application being referred to the Director of Planning for decision.

Ms. Nystedt said this is a development that the Arts and Entertainment District has been looking forward to for a long time. She supported conditions 1.1 to 1.4 and with respect to condition 1.5, Ms. Nystedt advised that loading is a challenge for the entertainment business and Engineering Services should give careful attention to the loading details. Ms. Nystedt did not support any form of parking relaxation for this project. She said that approximately 1,000 new residents will be occupying this area in a one block radius and those residents, along with area employees, will be competing for limited parking spaces. She was concerned about a relaxation even if it compared to a similar approval for the Shangri-la development. Ms. Nystedt felt that not enough parking was being provided for people to be able to enjoy the Arts and Entertainment facilities. She recommended that the complete application return to the Board for a final decision given the issues of parking and loading.

Mr. Chung said this project is well designed considering the constrained site, and he supported the conditions as outlined in the report. He encouraged the Board to allow the applicant to incorporate the proposed piano key design into the sidewalk treatment. Mr. Chung said there should be distinctiveness to each block and this proposed sidewalk treatment will be a great addition to the area. With respect to bicycle storage access, Mr. Chung thought that appropriate access was being provided via the freight elevator and an additional elevator was not necessary. He suggested there should be some type of legal agreement to require the Strata Council to allow bicycles in the freight elevator.

Mr. Braun recommended approval of the application with the conditions as outlined in the report. With respect to the children's play area, Mr. Braun said that requirement should be considered on a case by case basis. In this instance, Social Planning staff felt that a children's play area was not necessary and the Board should respect that advice. In terms of the unique sidewalk treatment being proposed, Mr. Braun urged the Board to encourage the applicant and staff to proceed, perhaps in a Note to Applicant. Mr. Braun was disappointed that the applicant did not express a strong desire for the complete application to be referred to the Director of Planning for decision given that the loading issues are resolvable. He recommended that the Board follow the advice of the Staff Committee and have the complete application return to the Board for a final decision. With respect to the height, Mr. Braun said that this will be one of the taller buildings in the city; therefore, he strongly encouraged the applicant team to do the best job possible on design and construction.

Board Discussion

Ms. French commended the applicant and staff team for the work they put into this application over the last two years. She moved approval in-principle of the application with amendments to the conditions. Mr. Timm offered two friendly amendments which Ms. French accepted.

Mr. Timm said this development is "pushing the envelope" in a number of different ways. He noted the large amount of density on a small site, the existing loading deficiencies for the adjoining site and the loading issues for this site, as well as proposed vehicular access across the sidewalk on Seymour Street rather than the preferred method of coming across the lane.

Mr. Timm complimented the architect on a good design and said this will be a prominent and noteworthy structure in the downtown. He seconded the motion with the exception of Ms. French's amendment to the Note to Applicant in A.2.7(iv) which addresses the specialty sidewalk treatment. Mr. Timm said it is not the Board's place to change or deviate from policy; therefore, he would expect a sidewalk treatment that is consistent with the public realm guidelines. Mr. Timm said the individual character of the buildings should not take over the sidewalk.

Ms. French agreed that sidewalk space should not make a character statement of a particular development; however, she would like to leave the proposed amendment on the table since it would ultimately be Council's decision to deviate from policy. Given the unique nature of this public facility, and the fact that the deviation from Downtown South standards is only in the patterning of the concrete, Ms. French wanted to encourage the applicant to look at what that might mean.

Mr. Scobie proposed some rewording to make it clear that the applicant may choose to pursue the piano key sidewalk pattern; however, the final decision on the matter will be made by Council and there may be differing staff recommendations to Council. Mr. Timm did not support this proposal but Ms. French accepted Mr. Scobie's rewording as a friendly amendment.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE IN-PRINCIPLE Development Application No. 410152, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 10, 2006 with the following amendments:

Delete the **Note to Applicant** in 1.4;

Amend 3.0 to read:

That the complete application be dealt with by the Director of Planning unless Planning or Engineering staff or the Applicant consider that it needs to be reviewed by the Development Permit Board;

Amend A.1.5 to read:

confirm access arrangements to all bicycle rooms on parking level P2 and show separation between bicycle rooms on parking level P1;

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in A.1.5 to delete the first two sentences and replace with: Propose a means to ensure elevator access to bicycles on parking level P2 or otherwise meet the access requirements of the Parking By-law;

Add A.1.20:

provide a secure, equipped children's play area with resilient play surface and seating on the podium roof deck (Level 8);

Note to Applicant: Play equipment must be located on resilient surface suitable for children's play. Particular care should be given to avoid the use of toxic plants and landscaping materials in and around the play area. A planting list should be provided for planters around the play area to ensure toxic plants are avoided. A list of toxic plants is available as an appendix to the City's Childcare Design Guidelines and is available on line at <http://www.vancouver.ca/commsvcs/Guidelines/C017.pdf>.

Amend A.2.2 to replace the words "an airspace parcel" with: *a legal interest*;

CARRIED

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

To amend the **Note to Applicant** in A.2.7 (iv) to add a new first sentence to read:
The applicant may choose to further pursue the proposed piano key sidewalk treatment noting that this would require Council approval to alter established Council policy and further noting that staff have not yet concluded whether it should be supported.

CARRIED
(Mr. Timm opposed)

4. **525 WEST 2ND AVENUE- OLYMPIC VILLAGE STATION - DE410272 - ZONE DD
(FOR ADVICE)**

Applicant: Stantec Architecture Ltd.

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

Edward Lefluffy, CLCO, provided an overview of the Canada Line project including system-wide issues, work done to date, a project overview, and roles and responsibilities. Mr. Lefluffy noted the stations must be in operation by 2009 and the overall budget has been established and is fixed. The alignment is fixed and the location of the stations and their functions and configurations have been established. He advised that there is commitment to creating a coherent architectural identity while responding to each station context. The three basic planning principles for the stations are (1) the human experience, (2) the architectural philosophy should be rooted in what is unique about Vancouver's natural context, and (3) the system should have a quality of timelessness.

Mr. Lefluffy reviewed the access agreement between CLCO and the City of Vancouver and reviewed the roles and responsibilities of the InTransit BC, City of Vancouver and Translink. Some of the system-wide concerns that have been identified are safety and security regarding CPTED, communications, fare barriers, GVTA Policing, public amenities, washrooms, functional design standards, communication and staffing. InTransit BC has a program for ongoing

development of retail at the stations and commercial viability. InTransit BC also has a program to create public art opportunities at the stations and between stations.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, presented this application and noted this is the first station of nine that will be presented to the Development Permit Board over next few months. City staff have been working with CLCO, a subsidiary of Translink, and have been providing advice on station locations, alignment, station entries and connectivity. In addition to the design advisory process around each of the stations, City staff will be undertaking a Precinct Planning exercise to ensure appropriate bicycle and pedestrian access and dealing with traffic, parking and other issues in and around the stations. The City will also undertake reviews around stations via Station Area Planning land use. In 2003, Council established the design principles for the stations and Urban Design Panel input was sought at the workshop level at a much earlier stage in the process than would typically occur.

Ms. Molaro described the station location and surrounding site context noting that the station entry house and platforms are located, in part, on City owned lands and City right-of-way. This station is a centre platform configuration and will achieve a high degree of transparency. The ramp off the Cambie Street Bridge will need to be reconfigured with changes to the road configuration to allow expanded sidewalk area and also allowing the station entry to be set back from the sidewalk area.

Ms. Molaro reviewed the recommendations in the report and noted the proposal generally reflects the ongoing discussions with staff. The Development Permit Staff Committee recommends support of the application with the advice and comments provided in the report dated May 17, 2006.

Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. Timm regarding the load carrying capacity of the top of the station box at grade, Ms. Molaro advised that it could handle a landscaping load of up to a metre of soil. As to whether this would be limited by the exhaust vents, Ms. Molaro said it would be possible to extend the vents and incorporate them into the overbuild. Likewise, the exit stair could also be built into an overbuild scenario. Mr. Timm suggested that everything possible should be done to relocate the vents in order to maintain flexibility for future development of the site.

Mr. Timm also questioned whether other options had been considered for the substation. Ms. Molaro said locating it to the north of the station entry house was explored but it was found to conflict with future development potential. Mr. Timm questioned whether it could be located off the alignment, under the Cambie Bridge abutment.

In response to a question from Ms. Nystedt regarding maximum integration of the stations to the transit network, including a potential streetcar station, Donny Wong, Engineer, Rapid Transit Office, advised they are working with the streetcar group to develop a pedestrian connection at grade to link the streetcar station to the Canada Line station.

Ms. French sought clarification regarding pedestrian movement adjacent to the station. Mr. Wong said there are currently two options being considered, either to reconfigure the ramp and allow vehicles to enter Cambie Street and access 2nd Avenue, or to restrict the ramp to pedestrian and bicycle use only. If the first option is chosen there would be an additional pedestrian crossing which would not impact station design.

Mr. Scobie cautioned that some of the issues being discussed are not within the purview of this proposal.

Ms. Long sought clarification regarding the landscaping around the stations. Ms. Molaro advised the City has requested landscape concept plans from the applicant team for both sides of this station. The applicant will be responsible for the hard landscaping features (curbs, gutters, etc.) and the City will be responsible for the soft landscaping. City standards with respect to street trees, sidewalk treatment, etc. will need to be met.

Mr. Timm noted that this station differs from other stations in the city because the adjacent site is City-owned and the City is making a significant financial contribution to the station. He therefore questioned whether the City has greater input on its design. Ms. Molaro advised that each station is treated the same way. Wayne Pledger, Manager, Rapid Transit Office, advised that no design conditions were applied by the City when it chose to financially contribute to the cost of the station. He noted the station does not cut through the centre of the site but is far to one side. He added, a lot of the public realm treatment will be determined later by the City's consultant who will study how the remainder of the site will be integrated into the broader community. Mr. Wong added, the residential neighbourhood to the north is strongly opposed to the introduction of additional non-local traffic into the neighbourhood, which discourages extending a road through.

Mr. Scobie sought clarification as to future permitting requirements for retail. Ms. Molaro explained the agreements in place allow the proponents to build the station infrastructure, which does not include retail. Retail use is not exempt from the development permit requirements and retail use under City streets would require approval of the General Manager of Engineering Services. With respect to advertising, Ms. Molaro advised the proponents are allowed signage relating to the system but no third party advertising at street level.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie as to how the site will be managed during construction, Mr. Pledger said it will be addressed through traffic management and construction management plans. There are also environmental requirements relating to waste water, etc. He confirmed the City's interests will be met.

Applicant comments

Allen Parker, Intransit BC, provided an overview of the architectural identity of the station. He noted they are looking to identify families of stations and seek an aesthetic to tie stations together and interpret them as the Canada Line.

Peter Buchanan, Stantec Architecture, reviewed the design rationale for this station which tries to capture the spirit of the water's edge. He briefly described the material palette and the system-wide components and the goal to incorporate intuitive wayfinding to the stations.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Buchanan briefly described the access and egress arrangements. In response to a question from Mr. Braun about a possible connection to the other side of 2nd Avenue, Mr. Buchanan advised that under-street connections are not desired. He noted the Stadium station underground passage was closed because people felt safer on the street.

Ms. Nystedt questioned whether sustainability issues were considered in the design, noting it seems an ideal location for solar panels. Mr. Lefluffy advised the project does not have the equivalent of a LEED standard but opportunities for sustainable practices have been discussed,

noting the transit system is in itself a sustainable feature. He confirmed they are looking at opportunities for rainwater collection although they have not pursued a green roof per se on the main entrance of this building.

Ms. Long questioned whether connecting the substation to the vents had been explored so that it reads as one piece of the infrastructure that expresses where the tunnel is going. Mr. Parker said it is necessary to ventilate both ends of the station so it could not be physically tied together, although he agreed that an architectural connection could be explored.

David Harding, Stantec Architecture, responded to questions about the substation location. He explained that locating it under the bridge proved impossible due to tight headroom conditions. The south plaza area was determined to be the best location for it. He briefly described the proposed treatment of the area.

Comments from Members of the Public

None.

Advisory Panel

Ms. Long was concerned that the critically important public realm and underground aspects of the project are missing from the scheme. She suggested a lesson should be taken from the Expo and Millennium lines with respect to integration of the stations because, while the Millennium line architecture is beautiful, its integration to the neighbourhoods is sadly lacking. There is a disconnect between Intransit BC being responsible for the hard landscaping and the City for the soft landscaping. These should be tied together and not just a matter of an exchange of money. Ms. Long said she believed the Staff Committee recommendations address the concerns of the Urban Design Panel and she emphasized some of these concerns, relating to the architectural character, sustainability, integration with the neighbourhood, and integration of the substation, venting and exit stairs with the station house. Ms. Long expressed support for pedestrian routes at the intersection and said she would support a pedestrian/bicycle ramp coming off the bridge rather than a vehicular ramp. She emphasized the importance of recommendation 1.4 relating to the landscaping. Noting that transit stations are among the most public spaces in the city, she stressed that considerable attention needs to be paid to the public realm.

Mr. Acton said he did not believe the design objectives were being met and he failed to see the nautical and heritage references. He also thought these references were not necessary, rather that the potential strength of the design is in its utilitarian and functional aspects. He urged the applicant to focus on the simplicity of the design and to find ways to bring light into the building. He said it is evident it had been designed with a great deal of economy in mind. Mr. Acton did not support recommendation 1.3. He also recommended that further consideration be given to locating the substation under the bridge.

Mr. Shearing stressed that every station should be reflective of its location and he expressed frustration at being unable to comment on the project as a contextual piece. He was generally disappointed in the architectural expression and the implications for the other stations along the line. He also commented that the aspiration to make this station "timeless" has not been met, noting that it seems more reflective of the recently built Killarney Community Centre. He found the scale of the interior space and the exterior plaza to be out of proportion. Mr. Shearing had serious concerns about sustainability and said he was shocked that the City does not have its own sustainability guidelines. He urged that a program be developed for using local products which, while it may not achieve LEED certification, will lend some credibility. He was also concerned that feedback provided today will not find its way into the

project and he recommended that it be returned for further review. A full landscape plan is essential to ensure the public realm interests are addressed. Mr. Shearing also recommended locating the substation under the bridge to free up space in the park.

Ms. Nystedt said she had no problem with the architecture but she was also disappointed at the lack of consideration for sustainability. Ms. Nystedt was encouraged to see the potential connection to the streetcar system and urged that every effort be made to ensure it is achieved.

Mr. Chung said he found the station design somewhat bland compared to the Millennium line stations. He also failed to recognize a nautical theme. He was concerned about the location of the elevator which he thought should be better integrated into the building, and he thought the substation was misplaced. In general, he thought the design emphasized the operational aspects at the expense of aesthetics. He commented that, given this is the third skytrain line in the city, this one should be done right. Mr. Chung concurred with the comments made by his Panel colleagues and stressed that the City should have greater influence on the design.

Mr. Braun said he had faith that the station will look attractive in the end, noting the city has the most spectacular skytrain and buses in the world. He urged that close attention be given to materials to ensure it is warm rather than sterile. In general, he said he had greater faith in Translink than expressed by others. His major concerns related to the grates in the centre of the lot and to ensure there is connection to the streetcar. It is essential that the grates and accessway do not jeopardize the potential future development of the site. He also thought the substation should be located under the bridge. Mr. Braun was also in favour of underground pedestrian connections, noting this station will serve a large number of UBC students. He stressed that the general vicinity around the station needs to be very carefully planned to ensure its future programmability.

Board Comments

Mr. Timm noted this is a difficult process because the City is not in a position to enforce conditions because of the relationship already entered into and the rights of Canada Line and InTransit to build the station. Mr. Timm did not support the proposed location of the traction power substation (TPS) because it will intrude on convenient and established pedestrian connections.

With respect to the station design, goals and principles, Mr. Timm said it is difficult to review without the surrounding context and analysis of development potential for surrounding lands. He said the elevator shaft should be incorporated into the design and included in the station envelope. Mr. Timm noted that there might be potential to incorporate the elevator given the size of the plaza in front of the station.

He moved support of the application with the recommendations of the report and several amendments.

Ms. French agreed with Mr. Acton's comments about the station design and the storyline of ships not being convincing. She said it is acceptable to have a relatively modest but elegantly made shelter for the escalators and stairs at this location since it is unclear what type of development will be happening around this station in the future.

Ms. French said she was concerned with the TPS and did not find the proposal from the applicant or the design development direction from staff to be convincing. She said she was not convinced by its location now or staff's analysis of pedestrian movement; therefore, she

recommended a more thorough re-evaluation of the TPS location. Ms. French seconded the motion to support the application and offered further amendments to 1.3 and 1.4 regarding the TPS. Mr. Timm said he would be happy to have a more general look at the issues around the TPS and accepted Ms. French's friendly amendment. Mr. Timm emphasized that he would like to see the TPS located under the Cambie Bridge.

Mr. Scobie said this is an unusual circumstance for the Board to only give advice and recommendations rather than conditions; however, there have been similar processes with other transit facilities and traditionally the proponents have respected the advice provided by the Board.

Mr. Scobie also agreed with Mr. Acton's comments regarding the storyline of the ship and said it almost works against the architectural statement that this building intends to convey. He said there is a strong need to demonstrate a greater emphasis on sustainability and green building principles, noting the public is going to expect visually demonstrable sustainable architecture at this location.

Mr. Scobie said he was concerned that City staff and the proponents need to get together and advance a plan for treating the area around the buildings. The TPS is a troubling proposition and Mr. Scobie said he hoped that the other stations would not pose the same problem. He said it was discouraging that there was not even a hard landscape plan for review. It is as much the entryway to the building and the treatment around the building that will determine how the public view this station.

Motion

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

THAT the Board SUPPORT Development Submission No. DE410272 as submitted, the plans and information forming a part thereof, thereby allowing the development and construction of a rapid transit station and traction power substation including below grade platforms, subject to the following advice and comments:

Amend 1.1 to add at the end:

,and to consider relocating the elevator to the station house envelope;

Amend 1.3 to read:

Significant reconsideration to the traction power substation building and its surrounding landscaping including consideration of future pedestrian desire lines.

- a) reconsideration of concept for integration of urban site including clear pedestrian routings and including reconsideration of the siting under the bridge as an option;
- b) appropriate architectural treatment of this building's façades, grilles, doors and other elements, not necessarily as a "family" with the station house; and
- c) development of a landscape concept plan for the entire area including relocation of the rocket sculpture.

Delete 1.4

Amend A.2.3 to replace "West 2nd Avenue" with: *West 6th Avenue*

Add A.2.11

design development to provide a wheel ramp for bicycles on all public stairs within the station;

Add A.2.12

provision of detailed design drawings of all ventilation grates on the City street should be reviewed by Engineering, Structures Branch and are to meet all requirements for loading, grate sizes, bar spaces, attachment and mounting methods and are to be designed under the seal of a Professional Engineer;

Add A.2.13

confirmation that all portions of underground structures within the road right of way are designed to withstand all applicable vehicles loads for the street.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

D. Kempton
Assistant to the Board

F. Scobie
Chair