

Meeting: No. 463
Date: Monday, May 31, 1999
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: No. 1 Committee Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F.A. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair to 6.35 pm)
J. Forbes-Roberts Acting General Manager of Community Services (Chair after 6.35 pm)
L.B. Beasley Co-Director of Planning
E. Lo General Manager, Corporate Services
D. Rudberg General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

J. Hruda Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
A. Gjernes Representative of Development Industry (excused Item #4)
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry (left at 5.35 pm)
D. Chung Representative of General Public
R. Mingay Representative of General Public
B. Parton Representative of General Public
R. Roodenburg Representative of General Public

Absent

J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions

ALSO PRESENT:

M. Kemble Development Planner
R. Segal Development Planner
A. Molaro Development Planner
N. Peters City Surveyor

Item 3 - 301 Jervis Street - DE403667

James Cheng Architect
Jones Lee Architect
Chris Phillips Landscape Architect

Item 4 - 601 Canada Place Way - DE403959

David Galpin Greystone Properties Ltd.
Robert McKay Greystone Properties Ltd.

CLERK TO THE BOARD:

Carol Hubbard

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of April 19, 1999 be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 301 JERVIS STREET - DE403667 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE AFTER PRELIMINARY)**

Applicant: James K.M. Cheng Architects Inc.

Request: To construct a 30-storey commercial/residential development containing a total of 97 dwelling units with a two to three storey podium base (8 townhouse units) and 3,711 sq.ft. of retail uses at grade along the waterfront walkway.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Mike Kemble, presented this application. The preliminary submission was approved in principle by the Board on December 14, 1998. In response to a preliminary condition to provide commercial use at grade, to comply with the ODP, the ground floor plan has now been revised to include about 3,700 sq.ft. retail space, approx. 25 ft. deep, along the waterfront walkway at the park. It was noted, however, that the applicant may be applying for a Text Amendment to delete this requirement. After reviewing the revisions to the scheme, Mr. Kemble advised that staff consider the response to the preliminary conditions to be very well handled.

Three issues remain with respect to the complete submission, relating to public street-end view corridor encroachments, vehicular access arrangements from the Jervis Street right-of-way, and the tower floorplate size. After reviewing view analysis which was not available at the preliminary stage, staff believe the issue of encroachment into the street-end view corridors must be addressed, and condition 1.1 requires adjustment to the massing of the two storey townhouse and amenity pavilion elements to ensure the Jervis Street-end view corridor is preserved. It was noted the Board does not have the authority to relax this ODP requirement. With respect to vehicular access, staff consider the three crossings proposed should be reduced to two, as called for in condition 1.2. Condition 1.4 requires a reduction in floorplate size, to not exceed the 595 m² maximum called for in the Guidelines.

In summary, staff believe the proposed tower is very elegant and the complete application has responded very well to the previous conditions. The Staff Committee recommendation is for approval, subject to the conditions contained in the report dated May 5, 1999. Mr. Kemble tabled some minor amendments to conditions 1.1 and A.1.23.

In the question period that followed, Mr. Beasley noted that, at the rezoning stage, considerable discussion took place with upland owners regarding Coal Harbour tower heights and locations and the zoning and guidelines reflect the understanding that was reached at that time.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. James Cheng, Architect, pointed out that this particular site was not part of the discussions with the upland owners. Those discussions related to the Harbour Green towers which were rezoned almost ten years after this site. The main issue for the upland owners was the width of the towers they would be facing, rather than actual floorplate sizes. It was therefore determined that additional massing would be on the view shadow side to the north rather than to the south or increasing tower width. Referring to an illustration of the public street end views cones, Mr. Cheng explained why he believes this particular site is an exception. He noted as well, that setting back the townhouse component would be contrary to the intent of maintaining continuity with the Harbour Green towers, to define the edge of the park. In summary, he stated they are not asking the Board to relax the view cone but rather to clarify the documentation, noting they believe they are in compliance.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, the Development Planner confirmed the view cones are clearly indicated in the Coal Harbour ODP. Mr. Kemble also confirmed that even if the Guidelines are not strictly accurate, the ODP must prevail.

Referring to the prior-to conditions, Mr. Cheng agreed they can reduce the vehicular access points from three to two, as required by 1.2; however, he noted the reason for providing three openings was in response to a security concern because having only two openings will require people to drive under the building, in an uncontrolled area. With respect to 1.3, he reminded the Board that the area in question is also a designated emergency access area so that centrally located benches and planters would not be appropriate. Regarding the size of the floorplate (condition 1.4), Mr. Cheng explained they felt the proposed size was acceptable, noting it is the width of the tower which has been the key issue and the proposed tower width is 18 inches less than allowed by the Guidelines. With respect to the top of the tower (1.5), Mr. Cheng said they would like to maintain it as shown, noting this is a landmark building site at the entrance to the harbour. He explained, they are currently working with the Public Art Commission to establish three public art locations, one of which will be at the tower top. The intent is to provide sufficient height for a piece of three-dimensional art which has yet to be determined. When the public art competition is concluded, an appropriate amendment to the DP will be sought. Condition 1.6 is acceptable. Regarding 1.7, to provide a secondary access to the park, Mr. Cheng said they are in agreement but since it would require Park Board approval which could take some time, they request that this be a recommendation only so that completion does not delay the project.

Some discussion took place with respect to the top of the tower and approval of the requested height subject to confirmation of the approved public art piece through the public art process. In discussion, the Board agreed to expand condition 1.5 to permit the Director of Planning to confirm the additional height once an appropriate art solution is endorsed by the Public Art Commission.

(Board and Panel members then took a few minutes to review the model and posted materials)

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Hruda noted the areas of concern to the Urban Design Panel. Regarding the tower top element, the Panel considered this tower to be the fulcrum building on the waterfront and therefore thought its landmark character should be strongly perceived throughout the waterfront. The Panel thought it was essential that the element extends above the height of the penthouse so that it is seen against the sky. Lowering it to the level of the

penthouse would reduce significantly its impact as an icon. With respect to the street-end views, the Panel thought the important principle to be maintained was the definition of Harbour Green. The Panel had no problem that the lower elements extended into the view corridor. With respect to the floorplate size, the Panel thought the proposal was the best solution, noting the alternative of widening the base up to the 8th floor level has some very undesirable consequences for the upland properties.

Mr. Kavanagh said he hoped the applicant would seek an amendment to the ODP with respect to the street-end views because it is important that this building connect appropriately with the adjacent buildings. He recommended an amendment to 1.3 and the deletion of 1.4. He also recommended deleting 1.5, stating that this building needs the extra element at the top. He also recommended amending 1.7 to be advice to the applicant rather than a condition. Regarding condition 1.2, Mr. Kavanagh asked the Board to weigh the merits of pedestrian amenity against safety and security.

Mr Gjernes expressed concern that, if Council does not approve a relaxation of the view corridor, the proposal will differ to the extent that it should come back to the Board. He recommended, however, that the Board might suggest to Council that it is unfortunate that this view corridor prevents the Board from approving what it believes to be most appropriate for this site. He concurred with Mr. Kavanagh's suggested amendment to 1.3, and agreed with deleting 1.4. With respect to 1.5, he said he thought the public art feature should be accommodated, and that 1.7 should not be a condition of the development permit.

With respect to the issue of street-end views, Mr. Roodenburg said the intent is not clearly defined in the ODP. He recommended there be a clear definition, with examples of other areas where the ODP has been adhered to. He agreed with the applicant's request to delete reference to centrally located benches in 1.3. With respect to 1.4, Mr. Roodenburg noted the 3.7% overage is very little and the applicant should be able to meet the guideline in this respect. Regarding 1.5, he questioned whether it would be possible to treat the mechanical penthouse in concert with an art feature so that they work together as a combined landmark. He added, it is very difficult to assess a height limitation on a piece of art.

Mr. Chung agreed with the previous speaker regarding conditions 1.1 and 1.3. Regarding 1.2, he thought the Board should take into account the security issue raised by the applicant. He recommended deletion of 1.4, and also agreed with Mr Roodenburg regarding 1.5 that a piece of art should not restrict the height.

Ms. Mingay agreed the tower top beacon should be higher to make it a distinctive element on this elegant building.

Ms. Parton commended the architect on a very attractive building. She agreed with the previous comments about the view corridor and with allowing the townhouses to remain as proposed. She added, it is unfortunate that maturing trees in the city are now obliterating view corridors that were established some years ago. With respect to 1.2, she agreed with the applicant's proposed three access points. She recommended deletion of 1.4. With respect to 1.5, she agreed there should be an attractive focus on top of this building and also recommended that the mechanical penthouse be treated in a complementary fashion. She recommended condition 1.7 be revised to be a recommendation only, to avoid delaying the project.

Concluding Comments from Staff

Mr. Kemble noted that, given a Text Amendment to allow encroachment into the street-end view corridor will take approximately 7 to 8 months to conclude, if the application has to come back to the Board for approval it will delay the project considerably. With respect to condition 1.7, there was some discussion as to whether a gated access to the park would require Park Board approval.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley said he considers this to be an excellent project, and a number of issues have been resolved since the preliminary stage that have resulted in a much better scheme. With respect to condition 1.1, he expressed serious concern about the Board taking a policy decision that should rest with Council. He suggested that, if the applicant is successful in pursuing a Text Amendment, a subsequent revision can be dealt with by the Director of Planning on behalf of the Board. However, for the Board to proceed with this application according to the zoning in place it is important that 1.1 remain. He suggested a minor amendment to 1.2. With respect to 1.5, he noted the applicant is in the process of converting the tower top to a public art piece. He therefore agreed with staff that, if it is not a public art piece it should be brought back to the height of the mechanical penthouse. However, if it is approved as a public art piece, it could perhaps go slightly higher. With respect to the floorplate (1.4), he felt the applicant made a very good argument for the overage, but only on the basis of the expectation that the additional mass would not affect views. He added, the elegant, slim tower form is better than a stepped form in this case.

Ms. Lo agreed this is a good project and supported Mr. Beasley's motion.

With respect to condition 1.1, Mr. Rudberg suggested that, as a reflection of today's discussion, the Board offer support for a Text Amendment to allow an intrusion into the view corridor in this case. In discussion, Mr. Scobie agreed it would be appropriate for staff to convey to Council the tenor of the Board and Panel's deliberations, if and when an application is made, but that it may not be appropriate for the Board to offer advice to Council on a policy matter. A motion from the Board in this respect may also hinder staff's analysis. Mr. Beasley concurred, noting a key variable for Council will be public commentary on views. While he agreed with some of the discussions about the architecture of this particular proposal, he noted that the established view corridors are in place as a result of public opinion. Mr. Rudberg concurred and withdrew his recommendation.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 403667, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 5, 1999, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1:

design development to the ~~massing setback~~ *setback* of the two storey townhouse and amenity pavilion elements along the north and south sides of the site, to *comply with* ~~further set back these encroachments from~~ the ODP and Guideline prescribed 5° street-end view corridor on Jervis Street;

Amend 1.2:

design development to the vehicular access from the Jervis Street right-of-way area, to reduce the number of vehicular crossing points from three to two, to improve the pedestrian amenity and use of this public open space area connecting to Harbour Green Park, *but with consideration of safety and security issues*;

Amend the Note to Applicant in 1.3 to delete "a centrally located bank of";

Delete 1.4;

Amend 1.5:

design development to the treatment of the tower top element to reduce its height to not exceed the top of the mechanical penthouse, *or to the currently requested height if an integral part of an approved public art installation (as confirmed by the Director of Planning) to in any case* provide a distinctive landmark feature having a reference to a lighted beacon, in consultation with Cultural Affairs staff and the City's Public Art Advisory Committee;

Amend 1.7:

consider, in consultation with Park Board staff, design development, if practical, to the proposed landscaping treatment adjacent to the townhouses on the north side of the site, to provide a secondary gated access connection between the private walkway and the existing public pedestrian route along the back side of the park.

Amend A.1.23:

provide additional play structures (e.g., spring toys) and resilient paving in the rooftop play patio area, to the satisfaction of the Social Planning Department;

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**4. 601 CANADA PLACE WAY - DE403959 - ZONE CWD (CD-1 PENDING)
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership

Request: To construct a new waterfront 41-storey hotel building with two levels of retail/ restaurant, meeting room and ballroom space.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Ralph Segal, briefly described the context, referring to the model and posted drawings. He then reviewed the prior-to conditions recommended by the Staff Committee, and tabled an amended condition 2.18 dealing with the connection of this application to development applications for other components of the trade and convention centre complex. In summary, the Staff Committee recommends approval of the application, subject to the conditions outlined in the report dated May 5 and 19, 1999. Mr. Segal noted that considerable detailed work remains to achieve the level of resolution necessary for a project of this size and stature.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. David Galpin, Greystone Properties Ltd., noted this is a very complex project. The process to date has been quite extended and fruitful and a good working relationship with staff has been established. Referring to the prior-to conditions, Mr. Galpin stated they are in concurrence with 1.1 to 1.5, and suggested adding 1.5.6, dealing with the parking count, and 1.6 regarding a comprehensive sign concept for the entire project. A number of amendments to conditions 2.1 to 2.15 were suggested and outlined in a memorandum that was distributed to the Board. Mr. Galpin explained the reasons for the requested amendments. Finally, on the standard notes and conditions, Mr. Galpin requested the date for compliance be extended to January 31, 2000, and sought clarification that reference to "the proposed development" in B.2.6 refers only to the subject development application.

Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning the applicant's request to delete the Note to Applicant in the revised condition 2.18, Mr. Graham Johnsen, the City's legal representative, noted this situation is almost unique where we have a request to issue development permits for integral parts of a project. This has only been done in the past on the basis that the land owner promises not to develop until all the pieces are put together. In this instance, it is only the Vancouver Port Authority which can effectively promise not to build on its own land, and the Note in condition 2.18 is intended to emphasize this understanding.

Mr. Bob McKay, Greystone Properties Ltd., stated this is a very complicated project, and the difficulty they have with the Note is that they have not yet discussed it with the Vancouver Port Authority. He acknowledged there needs to be a mechanism that is satisfactory to the City.

Mr. Rudberg raised a question concerning the applicant's proposed new condition 1.5.6 on parking. Mr. Galpin explained it is his understanding that the staff parking analysis differs from the analysis prepared by the traffic consultant. Mr. Noel Peters, City Surveyor, confirmed the numbers in the report are based on the staff review of the consultant's report. The proposal has since changed and will likely result in different numbers, but the parking requirements noted in condition A.2.4 are based on the application as submitted. In discussion, Mr. Rudberg suggested amending A.2.4 to provide opportunity for further discussion on the issue, but stressed he would be very reluctant to consider changes to staff's numbers unless a very convincing case can be put by the traffic consultant.

In response to a question from Ms. Lo concerning the intent of condition 2.12, Mr. Segal explained the ballroom roof is highly visible and staff are recommending its design be revisited by the applicant. Staff believe it would be a missed opportunity in this prominent waterfront location to consider something other than the flat roof treatment proposed. Pedestrian access is not being sought, nor is a vaulted space seen as the only alternative.

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

(Ms. Forbes-Roberts took over the Chair from Mr. Scobie who had to leave the meeting at this point in the proceedings)

Concluding Comments from Staff

Mr. Segal briefly reviewed staff's response to the applicant's requested amendments to the conditions. With respect to the request for some of the conditions to be "consideration" items, Mr. Segal said staff would not support this request, noting that staff will continue to be reasonable and accommodating in discussions with the applicant. With respect to condition 2.2, staff consider the area at the south end of the hotel to be public realm, requiring appropriate treatment. Staff's concern with respect to signage (2.4) is that visual termination of the public street end should not be privatized with commercial signage. Regarding 2.14, Mr. Segal said staff agree with the applicant that a temporary cantilevered structure would not be very attractive, rather the intent is to try and achieve a pedestrian route at grade level around the east side of the site, a possible solution being within the boundary of the hotel. In discussion, Mr. Segal acknowledged that such a pedestrian route would be temporary until phase two is constructed.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Hruda noted there were a several workshops with the Urban Design Panel and the applicant, focussing on a number of issues that changed over time, with positive results. The recommended prior-to conditions generally reflect the primary concerns of the Panel, with a few minor exceptions. With respect to the pedestrian environment, Mr. Hruda noted there was considerable discussion about the edge treatment, noting this hotel is one of the largest buildings in the city in terms of its footprint. There was also considerable focus on the north side of the building and how to make it a lot more friendly as the design developed. He suggested condition 2.2 be expanded in this respect. Regarding the northeast corner entrance area (condition 2.9), Mr. Hruda noted this is also another important point of movement in this project and there seems to be a serious pinch point at the corner at the plaza level. With respect to 2.7, there was a lot of discussion at the Panel about how to increase the bulk and volume of this building on a plaza of this scale. The third storey trellis element is visually quite fragile and the arcade expression should have extended across the western façade to give the hotel a much greater sense of presence on the plaza. Regarding the southeast corner of the podium (2.13), the concern of the Panel was that there be an important gesture made now, to something that will occur in the future, noting also it is also important now from a pedestrian point of view. The Panel's concern was in reinforcing the future link and to reflect its importance in the public realm at the street edge. The Panel was very disappointed at the lack of public access on the podium roof. Even if not for the entire space, it would have been worthwhile to have public access on a small portion overlooking the plaza. The Panel also stressed the importance of providing a very strong physical element in the centre of the porte cochere. Regarding the design of the hotel rooftop, the Panel recommended that greater emphasis be given to the design of the top element, to make it a distinctive feature.

Ms. Parton said she thought something more dramatic should be done with the ballroom roof, including some landscaping. She stressed the importance of pedestrian access in and around the site. She questioned whether there is enough parking being provided, given the large amount of retail space in the complex. She had no concern about the hotel sign. She stressed the importance of outdoor seating, as well as adequate provision for handicap access. Ms. Parton also questioned the long distance for commuters to get to the new seabus terminal. Otherwise, she said it is a wonderful project that will be a major asset to the city.

Ms. Mingay said this is a very complex project and she looked forward to seeing it proceed. Given it will be a very strong tourist draw, every opportunity should be taken to enliven the plaza and provide public seating. She thought the illustrated signage was quite attractive. She agreed every effort should be made to relocate the garage fresh air intake (condition 2.10), but did not believe further work needed to be done on the upper walls (2.11). She did not consider the temporary stairs were a problem, and she agreed with the applicant's request to delete the Note after 2.18.

Mr. Chung recommended retention of conditions 2.2, 2.4, 2.7, 2.8, amended to reflect all seasons other than winter, 2.10, and 2.12. He recommended deletion of 2.11. He supported the proposed parking, noting that Canada Place currently has a parking surplus.

Mr. Roodenburg said an all-encompassing signage program will be very important. He reviewed the major conditions and suggested a number of alterations. With respect to condition 2.2, he urged the applicant to work with staff to avoid misunderstanding regarding the use of the area in question. With respect to 2.6, he said the emphasis should be on the variety of display options and seating. He felt the treatment of the third level screen wall (condition 2.7) was a design issue that the architect should address. With respect to 2.12, Mr Roodenburg said he liked it as proposed. He agreed that attention should be given to the interface of this project and phase 2 (condition 2.13), and thought the stair was appropriate, even if it is permanent. He recommended deletion of 2.14.

With respect to 2.18, he did not believe the development of the parkade should be dependent upon completion of the whole project.

Board Discussion

Mr. Rudberg commented on the difficulty of trying to understand a very complex project in such a short time, as reflected by the mixed response from the Advisory Panel. He said it is a great project that everyone wants to be successful. He reviewed the conditions under 2.0 and recommended a number of amendments.

In discussion, Mr. Beasley said he did not support Mr. Rudberg's recommendation to delete 2.11 because it deals with articulating a very obviously blank wall. In discussion regarding the proposed amendment to 2.13, Mr. Rudberg confirmed it was his intention that the interface applies to the whole linkage, including the building and the forecourt.

Ms. Lo congratulated staff, noting it is a very complex project and one that is very important for the city. With respect to the conditions, she concurred with Mr. Beasley's recommendation to retain 2.11, given the high visibility of this wall from the water.

Mr. Beasley added, this approval represents a very good resolution of many of the issues. He expressed the hope that succeeding applications for the other parts of this project will be dealt with in a similar way. He recommended, however, that staff and the applicant fully discuss the wording of the conditions before the Board meeting, noting he believed many of the items could have been agreed upon earlier, so that the focus of the meeting could be more on the areas of disagreement. Nevertheless, he acknowledged the time constraints involved on this project and commended the applicant.

Motion

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

THAT the Board retain condition 2.11;

-CARRIED
(Mr. Rudberg opposed)

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 403959, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 5 & 19, 1999, with the following amendments:

Amend the Note to Applicant after 2.1:

The entire Canada Place Way frontage, including the hotel frontage, should be comprehensively designed in co-ordination with Planning, Engineering and Park Board to provide a high degree of public amenity. Particular attention should be paid to street trees to ensure adequate soil and irrigation for their healthy growth. The tree spacing and number illustrated in the CDA submission should be ~~pursued~~ *a target subject to structural and other limitations*;

Amend 2.2:

design development to grade level at the "prow" (south end) of the hotel to provide weather protection for pedestrian comfort from rain and wind (in response

to wind study), possible seating, trees and planting to create a mini plaza in this expanded sidewalk area;

Amend the Note to Applicant after 2.4:

This feature area should not contain major signage;

Amend the Note to Applicant after 2.6:

Opportunities for outdoor seating and display of goods should be ~~maximized~~ explored;

Amend the Note to Applicant after 2.8:

Improving comfort levels to meet “suitable for sitting” criteria other than in the winter ~~as well as summer~~ should be pursued wherever possible.

Amend 2.10:

design development to relocate, if at all possible, out of the public pedestrian area the garage fresh air intake proposed at the southwest corner of the podium (see also standard condition A.1.20);

Delete 2.12;

Amend 2.13:

design development ~~to the southeast corner of the podium~~ at the interface between this project and phase 2, illustrating how a prominent entry and public link can be achieved through the Phase 2 development in response to condition 3.1, Appendix C of the CDA approved by Council, December 10, 1998;

Note to Applicant: The orientation of this public link is envisioned to be on the alignment of the pier axis. ~~The open staircase at the southeast corner would appear to obstruct such an alignment (see also condition 2.14 below).~~

Amend 2.14:

consideration be given to develop a more ~~provision of an~~ attractive, direct public pedestrian route around the eastern side of the hotel linking Canada Place Way with the waterfront walkway;

Delete the Note to Applicant after 2.14;

Amend 2.18:

development applications DE404108 and DE404106, for the parkade and convention facilities, respectively, as well as the development applications to be submitted for the retail pavilion, plaza, and SeaBus terminal, must all be issuable prior to the issuance of this permit due to their inter-connected and inter-related nature (see Appendix D, p.2 of 23) or such other alternative arrangements to the satisfaction of the City Manager, the Director of Legal Services and the City Engineer to ensure the inter-related relationship of the various permits can be achieved;

Note to Applicant: Such alternative arrangements may include the execution by the fee simple owner of the lands of a covenant which would among other things

preclude any development on the lands that is to be, in accordance with the provisions of the Comprehensive Development Agreement, carried out in compliance with by-laws of the City which are applicable thereto, until all related development permits (as determined by the City Manager) are issued. The covenant would be drawn and registered in the Land Title Office to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services.

Amend A.2.4 (a):

a minimum of 260 parking spaces, or such other numbers as determined by the City Engineer in consultation with the traffic consultant for the 1041 hotel rooms, and an additional 18 parking spaces for commercial/service uses within the hotel development;

Amend B.1.2:

It should be noted that if conditions 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0 have not been complied with on or before ~~September 20, 1999~~ January 31, 2000, this Development Application shall be deemed to be refused, unless the date for compliance is first extended by the Director of Planning.

Amend B.2.6:

A Certificate of Compliance, from the B.C. Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks, is required prior to the issuance of any required occupancy permit or any use of occupancy of the area of this application ~~the proposed development~~ not requiring an occupancy permit.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7.45 pm

Carol Hubbard
Clerk to the Board

F.A. Scobie
Chair

/ch