

Meeting: No. 481
Date: Monday, May 29, 2000
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: No. 1 Committee Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)
L. Beasley Co-Director of Planning
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager
D. Rudberg General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

J. Cheng Representative of the Design Professions [Urban Design Panel] (Item #3)
P. Grant Representative of the Design Professions [Urban Design Panel] (Item #4)
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions
A. Gjernes Representative of Development Industry
J. Leduc Representative of General Public
M. Mortenson Representative of General Public
R. Roodenburg Representative of General Public

Absent

P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry
R. Mingay Representative of General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

M. Rondeau Development Planner
R. Segal Senior Development Planner
S. Hein Development Planner
J. Bird Project Manager, Rapid Transit Office (City of Vancouver)
F. Ducote Senior Planner, Rapid Transit Office (City of Vancouver)
N. Peters City Surveyor

Item 3 - 525 West 10th Avenue - DE404963 - C-3A

P. Grant Grant & Sinclair Architects
G. Moffatt B.C. Principals' & Vice Principals' Association
G. Buckley B.C. Principals' & Vice Principals' Association

Item 4 - 1725 East Broadway - DE405018 - CD-1

G. Ball Baker McGarva Hart Inc.
E. LeFluffy Rapid Transit Project2000 (RTPO)
J. Durante Landscape Architect

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of May 15, 2000 be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 525 WEST 10TH AVENUE - DE404963 - ZONE C-3A (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Grant & Sinclair Architects

Request: To construct a 3-storey office building with underground parking. To relax FSR from 1.0 to 2.58 and to relax height from 9.2 m (30.18 ft.) to 13.26 m (43.5 ft.).

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, MaryBeth Rondeau, described the context of the site, situated in the C-3A District. The 3-storey office proposal seeks height and density relaxations, which are permitted in the C-3A zone. The outright permitted height is 30 ft. and outright density is 1.0 FSR. The maximum height of the proposal is 43.5 ft. at the rear of the building and 31 ft. at the front. Proposed FSR is 2.58. Staff have reviewed the impacts of the proposed height and believe that, because the highest part of the building is at the rear of the site, the view impacts for people across the street will be minimal or non-existent. While it will cause greater shadowing than an outright 30 ft. building, this will be fairly minimal and affect only existing and future commercial development facing West Broadway. Staff consider the architectural resolution of the building to be superior. Proposed materials include concrete, metal cladding and high quality glass. Staff have only one minor concern, relating to the interior wall along the east property line. Condition 1.1 seeks to reduce the height of this wall (by about two feet) in order to increase light access to the lower floors of the adjacent VanCity building. In summary, staff are very supportive of the application and recommend approval, subject to the conditions outlined in the Staff Committee Report dated May 3, 2000.

Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning the blank party wall situation, Ms. Rondeau confirmed it would be possible for windows to be introduced, provided fire rating standards are met and there is agreement from the adjacent property owner. With respect to the skylight, Ms. Rondeau confirmed it is acceptable under the Building By-law, and would remain so if its slope increased as a result of reducing the height of the wall. In answer to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding the earlier use of this site and whether there is any obligation to provide parking for the adjacent VanCity building, Ms. Rondeau confirmed there is no legal tie between the VanCity building and this site.

Applicant's Comments

With respect to the party wall, Mr. Paul Grant, Architect, asked the Board to permit them to maintain its height as proposed. He explained that his client does not want to look into the VanCity offices from the top floor of the building. The concept was to develop this long, narrow site in a way that would allow light into the building all

the way along through the middle portion of the building, and this has been achieved to a large extent. Further, the BC Principals' and Vice Principals' Association intends to use the interior wall as an art gallery, to display school work from around the province. As well, if the wall were to be lowered beyond what they have done already, it would interrupt the fluidity of the architecture as it has been resolved. With respect to treatment of the wall, Mr. Grant said they can consider introducing windows, but with some duress with respect to meeting fire regulations. Different surface treatment may also be considered. Given the constraints of this 50 ft. wide site, Mr. Grant explained that considerable time has been spent discussing parking with Engineering Services and agreement has been reached as to how it is to be resolved. He confirmed they can address the standard conditions contained in the report.

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Cheng reported that the Urban Design Panel unanimously supported this application and complimented the architect for the exemplary design. Mr. Cheng supported the applicant's request to delete condition 1.1 because lowering the wall two feet would compromise the design and achieve no real benefit for the neighbouring building. Noting there is a gap of only 15 ft. between the façade of this building and the VanCity building, Mr. Cheng suggested amending condition 1.1 to request the applicant to consider introducing some window openings into the side wall.

Mr. Hancock said he liked this project very much and he recommended approval of the application. He also recommended deletion of condition 1.1, but agreed that further exploration of detailing of the wall might be appropriate.

Mr. Gjernes concurred with the previous speakers and recommended approval.

Ms. Leduc agreed. Given the Association's intention to use the side wall to display artwork, she thought adding window openings would not be appropriate, although some treatment that makes the wall more interesting might be considered.

Mr. Mortenson also supported the application, and supported introducing windows to the side wall, if possible.

Mr. Roodenburg supported the application. He also recommended deleting condition 1.1 and suggested that staff and the applicant come to some agreement with respect to improving the appearance of the side wall.

Board Discussion

Mr. Rudberg said it is a good design that earns the relaxation of height and density without significant view impacts. He recommended a substitution for condition 1.1, to require the applicant to consider windows or some other treatment to the side wall. Responding to a concern expressed by Mr. MacGregor that construction of this project should not be delayed by this condition, Mr. Rudberg stressed that windows would be only one option that might be considered.

Mr. Beasley commented that this is the kind of elegant design we would like to see more often for smaller sites such as this. He concurred with the suggested revised condition 1.1, noting it will generate further discussion between the architect and the development planner to achieve a good neighbourly interface.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 404963 , in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 3, 2000, with the following amendments:

Delete 1.1 and replace with the following:

design development to consider some windows or other design treatment to improve the appearance of the interior side wall on the eastern property line;

Note to Applicant: Adding windows is one option, among others, that may be considered.

**4. 1725 EAST BROADWAY - DE405018 - CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Baker McGarva Hart Inc.

Request: To construct a new rapid transit station with at grade entry, elevated platform/guideway and commercial-retail units.

The Chair noted the City is not in a position to approve or refuse a development permit in this instance. The Board's role is to offer advice to the proponent, Rapid Transit Project2000 (RTPO).

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Scot Hein, advised the CD-1 zoning and guidelines for this site were approved by Council in February 2000. The proposal will be returned to Council for approval of the form of development. Mr. Hein reiterated that the role of the Board is advisory, given the Provincial ownership. It is, however, recommended that the two flanking retail blocks on the proposed station proceed through the full permitting process. This important retail component is presented today as contextual information.

Referring to the model, Mr. Hein provided a brief overview of the proposed station and its immediate context, noting the focus of discussion will be on the "triangle site" for the new station, noting also that the proponent does contemplate some remedial upgrading to the existing Broadway station. The proposal comprises a series of components, including the existing phase one station, the overpass, the concourse, the flanking retail, and a bridge to the new station platform.

Frank Ducote, Senior Planner, briefly described the process to date, and highlighted the issues for the Board's consideration, namely: the proximity of the two stations to one another; ownership and viability of the retail units; provision of a safe environment; and public realm quality.

Referring to the Staff Committee Report dated May 17, 2000, Mr. Hein noted the proposal conforms significantly to the requirements of the CD-1 Guidelines, with the areas of concern addressed in the items for consideration ("conditions"). The first condition recommends shifting the existing platform further over Broadway. A 15 m shift is believed to be technically possible, to better link the two stations in a more integrated way. The second

major condition deals with the commercial retail space, in which formal confirmation is sought that the spaces will be available for occupancy when the station becomes operational. Staff consider the retail units to be very important to the success of this station because they provide on-site surveillance, and it is recommended there be some commitment made to the community that everything possible will be done to ensure they remain viable and occupied. Mr. Hein then reviewed the Crime and Safety considerations, which include the recommendation for some full time personnel. Noting that TransLink ultimately will be the operator of the rapid transit system, Mr. Hein explained that some of the recommendations will be forwarded to TransLink by RTPO. Provision of a community amenity space is also sought, to provide opportunities for station "ownership". Mr. Hein tabled an amendment to condition 1.9, relating to the Station Precinct Enhancement Plan. Mr. Ducote added, this may include improvements to Commercial Drive and Broadway, beyond the triangle site. In conclusion, Mr. Hein tabled an amendment to Appendix A, to delete A.5.3.

Discussion

During the question period that followed, Mr. Rudberg expressed concern about the potential for graffiti on the large concrete wall within the Grandview Cut, and Mr. Beasley raised a question about the retention of existing trees in the Cut. Jane Durante, Landscape Architect for the proponent, explained that a full analysis will be done when the inventory of existing trees is completed. Mr. Hein noted that condition 1.3 addresses the exposed structural "green" walls and landscape planting within the Cut, to minimize visual impact and reduce opportunities for graffiti and mischief. Responding to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning the provision of washroom facilities for bus drivers, Mr. Leflufy explained this is not part of their scope of work. Discussions between RTPO and TransLink with respect to the location of this facility are ongoing.

Mr. Scobie expressed some concern about the mandatory wording of some of the "conditions" and the preamble, given the report is intended to be advisory. He also questioned the intent of condition 1.8 regarding community amenity space, noting the report indicates the proposal complies with the guidelines in this respect. Mr. Ducote briefly reviewed the various kinds of amenities under discussion, including a crime prevention office which could be on or off site. Commenting on a concern expressed by Mr. Scobie regarding the confusion of ownership of the various parcels which comprise the site, Mr. Rudberg noted that condition 1.18 calls for all the parties to pay early attention to legal survey and resubdivision matters. Jane Bird, City of Vancouver Rapid Transit Office, briefly explained the ownership and leasing history.

Responding to a question by Mr. Scobie as to whether or not a development permit will be issued, Ms. Bird explained it was never the intention to issue a development permit, rather that RTPO has participated in the typical development permit process in order to solicit the advice of the Board and to provide an opportunity for members of the public to comment. Considerable discussion ensued with respect to jurisdiction of the various components of the site. Mr. Scobie noted the Staff Committee report refers to a development application for the CD-1 zoned site but clearly there will be no development permit issued and the proposal extends beyond the boundaries of the CD-1 zoning, as do "conditions" recommended by the Staff Committee. For that portion zoned CD-1, Council approval must be obtained as to the "form of development". For the balance, including the guideway treatment entering the new station and connection/ improvements recommended to the existing station, it may be appropriate to seek Council endorsement as was done for the Rupert and Renfrew Stations.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Edward Leflufy, Project Consultant to RTPO, expressed appreciation for the Board's consideration of the items outlined in the report. He noted the situation is very complex, involving a precinct plan, two stations, the interconnecting spaces between the stations, and some commercial development. Mr. Leflufy stressed they understand the Staff Committee Report is for advice and comment. In most respects they have met the conditions or are working with staff to reach a consensus. There are, however, some areas which are causing difficulty.

With respect to 1.1, Mr. Leflufy explained that shifting the platform was an idea that was generated in a public workshop but, following exploration, they concluded it is not technically/structurally possible. It also has implications on operations which are not acceptable to TransLink, and has implications on the seismic capacity of the existing structures. They do not believe the 10 to 15 second reduction in the walk time warrants an expenditure of this nature, even if it were technically possible. Mr. Leflufy added, he also disagreed with the Urban Design Panel with respect to the urban design implications of such a move.

With respect to 1.7 concerning the provision of full time personnel, Mr. Leflufy advised this will be referred to TransLink because it relates to operational considerations. Regarding 1.8, he said he believes the amenity issue has been addressed, noting they have indicated specific facilities within the station or through requirements of the Vancouver Access Agreement. He said they have met with staff with respect to 1.9 and are satisfied with the revised wording tabled by the Development Planner, noting that many of the requirements in the Precinct Plan are to others' account. Item 1.12, dealing with bicycle lockers, is a TransLink program issue that will be referred to them. With respect to condition 2.0, Mr. Leflufy suggested rewording, to replace "be met" with "reviewed and responded to".

In conclusion, Mr. Leflufy advised they are looking to the Board for response and advice, particularly related to the commercial development, insofar as it will help them formalize their negotiations with third party developers so that they can proceed directly to a development permit through the Director of Planning.

Discussion

Acknowledging the applicant's disagreement with shifting the platform, Mr. Beasley questioned Mr. Leflufy's response to widening the walkway, also called for in 1.1. Mr. Leflufy explained that a comprehensive patron flow analysis was done and, while there was some difference of opinion on some of the details between the various consultants and staff involved, it is their opinion that the access bridge across Broadway is sufficient to handle the pedestrian volumes anticipated and does not need widening to meet functional requirements. They also consider that the station provides an adequate level of (disabled) accessibility.

Responding to a question by Mr. Beasley regarding the provision of community amenity space requested in 1.8, Mr. Ducote noted the access agreement negotiated some monies for a neighbourhood crime prevention office, which would go a long way towards satisfying this initiative. He confirmed the amenity space called for in 1.8 would be in addition to washrooms and lockers, etc.

Mr. Beasley questioned whether there will be an area allocated to bicycle lockers, notwithstanding the applicant's response that this is a TransLink area of responsibility. Mr. Leflufy explained there has been discussion about bicycle lockers at all stations. Their understanding is that while the City would like to see bike lockers, those they have consulted to date have not been particularly supportive of them at this particular location. No provision has been made for 25 bike lockers in the Commercial Drive station and triangle site. The matter will be referred to TransLink who may be able to locate them on the Broadway Station site. Mr. Ducote noted Rupert and Renfrew Stations provided spaces for 10 bicycles. Staff believe this station will attract substantially more bicyclists and

would like to see an initiative to accommodate 25 bicycles before the design is resolved. Ms. Bird reminded the Board of its strong position regarding provision for bicycles in the Rupert and Renfrew Stations.

Comments from Other Speakers

Mr. Don Genoversa said the community is concerned about the crowds and associated crime and dirt that will be generated by this station. The projected additional half a million people per year will intensify the crime and dirt. The proponent is interested in moving people, not the community which will end up with more crime, more “squeegee pilots” and beggars on the streets. The neighbourhood wants some mitigation: more trees, more park benches, and an end of crime. Mr. Genoversa noted there is no long term commitment to a crime prevention office, only enough money to sustain such an office for perhaps five or six years. As ridership increases, rents will increase and make it even more difficult to locate a crime prevention office. Mr. Genoversa stressed they are depending on the City and TransLink to solve some of the crime problems. Responding to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning a separate community amenity space, Mr. Genoversa agreed this is necessary, and preferably outside the triangle site.

Mr. Tim Ames, Cedar Cottage Neighbourhood Association, stressed that in all of the submissions the community has made, they have asked that the whole area be integrated as a pedestrian friendly place, with amenities that would keep people there in the evening. He said he would like to see provision for an open area where people can eat late at night and socialise. With respect to the 6 m wall on either side of the station, Mr. Ames said it will be very unsightly if nothing is done to it and it will attract graffiti. He was not convinced it could not be made to accommodate vines. Mr. Ames said he was encouraged to see the issues raised by City staff, which are also the concerns of the neighbourhood, but questioned what will happen if the advice is ignored. He expressed concern that suggestions and advice do not always bring agreement, and he urged that there be serious negotiation on the issues raised. For example, Mr. Ames said he would like to see secure bicycle lockers as part of the design now rather than added later. He added, their original concern was that this transit initiative would offer some way to improve their community, and they have been assured this would be the means to achieve that. With respect to the separate community space, Mr. Ames said he hoped there would be space within the triangle site for a plaza and semi-outdoor cafes, and a place for community music. The purpose would be that members of the community would want to be there at all times of the day and night.

Mr. Simon Davey said he felt the City and the architects have done a very good job to make the most of a difficult and tight site. He agreed that secure bicycle storage should be designed for now. He said he hoped this station would not become the terminus of the SkyTrain route but continue to Vancouver Community College and beyond. Mr. Davey said he also hoped the City would do whatever possible to get the CIBC site and the rest of the block redeveloped. With respect to community amenity space, Mr. Ames said it may be better to locate it elsewhere in the neighbourhood rather than on the triangle site.

Ms. Barb Wright, representative of the neighbourhood association and coordinator of the neighbourhood safety office, acknowledged that the architects, the City and the Province have tried to work with the community. However, the constraints of time, engineering and finances have had a serious impact on the achievement of their wishes. Noting it will be the largest transit hub in Western Canada, Ms. Wright said the proposal falls short of being a worthy flagship of which the Province, the City and the community can be proud. It would be very detrimental to the community if the SkyTrain route stops in this location. The community would like to see the following:

- a safe station and a safe area. There must be security staff who take ownership of the space in this station at all times;
- CPTED principles must be addressed, and the retail spaces will be essential to create positive activity on the site. The community is concerned about how the retail space will be managed;

- replacement trees in the Cut should be the same size as the ones removed;
- more public access along the back of the retail development, overlooking the Cut;
- the wall in the Cut should be architecturally designed and a way found for planting to grow on it;
- there should be some amenity spaces for the public in the form of walkways and cafes within the development as well as other amenities in the community as well;
- a permanent home for the neighbourhood safety office should be found, preferably in the area.

Responding to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning the provision of cafes and open eating areas within the commercial area, Greg Ball, Architect, said they believe these could be accommodated within a 3 m wide space in front of the retail on the westerly side, and this is the intention. With respect to the suggestion of a walkway along the southern edge of the development, Mr. Ball agreed it would be possible and it has been considered. However, it was not pursued because of the difficulties of the engineering. As well as it being north facing, they were also concerned about it becoming a “back eddy” space. Mr. Ducote added, Staff have tried to provide, through the guidelines, a number of public spaces that overlook the Cut, especially along the Grandview Highway bridge, particularly at grade. He noted that public consultation has shown that a public plaza on the street would be better suited than a north-facing private deck.

Mr. Rod Russell said the Grandview Cut is an area of wilderness that is a defining feature of the community. It is a boundary and demarcation that has the same effect as a river in a neighbourhood. This intersection has been badly neglected and commercial development has failed to thrive over the last ten years. This project provides an opportunity to mark this intersection as being a gateway to Commercial Drive, but it has not happened. While the project has attracted the best efforts of many good people, the process has been fragmented and there is a lack of leadership. Mr. Russell suggested the Board should turn this application back and ask the proponents to spend another few months working on it, because a much better design needs to be done.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Grant thanked the members of the public for their input and noted that many of their concerns are shared by the Urban Design Panel. There is a problem with not being able to deal with more of the elements under one design roof. That the retail components will be done outside the context of the design of a major transportation hub is a major concern if it results in retail units that turn their back on the public aspects of the project. The Panel thought this project was big enough and important enough to be able to reach into the community much more. Even if it is not possible to shift the existing station, there are architectural ways to integrate the new station with the existing. The Broadway bridge linking the two stations, at 3.6 m wide, is a serious problem, especially for the long term. This will be a major transportation hub and it demands much more attention to the station aspects, as perceived by the community. Commercial Drive is a special place and the recent retail failures should concern the City. Perhaps the answer is to create a station-like environment that is very transparent, exposing it more to the Cut from the public aspects of the station within. There needs to be a kind of retail that works within an open space concept. The designers have done a good job with the small parts they have been allowed to do, but there needs to be a more comprehensive approach.

Mr. Hancock agreed with Mr. Grant. The piecemeal approach results in a functional station that does not integrate well with the community, notwithstanding the good architecture. With respect to the wall in the Cut, it would not be a major challenge to move it back and have the columns go further out on either side in order to have some green growing on the wall. The Board should encourage a space to be allocated for bicycles. With respect to the amenity spaces, there should be something both in the station and in the community. If there is to be a significant commercial development that is integrated with the station, the very minimal approach now taken will result in a lot more fast food outlets.

Mr. Gjernes said retail viability is a critical aspect of the whole project. The retail should be approached as a means of contributing to the excitement of the station, making it part of the centre of the station and looking at the long term as opposed to selling it off into small units. It should include a “festival area” of programmed space that the community can use. Bicycle storage should be lockable but out in the open. In closing, Mr. Gjernes said, if this were a development application, he would recommend that the applicant bring it back after doing more work.

Mr. Roodenberg said he agreed with the previous speakers. He stressed that secure bicycle storage is very important, and concurred with Mr. Gjernes’ comments about the retail.

Mr. Mortenson stressed the importance of comfortably accommodating the transit riders and said it would be inadvisable to under-serve them at the outset. He shared the concerns expressed about the uncertainty of the retail component. It forms a large part of the proposal, yet still remains quite ambiguous. He suggested some of the retail uses should be designated now. There are opportunities to accommodate the needs of the neighbourhood and to bring transit users both into the station and out of the station in a way that respects the needs of the neighbourhood and the transit riders. The concrete wall could be landscaped in a way that reflects the natural environment of the Cut. Opportunities exist for public access and observation of the Cut on the east end of the site which have not been expressed in this proposal.

Ms. Leduc said the community has made it clear that they want a safe place and a special place for this site. The City and TransLink have to ensure it is safe. She agreed that it should also be a special place but was not convinced that it will be achieved with such a piecemeal approach. Her advice to the Province would be to take the time to do it right - we do not want this to be a white elephant in the middle of our city.

Board Discussion

The Chair noted the advice from the Panel is consistent with comments from members of the public. He said he was troubled because the project is being dealt with as a fragmented initiative: nobody is looking at the “big picture” and taking control in terms of how it is to be dealt with in the context of the existing community. It is being dealt with only as a transportation installation. There is some effort to deal with the residual lands on the “triangle” in a way that might begin to capture some potential for knitting this facility into the community, but this effort is weak and not well coordinated. Notwithstanding its constraints, it will be most unfortunate if the opportunity is lost on this project.

Mr. Scobie said he would rather not have the Board consider the project as a development application, because officially it is not, nor would he have it dealt with too strictly in the context of the CD-1 zoned site because it clearly goes beyond those zoning boundaries. He said he would encourage the Board not to think of it as it would a normal development application, but rather as a transit facility in the context of an existing transit infrastructure that does not work well in the community. This initiative is an opportunity to integrate the new station with the existing transit facility and to integrate both with the community.

Mr. MacGregor commented that the reality is that the rapid transit line is proceeding. The Board’s role is to give advice on the issues and hope that the transit authority follows that advice. With respect to the commercial component, Mr. MacGregor said he was quite concerned about the potential viability of the retail. When the design of this component is sufficiently advanced, it should be referred to the Board for approval if the Director of Planning believes it to be necessary. Mr. MacGregor recommended a number of amendments to the items outlined in the Staff Committee Report. He did not support the suggested amended condition 1.9.

Mr. Beasley seconded Mr. MacGregor’s motion. He acknowledged the proposal does attempt to do something more than just a station. However, while a great deal of work has been done to try to do something a little better, it

needs to go further. Mr. Beasley said he was very concerned about the areas reported as being “somebody else’s responsibility”. For example, some effort should be made to integrate the bus drivers’ facilities into the station. He emphasized the importance of the bicycle lockers. He strongly supported the addition of the word “architecture” in condition 1.1, noting it is more than just functionality but calls for bringing the existing station architecturally up to date. Responding to the number of comments that have been made about the Grandview Cut, Mr. Beasley tabled a new condition:

design development to respond to all aspects of the green environment of the Grandview Cut as an integral part of the station and commercial experience;

Note to Applicant: Where possible, save existing landscaping and trees, green blank walls, create more access to the edges of the Cut and create more views into the Cut.

This condition was not supported by Mr. MacGregor and Mr. Rudberg, and Mr. Beasley’s motion failed. Mr. MacGregor said he thought the existing conditions were strong enough, adding that RTPO will no doubt realise that greening the wall will be one of the best ways of preventing graffiti. Mr. Rudberg concurred.

Mr. Rudberg said he appreciated the comments from the community, and especially those from the Advisory Panel which were particularly thoughtful and well considered. He said he was encouraged by the fact that the Board is providing advice before the report goes forward to Council and before the formal applications are made for the retail space. The two areas of concern with regard to the station are the walkway over Broadway and bicycle storage. The width of the walkway, given the anticipated level of activity, is inadequate and should be addressed now. Mr. Rudberg said he failed to understand why there is no provision for bicycle storage in this station. With respect to the retail space, it needs significant redesign to have the public space work better for the community and transit users. He strongly recommended that the development applications for the retail units be referred to the Board. Mr. MacGregor concurred.

With respect to community enhancements, Mr. Rudberg said he would look to the local business to make some investment, as well as the City. The businesses have to take greater ownership of the public spaces, both in terms of their care and funding for improvements. He added, the City of Vancouver is certainly willing to work with the community in this regard.

Motion

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

THAT the Development Permit Board, in the exercise of its authority, is providing ADVICE to the Province of British Columbia on the Broadway/Commercial SkyTrain Station proposal as the Province will not be obtaining Development or Building Permits for the project.

THAT the commercial developments next to the station will require Development and Building Permits. Therefore, applicable recommendations made on these matters should be considered regulatory and not advisory to the Province of British Columbia. When the specifics of the third party commercial development on the site are known, the Development Applications will be dealt with by the Development Board.

THAT the Board SUPPORTS the submission dated April 5, 2000, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 17, 2000, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1:

Design development to the existing Phase 1 station upper platform and the Broadway overpass to better consolidate proposed new station functions with existing station functions *and architecture*;

Note to Applicant: ~~Consideration should be given to shifting the existing platform over Broadway as much as possible.~~ The existing platform and overpass enclosure should be upgraded to provide greater transparency, weather protection and lighting. The existing overpass width should be increased *at this time* to accommodate anticipated ridership activity.

Amend 1.3 to replace “minimize” with *improve*;

Amend 1.7:

~~Provision of consideration given by RTPO and/or TransLink to providing~~ full time personnel (formal, full time security/policing) to ensure a safe environment, in consultation with the Chief Constable of the Vancouver Police;

Amend the Note to Applicant in 1.8:

Note to Applicant: Provision of a community amenity space in one station and *a staffed* an information kiosk *in the other* with full time staff in the other is recommended.

Amend 2.0:

That the advice and comments set out in Appendix A be reviewed and responded to ~~met~~ prior to the submission of a Building Permit Application.

Delete A.5.3;

5. OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7.20 pm.

C. Hubbard
Clerk to the Board

F. Scobie
Chair

/ch