

Date: Tuesday, May 25, 2004
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
T. Timm Deputy City Engineer

Advisory Panel

D. Chung Representative of the General Public
G. Chung Representative of the General Public
B. Haden Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions
C. Henschel Representative of the General Public
J. McLean Representative of the Development Industry
K. McNaney Representative of the General Public

Regrets

E. Mah Representative of the Development Industry

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

A. Higginson Project Facilitator, Development Services
K. Magnusson Projects Branch, Engineering Services
A. Molaro Development Planner, Planning Department
P. Pinsker Parking Branch, Engineering Services
M. Thomson City Surveyor, Engineering Services
C. Warren Assistant Director, Development Services

9149 Hudson Street

Mr. Hargraves Cochrane Engineering
M. Minson Manager of Engineering, TransLink
S. Plewes Vice-president, Capital Management, TransLink

Recording Secretary:

V. Guthrie Raincoast Ventures

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Timm, 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 26, 2004 be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 9149 HUDSON STREET – DE407997 – ZONE M-2
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Cochrane Engineering Ltd.

Request: To construct a facility for the operation, maintenance and storage of diesel and electric trolley buses, along with ancillary office, training and staff facilities.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced this application and referring to a model and design drawings described the site location on the Fraser River, west of Arthur Laing Bridge, bounded by 75th Avenue to the north, Hudson Street to the east, and a vacant parcel owned by North Fraser Terminals to the west. The project was initially considered through a subdivision application that was subsequently abandoned and TransLink exercised its statutory authority in obtaining the land. TransLink intends to build a Transit Centre that would eventually replace the Oakridge site with parking and maintenance areas for trolley and diesel buses.

The development application process commenced October 2003 and was followed by public notification, review by the Urban Design Panel and an "interest-based problem solving" workshop involving TransLink, Park Board, the City, and some community members. Ms. Molaro reviewed recent design development configuration and described the relocation of waterfront parking for bus maintenance staff to the north of the site; the proposed creation of a riverside walkway; and noted that the revised plan had not been revisited by the Urban Design Panel. Subsequent to the initial UDP analysis that did not support the project, staff – in consultation with project engineers – determined that the site planning configuration was essential to the operation of the Transit Centre and that by siting the building on the northerly portion as proposed, a buffer had been created between the bus parking area and the community.

Staff were generally satisfied with the proposed site plan and have suggested improvements be made to the roof, enhancing the design for those who might overlook it from the bridge. It was noted that staff recommend the parking area paving material incorporate coloured and stamped asphalt; and that the proposal was seeking LEED certification.

Concerns from the community were noted and included: use of the site, impact of bus and employee traffic, environmental impacts, and public access. It was added that staff were also seeking improvements to 75th Avenue, and traffic light improvements.

The Staff Committee recommendation is for approval, subject to the conditions contained in the distributed report dated May 12, 2004.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley requested clarification as to why staff had not sent the project back to the Urban Design Panel (UDP) as it had not supported the first submission. Ms. Molaro replied that the Staff Committee had concluded, based on the project's stringent engineering requirements and health criteria, that the current project met the UDP's concerns relative to site planning rationale. Conditions of approval recommended by the Staff Committee re: parking lot treatment, and landscaping materials also respond to UDP concerns. It was added that any outstanding UDP concerns could be addressed in the conditions of permit issuance.

Mr. Beasley queried how the project would achieve LEED™ certification. It was clarified that TransLink had stated an aspiration of Silver LEED designation for the project, but that the building would not be evaluated until its completion.

In regard to transit routing, Mr. Beasley inquired whether the trolley buses would be gradually introduced to the Transit Centre. The applicant explained that, for a time, both the Oakridge Transit Centre and this proposed one would be operating but the former would be used for receiving and commissioning new buses, not for daily transit services.

In regard to condition A.2.13 relative to off-site improvements, Mr. Beasley asked if there was a guarantee that there would be no additional traffic in the local neighbourhood streets. A guarantee was not offered, however, the applicant indicated that efforts would be made to curb employee and business traffic.

Mr. Thomson informed the Board that consideration had been given to possible City acquisition of property at the foot of Hudson Street to enhance public waterfront access as well as improve access to TransLink's proposed waterfront walkway. It was pursued to the extent of establishing the work that would be required in order to complete a proposal for submission to the Province.

Mr. Beasley requested comments on the Vancouver Planning Coalition's proposal of a new residential/commercial village on the site. Staff indicated that, given existing rights for development under current bylaws, the alternate proposal would require a rezoning. The Coalition's proposal was not achievable under current industrial zoning.

Mr. Timm suggested that condition A.2.13 could be changed to mitigate impacts of the proposed facility on the local community.

Mr. MacGregor noted that Eburne Lands had once supported a thriving sawmill business with many employees and offered that any traffic problems could be addressed if TransLink and City worked with the community through monitoring traffic impact.

In regard to the use of the property, Mr. MacGregor inquired as to whether TransLink had any plans for the waterfront (e.g., SeaBus). Ms. Plewes indicated that TransLink had not ruled out the possibility of SeaBus maintenance being provided at this site in the future.

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor relative to security and liability issues for the public walkway, Mr. Thomson noted that TransLink would not be liable for the walkway. It was added that the Transit Centre would have security cameras on the site that could be used to monitor the walk. Staff agreed that it was preferable to avoid dead end walkways but to tolerate them if necessary so long as there was enough visibility through the site.

In discussion of a request from Mr. MacGregor, staff suggested that recommended conditions 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 could be made conditions to be satisfied prior to occupancy, as opposed to prior to development permit issuance, as there would be more time to address the broader community issues regarding the public space, without delaying development permit issuance.

With respect to the necessity of presenting the proposal to the UDP with additional information subsequently submitted to staff, Mr. Haden queried whether there was a time constraint that had affected that decision. Ms. Molaro responded that subsequent to the UDP commentary, the applicant had provided staff with analyses of alternate site planning and staff had concurred with the applicant that the proposal provides the optimal layout for effectiveness and efficiency. Staff were confident that the UDP would appreciate the rationale. As such, in the interest of time, the proposal was not resubmitted to the UDP.

In response to a question by Mr. Henschel, staff noted that the proposed walkway was 6.3 meters at its narrowest point, and 9.0 metres at its widest point.

Discussion ensued regarding the original subdivision application. It was clarified that North Fraser Terminals had applied to subdivide, and that the Subdivision By-law requires any parcel over 20 acres to provide a park or payment in lieu. When the subdivision application was withdrawn, TransLink acquired the property it needed, without City subdivision and voluntarily offered \$1.041 million as payment in lieu.

Ms. Chung requested additional information as part of the applicant's presentation regarding the security system, i.e. the type of cameras; who would be monitoring the video; whether the security cameras were intended for crime prevention or detection; and, the retention of any records or information captured by the cameras.

Mr. McNaney inquired as to the current status of this portion of the waterfront under the FREMP estuary plan and was advised by staff that the advice of FREMP is a recommended condition of approval and will be taken into consideration in regard to waterfront treatment.

In response to Mr. Scobie's request, Ms. Molaro reviewed the conditions and provided clarification in regard to completion requirements. It was indicated that additional information was required from the applicant regarding the number of loading spaces provided, and concerning the on-site water treatment system for storm water.

Mr. Scobie expressed concern regarding the Staff Committee's reservations concerning the Board's authority to require the applicant to address off-site traffic issues and the extent of upgrades that would be required to City streets. ***Mr. Thomson advised that the Staff Committee was not concerned that the authority existed but was cognizant that there was a reasonable limit to what the applicant could be responsible for and had therefore found an adequate balance.***

Applicant's Comments

Ms. Plewes, Vice-president, Capital Management, TransLink, explained that the landscape treatment of the site now proposed was provided in response to community concerns expressed at the workshop. The proviso on any landscaping was that it would not impede bus movement. At the request of City staff, the employee parking will be moved to the north of the site with some encroachment on 75th Avenue. Parking lot driveways were minimized to accommodate the 0.9 acres of walkway right-of-way.

Ms. Plewes indicated that the liability of the right-of-way would be the responsibility of the City and noted that the primary function of the monitoring cameras would be provided for site security, specifically the detection of unauthorized access to the site. It was noted that TransLink would meet with the public to discuss landscape treatment of the proposed waterfront walkway, the cost of which would be separate from the voluntary payment, as long as it was similar to other existing walkways in the immediate vicinity. It was added that the roof expression of the building will be enhanced by the addition of clerestories.

In addressing standard conditions, Ms. Plewes noted concerns regarding A.2.13 because of the broad interpretation of the condition, and because it was TransLink's understanding it was required to asphalt surfacing upgrades (not curb, gutter, or drainage) on 77th Avenue. In response to concerns regarding traffic impact she noted a traffic study had been provided and that employees would be informed of appropriate routing to/from work that would avoid neighbourhood residential streets. She explained that the site layout was the result of a number of key design criteria to meet the needs of TransLink, including: the efficiency of bus circulation; mitigation of noise impacts; bus storage; and, maintenance provisions.

Mr. Minson, Manager of Engineering, TransLink, confirmed that 70% of buses would leave the site between 5:00 a.m. and 8:00 a.m. and that 40% would return between 6:00 p.m. and 8:00 p.m. He added that, approximately 60% of the buses would be trolley.

In regard to the expedition of the permit, it was explained that new buses under construction were due to start arriving in 2005. It was further clarified that future extension of trolley wires would apply to Southwest Marine, from Oak to Victoria, enabling more dispersion of buses to/from the site.

Questions/Discussion

In discussion of the asphalt treatment, staff advised they had not seen samples of the proposed coloured and stamped asphalt but that they would seek different pavement materials for staff walkways on site that were also agreeable to TransLink.

It was anticipated that both facilities (Oakridge and Eburne) would be in operation at the same time for approximately two and a half years.

In discussion of condition A.2.4, regarding the modification of private easement, staff acknowledged that this was intended to prevent release of access available across the northwest corner of the site that would serve the adjacent site.

Mr. Haden raised a concern about acoustics in regard to the diesel bus warm-up noise. Mr. Hargraves, Cochrane Engineering responded that the study showed that the building would provide an ample buffer to such noise and site activity would comply with the City's Noise By-law.

In response to a query in regard to the bus flow, Mr. Hargraves advised that the key considerations had been given to the sequence of bus movement with buses entering from Hudson Street to make fare deposits at the west side vault and to proceed to the parking area from which they would leave on the morning service by Hudson Street. It was noted that the long approach to the vault allowed for bus line up on-site and that all circulation would be in a counter-clockwise direction.

In response to further questions, Ms. Plewes advised that there was a 10-year plan to increase the number of buses - from 1,200 to 1,600 - over all the TransLink's routes. It was anticipated that all buses would be housed at the point of origin.

Discussion ensued in regard to restricted access to the waterfront walkway. While no consideration had been given to not allow 24-hour access, consultation with the community and other authorities could assist **arrive at such a conclusion.**

In regard to the public walkway, Ms. Plewes confirmed that TransLink was supportive of improvements. Mr. Timm offered that work on the landscape treatment and walkway could proceed with the application process.

Mr. Henschel queried whether there was room for expansion or if the site was designed to maximum capacity. Ms. Plewes responded that the plan provided for projected expansion with a total capacity of 400 buses. Discussion ensued regarding the establishment of the west property line. Ms. Plewes explained that, in discussion regarding the initial subdivision, the boundaries met the design needs of the Transit Centre and that there was no opportunity to move the property line and expand the site.

Mr. McLean queried whether TransLink had considered a multi-use area with a deck over the parking lot and the office building(s). Response was that TransLink had not considered developing anything other than the Transit Centre.

Mr. McNaney commented that an anti-idling policy is being pursued by the City and anticipated that TransLink would conform to the policy. Further he expressed concern that a longer, more engaging public process had not been provided. In response, Ms. Plewes provided a timeline of the efforts by TransLink to address public concerns.

Mr. Beasley requested clarification of Council's intent in accepting payment in lieu of a park and whether the objectives of Council policy were being upheld. Mr. MacGregor advised that Council's most recent resolution had not sought park space and the proposed waterfront walkway was provided voluntarily by TransLink in response to the community concern. It was further noted that Council had not yet determined a use for the voluntary payment of \$1.041 M from TransLink. Mr. MacGregor noted that the public process had been broader than normal because of the former subdivision consultation with the community re: park dedication or payment in lieu, in addition to the recent facilitated process to achieve the walkway.

Asked by Mr. Scobie to clarify the southerly boundary of the property, staff indicated that it did not include any portions under the high water mark. Mr. Scobie inquired as to any proposed waterfront improvements by TransLink (e.g., fish habitat). Ms. Plewes offered that TransLink would be responsible for planting above the high water mark as it did not own the water lot nor had it any intentions of accessing the water.

It was queried whether the proposal would have to be substantially redesigned to satisfy Building Bylaw and Fire & Rescue Services requirements as outlined in Appendix C of the Staff Committee Report. Mr. Hargraves remarked that all conditions under Appendix C were manageable under existing plans.

It was clarified that any payment in lieu would be made upon receipt of development and building permits from the City. Mr. Beasley sought clarification that the policy resolution by Council had definitely designated the payment in lieu to be used for park. In discussion it was determined that the City had the authority to decide how the payment would be spent; however, given the expression of interest from the community, it was suggested that Council may well be influenced to use the payment for acquisition of additional park area in Marpole.

Mr. Chung expressed concern regarding the extensive parking lot and provisions for managing **storm** water runoff. Staff advised there was a storm water system on site and noted that further details were required from the applicant.

Recess

There being no objection, the Board recessed at 5:19 p.m. and reconvened at 5:28 p.m.

Comments from Other Speakers

It was a consensus of the Board to not impose a time limit on speakers.

Ralph McLean, member of the Metro Theatre, expressed concern regarding the project's location at the 'Gateway to the City' [from Vancouver Airport]. He queried whether or not there were archaeological interests (Marpole Midden) that might preclude the possibility of any development.

Staff clarified that the edge of an identified midden was north and west of the site.

Claudia LeRoy, Marpole Business Association (BIA) representing over 200 business owners and operators, and Eburne Coordinating Group Co-Chair, spoke in regard to the use of the funds contributed by TransLink (Appendix G, item 5) and the expectations of those who had made the 'agreement'. Although mollified by the provision of a waterfront pathway accessible to the public, it was hoped that the community would have the opportunity to continue to work with TransLink and the City to ensure that the traffic impact on the community was kept to a minimum. It was offered that a project with more visual attributes for the 'Gateway to the City' would achieve a win/win situation.

Gary Hackett, Marpole commercial property owner, could not support the project citing noise and air pollutants as his main objections. He was opposed to the hours of operation for the project as well as the negative impacts it would have on vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

Wendy Turner, Vancouver citizen and Eburne Coordinating Group Co-Chair, spoke regarding her concerns as a private citizen in relation to the negative impacts that the project would have on the Marpole community. In order to achieve trust between the City, TransLink and the community, she cautioned that the riverfront walkway must be expedited with vigor and become a show piece; and, that vigilance must be made in resolving traffic issues. She queried whether the Board was aware of the volunteer hours that have gone into consideration of this project.

Mr. Beasley requested clarification in regard to the intention of conditions 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3. Staff responded that, while it was the intention of the Staff Committee that, by implementation of these conditions, citizens would continue to be involved in the design development process, the City did not have any plans to lead the ~~expedition~~ **implementation** of the visioning process as referred to in agreement 4 arising from the recent workshop. The Board considered that not all six of the resolutions resulting from the workshop held April 17, 2004 were within its purview.

Don Larson, long-time Marpole resident, did not support the project and shared concerns regarding the negative environmental impacts related to the use, the perceived lack of public notification, and the appropriate use of the property. Further he noted that it was time to reconsider the zoning of the north side of the Fraser River.

Rick Balfour, Vancouver Planning Coalition, noted Planning Commission issues and spoke generally in regard to the narrow focus of most public institutions; the social responsibility of jurisdictions having authority; and that at the very least, more time should be given in the consideration of the use of the site. He also questioned the practicality of having a green building in the middle of a parking lot. He noted that there had been comments about the negative environmental impacts on the community. However, it was noted that transit was valued as a sustainable system and offered that it appeared sensible to locate the bus centre where the bus routes began and ended. Members of the coalition hoped that this could be achieved in addition to all the other uses that would benefit the community by 'double-decking' the uses.

Liz Haan, Southwest Marine Drive Ratepayers Association, expressed concerns regarding the sustainability of the surface treatment (asphalt). She discussed the opportunity of creating a city 'Gateway'; impacts to the community north of 70th Avenue and Granville Street; and questioned whether the recommendations of the Fraser River Estuary Management Program would be upheld.

Terry Slack, Fraser River Coalition, did not support the project in reference to consideration of the Fraser River and the existing uses. Major objections were the monitoring of river traffic, the design of any lighting on the river traffic, not being consulted or notified in regard to the project, and further concerns of habitat design and safety issues.

Paul McCrea, neighbouring industrial site owner, indicated that he had received no notification despite the proximity of his property to the proposed project, and added that he considered this to be an inappropriate use of the site. He urged that other options be explored.

Bob Williams, Vice Chair, Planning Commission (representing his individual views), addressed the possibility of optimizing the use for the site that would be more compatible with the existing community.

Paul Dean, Marpole resident for more than 27 years, expressed concerns regarding the increased volume of traffic to an area already congested with heavy (commercial and commuter) traffic, and the resulting noise and air pollution. He submitted a petition of 200 names that did not support the development.

Tom Nicholls, Save Our Parkland Association, recognized the need for such a project and noted precedents for public amenities sitting side-by-side with industrial sites. He expressed concern that the Fisheries Department had not been consulted to date.

Graham Brownley, Anglican Priest, St. Augustus Church, noted the (recent) family residential projects in the area and requested that a condition of permit be that the payment in lieu be applied to the purchase of a park site in Marpole and, further, that a matching amount be donated by the City to build the park.

Gundrun Langolf, Marpole resident for 20 years, discussed her quest for information on the process and her regret that there was no Official Development Plan in place. It was her observation that TransLink had not instigated public consultations or workshops noting that others had done the majority of public notification. She added that concessions offered by TransLink were insufficient and that the project was not compatible with the existing neighbourhood (comprised of not-for-profit housing, day care and other family related services).

Ron Lui Ying, land owner and resident of Marpole, voiced concerns about the process of notification to the people living in the area and the perception that Vancouver was fast becoming a concrete jungle, destroying rather than creating a healthy environment for the community.

Norman Zottenburg, a participant of the April workshop, noted that not one speaker from the community had supported the project. His concern was that the expectations of the community would be thwarted. In answer to a question from the Board, Mr. Zottenburg advised that he had never been contacted in regard to reviewing the revised plans nor given the opportunity to comment on the proposed plan.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Haden advised that the Urban Design Panel (UDP) did not support this application in its original form and noted that the UDP had not reviewed its revisions. He added that the application required more information in regard to acoustics, site plan alternatives, soil conditions, details of the fencing 'hidden' in landscape, and bus traffic flow. Issues of interest to the UDP were that the building had some architectural interest (especially sustainability aspects); the gateway quality of the site; and, the weakness of the waterfront treatment. Recommendations flowing from the UDP review were as follows:

1. That studies continue to investigate the relocation of the building to the riverside and alternative bus traffic flow on site;
2. That there be mitigation of the visual and environmental impact of the mass of asphalt; and,
3. That the roof treatment be substantially improved.

Notwithstanding the incomplete public process, and that there was no opportunity for the client to obtain more land, based on additional site planning rationale, the applicant's proposed changes including the waterfront walkway, the conditions of approval recommended by staff and because the project met the critical criteria as defined under the M-2 zoning, Mr. Haden was reluctant not to recommend its approval.

Mr. Hancock commented that, at a time when most cities were changing waterfront policies to exclude such uses as this project, it was puzzling that Vancouver's zoning allowed this use. It was his concern that the use was not appropriate for the site and that the asphalt treatment was very poor. He noted the use of the property was not water related in any way and considered that the application lacked completeness. The zoning, however, does not seem to aspire for more. Mr. Hancock was undecided as to what he would recommend to the Board.

Mr. McLean recalled that 25-years before, BC Hydro (the transit authority of the time) had purchased 25 acres of waterfront land for the SeaBus that had evolved to the development of the Lonsdale Quay. He suggested that this project could proceed with another development in a few years to include a more intensive, attractive and successful mixed use, and indicated his approval of the project.

Mr. Chung considered that it was not the optimal use for the site and would have preferred to see the highest possible use provided to the public benefit. Notwithstanding this, he agreed that it was a very suitable location for the north-south bus grid that it would service. As the project was in compliance with the zoning, Mr. Chung reluctantly gave his approval.

Mr. McNaney expressed concern over the constrained time schedule to achieve permits and the lack of response to public concerns. He offered that, should the application be approved, conditions should be attached in relation to: traffic management, enforced operations management, community advisory input, and assurance that the 'payment made in lieu' would be dedicated to the creation of a park for the community.

Mr. Henschel strongly supported the retention of industrial lands in Vancouver and expressed concern that there be more attention to design development of the site. He was of the opinion that the site had been treated in a singularly unimaginative way comparing it unfavourably with the symmetry of Granville Island. Should the project proceed in its present form, Mr. Henschel suggested that the following considerations be addressed:

- the site is too small for the use, it is designed to solely meet engineering needs;
- ensure the walkway is constructed;
- in consultation with the City, community and TransLink, purchase two additional acres to allow redistribution of the parking and have a larger pathway/park on the waterfront;
- suggest referral of the project to Council with a request for clarification and specification of policy for the use of this land;
- public authorities in their efforts to pursue public interest have to be more rigorous and less constrained by narrow mandates; and
- a multi-layered mixed-use development would be more profitable, and would benefit the community.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley cautioned that there was a need to look beyond the excitement of what 'could' be, i.e., a mixed-use dense scheme on the waterfront **that would require rezoning**. He noted that Council had two, if not more, opportunities to start the visioning process but instead had considered the allowable use, ~~what could be achieved in the quid pro quo and the loss of waterfront industrial land~~ **acceptable either in their support of industry or of transit**. Mr. Beasley commented that a Transit Centre was an industrial use and not much better or worse than what currently existed. He commented that the conditions of the permit would mitigate impacts on the community. In his evaluation, he expressed concerns regarding the need for more planning in regard to how the Transit Centre would interact with the community and that he found the walkway to be essential with the possibility for being wider (**a minimum of 25 feet wide**).

Further comments were in relation to follow-up regarding the community process, continued planning by the Park Board for the use of the payment in lieu for parks in the area, improvement to the roof and asphalt treatment, and a commitment on behalf of TransLink to uphold its promises to the community. It was added that potential traffic impacts put the onus on the City Engineer to ensure that traffic did not intrude on the residential areas.

Mr. Beasley stated that staff had assured the Board that this site had not been provincially determined an archaeological site. He moved approval, subject to several revisions to the recommended conditions of approval proposed by the Staff Committee.

Mr. MacGregor supported Mr. Beasley's motion and proposed amendments and queried whether the walkway should be closed after dusk. He commented that TransLink operated a public service and, in providing a new Transit Centre, was managing a sustainability issue for transportation that would support and be beneficial to a great number of people. He considered the issue of TransLink finding another site and resolved that at no time did Council talk about this use being incompatible with the area. In summary he commented that the project was operating within Council's policies and that he had no difficulty supporting the application.

Mr. Timm acknowledged the public delegations and the sincerity of their concerns. He agreed that the use was fitting for the existing zoning and that Council had reviewed the appropriateness of the use. He advised that, when a use was conditional, the comparison was relative to the outright uses that could be on the land not necessarily the "highest and best" possible use. In conclusion, Mr. Timm commended TransLink for the effort it was making to meet staff and community concerns and gave his support to the application.

Mr. Scobie noted that Mr. Timm's position made the Board's decision unanimous. He also indicated it was fortuitous that this was consideration of a conditional use and not an outright use given the many possibilities that could have been advanced with no opportunity for establishing any conditions of approval. He also noted the proposed use is consistent with Council policy; there is no Council policy for sustainability and that no policy exists that waterfront property should only support water-dependent uses. It was his opinion that approval of this application would not preclude future ambitious development on the property.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 407997, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 12, 2004, with the following amendments:

- Amend 1.1 to add: "to be concluded and provided prior to occupancy permit";

- Amend 1.2 to replace “provision of a registered” with “arrangements to be made for registration, prior to occupancy permit, of a”
- Amend 1.3 to strike: “design development to provide a pedestrian and bicycle path” and insert: “arrangements to be made for design development and delivery of a pedestrian and bicycle path, prior to occupancy permit,”
- Amend 1.4 to strike the word “the” between “to” and “enhance”;
- Amend to add condition 1.5: “design development to enhance the visual quality of the asphalt bus parking area as overviewed from the Arthur Lang Bridge.

Note to Applicant: This could be achieved by appropriate lighting, type/colours of asphalt and other paving materials and/or landscaping.”;

- Amend to add condition 1.6: “that TransLink confirm its commitment to meet on a regular basis through development, construction and operation of the facility, with a community committee and appropriate other stakeholders to discuss additional issues of concern, including consultation with river marine user groups, and, including consultation during design development.”;
- Amend A.1.5 to replace it with: “arrangements to be made to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services for completion of the proposal’s review within the Fraser River Estuary Management Program and summary of recommended mitigation measures prior to the issuance of a building permit.”;
- Amend A.1.6 to replace it with: “arrangements to be made to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services for completion of the provision of a storm water management plan for the site prior to the issuance of a building permit.”;
- Amend A.2.4 **Note to Applicant** (first sentence) to insert: “, or enter into an agreement with TransLink,” after “the City as a party” and before “so as to prevent”;
- Amend A.2.6 **Note to Applicant** to add a new sentence: “The encroachment agreement will be required prior to occupancy.”; and
- Amend A.2.13 to strike “traffic” and insert “residential community”.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

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

V. Guthrie
Recording Secretary

F. Scobie
Chair

Q:\Clerical\DPB\Minutes\2004\may25.doc