

Date: Monday, May 16, 2011
Time: N/A
Place: N/A

PRESENT:

50 PACIFIC BOULEVARD - DE409317 - ZONE BCPED

Minutes
Motion

Board

K. Munroe Assistant Director - Current Planning Division (Chair)
B. Toderian Director of Planning
D. McLellan General Manager of Community Services Group
P. Judd General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

S. Romses Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel) [Alberni Street]
F. Rafii Representative of the Design Professions
M. Pez Representative of the Development Industry
J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry
P. Sanderson Representative of the General Public

Regrets

K. Maust Representative of the Design Professions
M. Biazi Representative of the General Public
S. Bozorgzadeh Representative of the General Public
C. Chung Representative of the General Public
J. Miletic-Prelovac Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

City Staff:

J. Greer Processing Centre - Manager
R. The Engineering Services - Projects Branch
G. Papers Development Planner
S. Barker Project Facilitator

50 PACIFIC BOULEVARD - DE409317 - BCPED

W. Francl Walter Francl Architects
P. Webb Concord Pacific Group Inc.
M. Ewan Concord Pacific Group Inc.

CLERK TO THE BOARD: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Judd seconded by Mr. Toderian and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on May 2, 2011 with some minor typographical revisions.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 50 PACIFIC BOULEVARD - DE409317 - ZONE BCPED
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Walter Francl Architects

Request: To extend the time limited Development Permit DE409317 for a further period of three (3) years thereby permitting three temporary Presentation Centre buildings on this site with associated surface parking.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Garry Papers, Development Planner, introduced the application noting the history of the site. In July 2005 the Development Permit Board approved the original temporary use permit for a period of three years. The use as a sales marketing centre was confirmed as an interim use. Subsequently there was an amendment to allow a third building on the site. The buildings were used for marketing purposes for other Concord sites in False Creek and had been moved twice before being moved to the present location. It was intentional to place it in a location that was not going to be developed for some time.

Mr. Papers described the context for the area noting that the presentation centre fronts the seawall as well as the Carrall Street Greenway. The timing of the park is complicated in that there will be contaminated soil that is capped with top soil and then a surface use agreement will be granted to the Park's Board. The contaminated soil is to come from the 6C Parcel so that the park can't be implemented until that site is developed and the contaminated soil is moved to the area designated for the park. Mr. Papers noted that the context around the site has changed in the last six years. There has been a lot more activity along the seawall due the amount of development in the area.

Mr. Papers reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated April 26, 2011. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarifications were provided by Mr. Papers:

- The current bike path is between 15 and 16 feet wide and between 12 and 16 feet around to Science World.
- The final plans for the park have still not been set.
- The existing drive way could accommodate painted strips to separate pedestrians and cyclists.
- Any improvements would be temporary until the park is completed but would improve the current conditions.
- The existing fence was a requirement of the original permit. The area in front of the presentation centre could be improved by moving the fence back into the buildings.
- Concord has security on site 24-7.
- There are 63 parking spaces on the site.

- The initial drawings for the park show the possibility of a beach area where boats can be pulled up onto the shore, however, there is an existing barrier wall that will store all the contaminated soil.
- The False Creek ODP calls for a direct connection along the seawall.
- Concord owns the property that the presentation centre sits on.
- The province will own the land once the contaminated soil is placed there and will enter into a surface use lease with the Board of Parks and Recreation.

Applicant's Comments

Walter Francl, Architect, described some of the history of the site and noted that there have been ongoing temporary uses that occur on the site including the Cirque du Soleil's performances. He added that there are conditions that were part of the original permit including a site management plan. Mr. Francl noted that some of the fence on the south side of the site was put up as part of the Olympic security measures and could come down now. He also noted that there is 24 hours security on the site and there are relatively few incidents on the site. There could also be some improvements regarding lighting and signage along the seawall. Mr. Francl wanted the Board to entertain improvements that are sustainable and cost effective.

Peter Webb, Concord Pacific Group Inc., noted that in the last twenty years the presentation centre had moved three times. He said they spend a good deal of staff time educating tourists that come into the presentation centre from the seawall using their context model. He added that the context model was used in the City's pavilion at the Shanghai World Expo. Mr. Webb said he supported removing some of the fencing but was concerned that removing all of it might cause some security issues. He supported removing the fence in front of the presentation centre which was put up for the Olympics and he felt that the management plan could take care of any issues that were a consequence of more access to the site. Mr. Webb said he supported any improvements to the south east corner of their property including some additional seating along the seawall. Mr. Webb noted that they are obligated to put some trees back and have an agreement with the City to replace 13 trees. He added that considering Pacific Boulevard will have a streetcar in the future, any improvements there would not be permanent.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- Although the parking lot is not full all of the time it is often full. The applicant suggested that they could report through the Management Plan how often the parking lot is full.
- The presentation centre and parking lot is only used for Concord marketing functions. There are not any third party functions taking place on the site.
- As part of their corporate presence, Concord does provide information on their other projects at the presentation centre.
- Once the projects have been completed on their sites, the presentation centre will be removed for the park to be completed.
- Concord is committed to solving any problems regarding security when the fence is removed.
- Concord would support enhancements within their property but don't support adding additional trees and buffers.

Comments from other Speakers

Gary Jackson lives across the street and is the Director of the False Creek Resident's Association. He expressed his concerns as they have waited 21 years for the delivery of the park. He asked the Board to consider asking Concord for a date for when the park must be completed.

Patsy McMillan is also involved with the False Creek Resident's Association. She said she was in support of the Staff Committee Report and would like to see pedestrian and cyclists separated on the seawall. She said she would like to see commercial activities removed from the site as well and would like the remainder of the land not being used to be greened. Ms. McMillan noted that the fence has been a deterrent for motorcycle racing and was concerned if the fence should be removed if Concord would ensure that this would not continue to be a problem. She said she would also like to see the bollards that sit inside the fence be removed and wanted the Board to reduce the extension to two years instead of the three years being proposed.

John Murray is a member of the False Creek Resident's Association noted that the presentation building was on the site for two years before the fence went up. He said he would like to see more greening of the site instead of fencing but was against the perimeter fence coming down. He said he would welcome additional trees on the site and would like to see some delineation between the pedestrians and the cyclists on the seawall.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- There has been a problem for a long time with motorcycle racing but by the time the police arrive they are gone.
- There are security patrols on the property on a regular basis.
- Imperial parking manages the rest of the site and also has security people.
- Widening the path on the seawall would mean adding lighting that would be torn out when the park is developed.
- Staff are prepared to entertain a solution with the applicant regarding separating pedestrians and cyclists on the seawall.
- It is not reasonable to add trees on the site as they will be torn out when the park is developed.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Romses stated that in speaking for the Urban Design Panel they would be concerned with the urban design and public realm issues of the project. He said they appreciated the applicant's level of interest when the first application came to the City and improvements that have been made to the site. Mr. Romses said he thought it might be asking too much of the applicant to ask them to further landscape the site considering they would be temporary and would be lost once the park was developed. Mr. Romses thought that for safety issues on the seawall a dividing line for pedestrians and cyclists could be painted on the seawall. Mr. Romses supported removing the fence but thought it was discouraging that the fence might be needed in light of the public's comments. He said he thought the Management Plan could solve any security or noise issues.

Mr. Rafii thought it was pointless to spend money on the site for anything that would be removed later when the park is developed. He agreed that there needed to be separation between the pedestrians and cyclists but did not think the seawall needed to be widened. Mr. Rafii said he thought Condition 1.3 was excessive and was not an effective use of the applicant's money.

Mr. Stovell noted that given the complexity of the public process and the current real estate market conditions, extending the sales centre should be welcomed. He said he agreed with conditions the applicant was contesting and thought it was unfortunate that removing the fence could cause problems for the neighbours.

Mr. Sanderson thought some improvements were necessary to improve the overlook for the neighbours and for safety on the seawall, but thought that making improvements that would be removed once the park was developed was not practical. He thought there needed to be some serious considerations given to the Management Plan that would resolve any noise or security issues. He was not sure if all of the fence should be removed but thought it would improve the site to have some of it removed. Mr. Sanderson was concerned that the applicant might extend beyond the three years and thought the Board should consider asking the applicant to find another location or have the remainder of the sites developed and the park finished.

Mr. Pez thought there was a middle ground that could be found that would include upgrades to the public edges and a way to deal with safety and security. He said he was sympathetic to the neighbours having to look down onto the site but supported the sales program to complete the sale of the development. Although Mr. Pez supported keeping the fence around the larger area as it served a purpose, he thought it could be pulled back to the presentation centre.

Board Discussion

Mr. McLellan made a motion to approve the Staff Committee Report with amendments. He said he appreciated the point that the public made regarding the security on the site. He thought the fence was not the most attractive solution but noted that it has been an effective deterrent to nuisance in the neighbourhood. However, the edge along the building could be improved along the seawall by removing the fencing that was put in during the Olympics and by adding a little more landscaping. He added that the area will go through some change in the near future but was optimistic that this part of the city could be completed. He felt the conditions would be a good interim solution especially since the permit is only for three years.

Mr. Toderian said he agreed that given the high publicness of the site staff perhaps had too high expectations for improving the site but wanted to keep in mind that they did not create cost requirements that are throw-away costs. He thought that with the amendments to the Staff Committee Report there was a balance between edge conditions that need to be improved but are not expensive. He said he did not think the site management plan was critical to the functioning of the site. He said he was accepting the concerns from the public regarding the fence and would like to find creative ways so the fence would not be needed. He added that it was a significant disappointment that the fence was needed when it should be addressed in some other way as it was creating harm to the public realm.

Mr. Toderian thanked the members of the public for attending noting that the City would like to be able to deliver the park within the next three year time frame but felt there might be a need for a further extension. He noted that there is a large amount of work that still needs to be done from design to development of the park. Mr. Toderian also noted that Staff has a

clear understanding that the requirement for the nine acre park does not kick in until the excavation and moving of soil from the adjacent site. He added that Concord has been keeping to the agreement with the City and the Province in terms of the timing of construction. He agreed that everyone would like to see the park developed as soon as possible.

Mr. Judd said he supported the simplification of the requirements. He added that there seemed to be a wish list that got included in the Staff Committee Report and probably should not have been added. However, he did see that there was enough room on the seawall to create a division between cyclists and pedestrians. Mr. Judd was in support of the motion and the amendments.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. McLellan and seconded by Mr. Toderian, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE409317, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated April 26, 2010, with the following amendments:

To amend Condition 1.0 as follows:

1.0 Revised drawings and information shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and the General Manager of Engineering Services, clearly indicating:

1. Enhancements to the Public Water Edge and Seaside Greenway along the south edge of Parcel 9 as follows:
 - a) addition of seating and/or other water side rest places particularly at the Carrall Street Greenway terminus;
 - b) removal of the existing chain link fence along the Seaside Greenway at the existing Presentation Centre;
 - c) realignment of the fencing at the southeast corner to improve pedestrian and cyclists safety at that junction of pathways;
 - d) consideration of an extended curb and paint markings to separate pedestrian and wheel traffic on the seawall;
 - e) undertake similar improvements to the delineate cyclist's movement in the Carrall Street Greenway on the west side of the site.
- 1.2 provision of a Site Management Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning;

Note to Applicant: This plan shall reflect the current state of operations on the site, as well as any revisions anticipated as a result of required site enhancements. The plan shall include at minimum the following topics: site security, hours of operations, community contact, and specific descriptions of all current and anticipated uses in the Presentation Centre buildings (including daily functions and special events). A key issue for consideration in the creation of the Site Management Plan shall be the potential to fully remove the perimeter fence. If the Management Plan concludes this can be accomplished, it shall be removed by Concord.

The Board agreed that the removal of the perimeter fence be approved by the Development Permit Board.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:31 PM