

Meeting: No. 470
Date: Monday, November 1, 1999
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: No. 1 Committee Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F. A. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)
L. B. Beasley Co-Director of Planning
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager
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
D. Chung Representative of General Public
R. Mingay Representative of General Public

Absent

P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry
B. Parton Representative of General Public
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions
R. Roodenburg Representative of General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

R. Segal Development Planner
S. Hein Development Planner
M. Thomson Assistant City Surveyor
M. Pham Projects and Community Liaison, Engineering

Item 3 - ADDRESS: 2900 East Broadway - DE404308 - ZONE I-2 (I-3 Pending)

T. Bunting Bunting Coady Architects
K. Hanvey Bunting Coady Architect
A. Whitchelo Bentall Developments Ltd.

CLERK TO THE BOARD:

Louise Christie

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 October 4, 1999 be approved with two minor amendments. Mr. Scobie said that the final motion was moved by Mr. MacGregor, and that at the top of the final page the word 'achievability' should be replaced with 'livability', so the sentence finishes with "but the amount of space has an effect on livability". It was so moved by Mr. MacGregor and seconded by Mr. Rudberg.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. ADDRESS - 2900 East Broadway; DE404308 - ZONE I-2 (I-3 Pending)
(PRELIMINARY APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Bunting Coady Architects

Request: To develop this site and existing storage warehouse building to provide a complex for general offices for information technology with production and retail uses.

Development Planner's Opening Comments:

Development Planner, Scot Hein, presented this preliminary application intended to establish a working framework for future approvals for the eight buildings and related structures on this 18 acre site. Staff's evaluation has focussed on the following: site planning, general massing and height, movement systems, crime and safety performance, and urban design/architectural quality. He discussed the conditions which reflect staff's recommendations, outlining the need for design development to many aspects of this proposal, which is the first to be evaluated under the new I-3 Guidelines. Staff anticipate that Council should enact the I-3 zoning for this site by the end of November, and the approval of this proposal is dependent upon that. He placed the development in the policy context of the local area plan for the larger Grandview/Boundary Industrial area, which is scheduled for completion in the first half of the year 2000.

A previous rezoning on this site in November of 1996 from M-2, which provided for a height of 30.5 m (100 ft.), to I-2, established an outright height of 60 ft., relaxable to 100 ft. Council initiated a rezoning of this site to I-3 in July of this year which lists information technology offices as an outright use with FSR potential up to 3.0 and outright height up to 60 ft., relaxable to 100 ft. A number of public benefits were negotiated as part of the rezoning. This application provides for the retention of an existing warehouse structure, which will provide structural support for five 3-storey buildings (4 to 8) above. The application is also proposing three new buildings (1, 2, and 3) fronting on East Broadway of four, five and four storeys, respectively and a height relaxation of 9.7 ft. up to 19.2 ft. is sought from the Board for these buildings. The site slopes north to south by as much as 47 ft. Mr. Hein elaborated on the discrepancy in the notification letters mailed out and the posted site sign which used the applicant's height measurements taken from the north side of the buildings where height was measured to its lowest point.

The uses proposed are predominately for information technology and production, with ancillary retail such as cafes, and approximately 10,000 sq. ft. of retail use on the south/west corner, which is not an approvable use in the I-3

district schedule. However, staff anticipate an owner-initiated rezoning to add necessary retail uses for this corner. The typical floor plate of 30,000 to 35,000 sq. ft. is a market driven requirement. Approximately 5,000 to 6,000 employees over a seven year build-out program are anticipated. The existing structural grid organizes the buildings into a 'campus', linked by a weather protected circulation system, including entry forecourts, pedestrian bridges and covered walkways. The building entries are internalized within the site. The density is proposed at 1.43 FSR, noting that 3.0 is allowable. The covered walkway/ terraced component of overall FSR generates extra parking because it is not excluded. Staff noted the contradiction where Council's intent is to seek reduced parking near transit stations, while requiring weather protection systems for employees and pedestrians. Council has agreed to a parking standard of 2.5 cars per 1,000 sq. ft. and an amendment to the Parking By-law will be brought forward for enactment to add this site-specific requirement. This standard results in parking for over 2,600 cars with approximately 400 of those on the surface. The proposal does not contemplate a 'park-and-ride' use where parking would be a principle use (catering to the proposed SkyTrain station across the street). Also, Development Cost Levies (DCLs) will come into effect should building permitting not be secured by January 28, 2000. An application to change the East Broadway landscape setback to 25 ft. was withdrawn. Design conditions require the 40 ft. landscaped setback to be met above grade. Underground structures into this setback for parking garages is approvable under Section 3.2.4. "hardship clause" of the Zoning and Development By-law. This may impact significant trees.

Mr. Hein then went on to review the important conditions and the issues they are intended to address, including greater clarification of all proposed and intended uses; an additional 15 ft. setback to buildings 1, or 2, or 3 above grade; and better connected pedestrian links to transit with improved safety. He noted there are conflicts between pedestrians and possible loading zones on the southerly portion of the site where retail viability is important. He spoke to the extent and quality of the public open space, suggesting the road in the northwest corner be straightened. He also suggested an additional sentence to condition 1.9, Note to Applicant, requiring that the existing billboards be removed prior to occupancy of the open space. Mr. Scobie suggested that the timing be linked to the occupancy of the Phase I building. In conclusion, the plan generally meets Council's intention with rezoning, recognizing that large sites such as this one for the uses proposed are difficult to find.

Further discussion followed with Mr. Thomson of Engineering Services seeking several changes of wording in the conditions for clarification and co-ordination with precinct development. Mr. Beasley had the intention of condition 1.7 clarified, in that it is talking about additional openings and windows in the blank existing wall facades, specifically noting the Nootka Street frontage. Mr. Scobie asked what changes had been made since the scheme was before Council during the rezoning, other than an increase in height of one storey for buildings 1 and 3. Mr. Hein said the only other change was back to a willingness to comply with the 40 ft. landscape setback at grade. Mr. Gjernes received confirmation that the servicing agreement is being negotiated, with the City to do the work at the cost to the applicant, and the City would also remove the rail link across Hebb Avenue. Mr. Hein said the applicant was being asked to liaise with the retail consultant for SkyTrain Stations to better understand the viability of the southwest corner and what on-site recreational and amenity space is required given the scope of the projet. There are two main circulation routes and, following CPTED principles, staff would focus on travel through the site along the main north-south axis with possible changes to the east-west routes that dead-end. The northwest corner will require design development to straighten the road and enlarge the park space at the corner of East Broadway and Renfrew Street. It is approximately 148 ft. long and 200 ft. wide for about 0.6 of an acre. There will be challenges to find other opportunities to link necessary loading to the buildings to the north but there are possibilities involving the grid. Mr. Beasley expressed that the 'campus' would function like a university where the public can stroll around.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Bunting said this proposal was an exceptional opportunity to fulfill the desire of the new I-3 zoning as proposed by Council. A key element is retaining 500,000 sq. ft. of a warehouse that will be used as a parking garage and production space. This pre-existing structure established the planning grid, with restraints for loading

for which solutions have been developed. There is workable slope off Nootka Street for truck access to go underground for building number 3. The phasing sequence is from north to south and east to west which allows for a reduction in parking as the development moves forward. Parking is not salable and the intention is to change it into production space. They are not proposing a park-and-ride operation. Mr. Bunting confirmed that the buildings will be setback 40 ft. or more but underground parking structures may intrude 15 ft. into the setback. There is enough of a slope that trees can be accommodated in this area, except for perhaps near Nootka Street. The internal green courts will be a place to plant any large retainable trees and the view from across the street will see tree tops and the building as the below-grade parking will be out of sight. The project is physically inwardly entered through the front doors, but it is outwardly looking with eyes-on-the-street, as office areas look out over Broadway. There are no 'back' doors proposed for access to/from Broadway. On a campus, a great deal of the circulation is interior by means of interconnected plazas and stairways which bring people into the site. The Broadway corner at Renfrew Street has a major public space of approximately 0.6 of an acre, noting that the existing line of the warehouse determines the westerly edge of the 148 ft. setback. The landscape design will ensure pedestrian oriented routes through the openings off of Broadway between buildings 1 and 2, and 2 and 3, by utilizing signalling and signage. When the Renfrew SkyTrain station is in operation, pedestrians will use the internal corridor as a north-south route through the complex. Private security and policing of the parks and public access routes will be provided on an around-the-clock basis. There is no proposed public right-of-way but for the north-south circulation route. Tree retention and landscaping is being done in consultation with City staff and following CPTED principles. Along Broadway, there will be considerable new plantings. Rezoning will be sought for commercial/retail to get the most value out of the amenity space in the southwest corner.

Mr. Whitchelo then explained the approvals process for this application which has been to Standing and Environment Committee Meetings in July of last year and February of this year. Rezoning required a Public Hearing convened on April 13, 1999, followed by three more reconvened Hearings, and there was also a Public Hearing for the 25 ft. setback in September. The design of buildings 1, 2 and 3 goes well beyond what would usually be presented at rezoning. His request to the Board was to allow approval of complete development permits for the first three buildings through the Director of Planning, rather than returning to the Board. Mr. Segal clarified that returning to the Board would add an additional three to five weeks to the normal Director of Planning processing time. Mr. Whitchelo said there is an urgency due to the market demand with building 3 requiring start up in the spring.

Discussion:

Mr. Rudberg asked Messrs. Bunting and Whitchelo if they were seeking any amendments to the conditions recommended by the Staff Committee and the response was negative. Mr. MacGregor questioned what East Broadway would look like with additional entries as there are currently no entries from that street and Mr. Segal clarified that they are being requested by staff in condition 1.3, Note to Applicant. The applicant's intent is to transform the site into a business or urban park with the majority of entrances internalized. The applicant felt funnelling people into two main access routes was safer and more pedestrian friendly than would be doorways onto Broadway. Mr. MacGregor felt this type of complex needs flexibility for the tenants who may want staff access directly off Broadway, especially in seasons of inclement weather. Mr. Scobie questioned the future of the site from the point of view of ownership and, if subdividing the property was contemplated, there could be difficulties with road dedications and various easements. Mr. Whitchelo indicated that the owners would be advised of Mr. Scobie's concerns. The owner is a pension fund and, at this point in time, there is no desire to sell, subdivide, or stratify the property. Mr. MacGregor was concerned that, in the future, the walkways which are not very spacious and awkwardly linked could technically be closed off to preclude public access. Mr. Bunting advised that the elevator kiosks are purposefully on the outside of the buildings in the hub by the cafeteria and amenity space, with direct access to the plaza, integrated by a 20 ft. wide walkway. He acknowledged that the southwest corner does need major design development, in particular to link to the future Rupert Street SkyTrain station. Mr. Scobie questioned the publicness and safety/security of recreational space, particularly in reference to a plaza raised 20 ft.

above the grade. Mr. Bunting advised that a basketball/roller-hockey court, with barbecue facilities is proposed for use of the tenants, who work in shifts around the clock.

The Board and Panel took time to review the model and drawings before speakers were invited from the public.

Comments from Other Speakers:

Mr. Louie lives on East Broadway in the 3000 block. In his opinion, buildings 1, 2 and 3 are too high. It was determined that any building above three storeys would eliminate the view. He was assured the required 40 ft. setback off Broadway would be met above grade. Mr. Scobie clarified that Council has approved the zoning which allows a building height of 60 ft. "as of right". The Board's jurisdiction in terms of height is only whether to permit increases beyond 60 ft., up to a maximum of 100 ft. This is the same as has existed under the I-2 zoning and, as Mr. Hein outlined in his presentation, the M-2 zoning that existed for many decades prior allowed a building height of 100 ft. "as of right". As for the 40 ft. landscape setback, Mr. Scobie advised that the applicant has agreed to set the buildings back 40 ft. from Broadway but seeks to extend his underground parking 15 ft. into this area, with landscaping above.

Mr. Joe Radonic, representing parents who live in a house on Broadway, suggested a three storey building height maximum as the amount of visible sky is important. He mentioned that a pension fund owns the property and, although they have no intention of selling now, pension funds are constantly buying and selling assets.

Mr. Papillo was concerned about the height, particularly at the corner of Nootka Street and East Broadway, where he has lived for many years. Mr. Scobie again explained that the site had been zoned M-2 industrial which allowed heights of 100 ft. for over 40 years. The I-3 zoning will allow 60 ft. as of right, with increases possible to 100 ft., being the same as the I-2 zoning in place for the last few years. There was discussion of the floor-to-floor height being 12 ft. to accommodate four feet of interstitial space for ducts and lighting which is the reason the five storeys are 60 ft. high.

Mr. Leal lives at 3103 East Broadway. He pointed out that, because of the grade, building 1 will be higher than building 2 and he suggested the option of lowering the buildings and adding the density toward the southern portion of the site. Mr. Segal explained the structural constraints of building on top of the existing warehouse, and that retaining the structure is a positive environmental response. Mr. Leal was concerned that eventually 5,000 to 6,000 employees will be working on the site, on shifts around the clock. He perceives problems with more traffic and other impacts. He thought his residential property would be devalued.

Mr. Oreste has lived at 3033 East Broadway since 1964 and is concerned about the height blocking the sun in the winter months. It was explained that the total distance separating the houses from the buildings is the 40 ft. setback, plus Broadway at 100 ft. width, plus the 20 ft. residential setback, so the winter sun would not be blocked from reaching the dwelling on the north side of Broadway. He suggested the buildings be stepped back, like the BC Tel Building on Kingsway in Burnaby. He has also witnessed three fatal pedestrian accidents as people tried to cross the busy arterial of Broadway. Steps should be taken to protect them but he thought the signalized crossing at East Broadway and Nootka Street will back traffic up to Willingdon. Mr. Rudberg advised that a signal at Nootka will be installed as part of the rezoning process.

Mr. Dorofay, of the 2900 Block East Broadway, could live with the loss of view but was concerned that East Broadway is becoming a canyon, not just for the residents but also for everyone driving. He asked about the proposed landscaping quality, as residents with their gardens create a view for the workers, so a view should be created for the residents. He reinforced the need for a signalized crossing of East Broadway and noted that there is often radar there because of the speed of the traffic.

Mr. Miho Radonic of 3037 East Broadway understood Council had approved the height but suggested that, if the

buildings were only three storeys high or designed like the BC Tel building, the residents would not lose so much sunshine.

Mr. Greg Reid has relatives who live in the area. He reiterated the concerns expressed previously by the area residents. A relaxation is based on hardship and the applicant is imposing their own hardship because they are retaining the existing structure. They could be more creative and innovative. He went on to say he was strongly opposed to the Director of Planning being the sole approval of any complete development application as any significant change needs to be discussed in a future public forum. In the 300 or so mailed notifications of this preliminary application, the heights were misleading. Referring to the Development Permit Staff Committee Report, he suggested the view and shadow impact studies prepared by the applicant were erroneous. The photos on the applicant's view analysis were also incorrectly assessed as they were taken on a sloping street with the actual location being a block away from that referenced on the map. The shade analysis is done on March and September 21st, and not in December when the sun is at its lowest and he mentioned that many social and physiological disorders can be associated with lack of sun. There should be further development of the southern portion of the site rather than adjacent Broadway. He thought the plan was wrongly conceived. As for approval of the I-3 enactment on Nov. 30, it may not happen as a quorum of Councillors must be present. He had spoken at the Public Hearing, and questioned if there was a public benefit for allowing them to build underground parking into the 40 ft. setback. This will entail the removal of a lot of dirt. The approval process of this 18 acre site has not adequately consulted the community. Mr. Scobie then asked Mr. Bunting and Mr. Hein, both registered architects, if they had confidence in the accuracy of the professional shadow analysis submitted. Their response was affirmative.

Lena Reid began by asking if any of the Board or staff lived in the neighbourhood. She spoke about the view analysis and suggested that the photos for the views that are indicated as taken at 8th Avenue are actually taken one block further back at 7th Avenue. Her concern was that this erroneous information may form a basis for the allowing the height relaxation, whereas more people will be impacted by the height of the buildings than what the view analysis suggests. She went on to say the warehouse structure they are retaining is going to require partial demolition in any case, especially to get the walkways through and the notification letters caused some misunderstanding as to the way the building heights are measured on sloping ground. It was explained that the by-laws specifies how height is measured. Mrs. Reid has spent many hours sourcing information. The policy reports from February indicated that local area changes would not be considered until final zoning was in place. Council instructed that a Director of Planning initiated rezoning be pursued but she understood from speaking with Councillors, that it was Council's understanding that the public would have input. Mrs. Reid wanted the application to go back before Council to discuss the public benefits and the impact of the two SkyTrain stations, along with this extensive development, on the neighbourhood.

Panel Opinion:

Mr. Hruđa said the Urban Design Panel was supportive, voting four to one in favour, in spite of serious design concerns. The main concern was with the inadequacy of proposed open space at 0.6 of an acre for both the public and the number of employees on this site. Its location at a very busy traffic corner was not desirable. The site should have seven buildings instead of eight [i.e., removing the centre building (#5) to create a meaningful interior plaza], without reducing density. Condition 1.10 should be reworded. Public movement through the site in light of the future SkyTrain links needs some major reworking. The density along Broadway versus the southern portion of the site was questioned. The grid is urban but the development still has a suburban feel as a visitor will be constantly exposed to cars. To clarify pedestrian paths, the most direct route would be a diagonal from southwest to northeast, which could be achieved by redesign. The connection to Hebb Avenue ought to be stronger and there could be a gradual stepping for a better transition. Along Renfrew Street, the narrow sidewalk overlooks a depressed parking lot. Finally, to address the views issue, Nootka Street's north-south alignment could be extended through the site by shifting the development over to the west. Mr. Hruđa suggested changes to condition 1.10 and 1.6 to address the issues of site planning, and added that the views along Nootka to the north should be extended. Condition 1.7 should also refer to the whole site and include the visual quality. He said it was unclear if sustainability addressed in condition 8 to increase the 'green' aspect was just from the Engineering

Services perspective or was it to include the livability of the site for the workers. Condition 1.10 should read 'design development to increase open space', period.

Mr. Gjernes reminded the public that, as a member of the Development Permit Board Advisory Panel, he represents the development industry. The project has to be economically viable to be able to compete with surrounding areas like Richmond and Burnaby. To bring industry compatible with the urban surroundings and to create jobs here, there may have to be compromise with urban design. Height is not a problem due to the setbacks off of Broadway, which is very wide itself, and the buildings should not have entries there as the activity should be kept internal. Encroaching below grade into the setback is not a problem. He appreciated the citizen's concerns and requested that the application come back to the Development Permit Board, accompanied by accurate information.

Mr. Chung, the youth representative on the Advisory Panel, thought this project would benefit the community, as the site is now almost abandoned. The current proposal has too much emphasis on the car. There are public benefits of the park and the crossing signal light. The height is satisfactory but future applicants should ensure they are precise in their shadow and view analyses. Retail should be encouraged. He suggested it come back to the Board, and commended the designers on architectural quality.

Ms. Mingay left the meeting just prior to Advisory Panel members being asked for their comments. She did, however, provide written comments before leaving. As read by Mr. Scobie, she sympathized with the neighbourhood but found the heights acceptable. This site is a rare chance to provide the City with this much needed type of development. The relationship with East Broadway should be maximized in terms of beautification. The design was good quality and, given the lengthy process, the Director of Planning should be able to deal with the complete development application for buildings 1, 2 and 3.

Discussion:

Mr. Rudberg found the design and heights supportable and moved approval in principle. Areas of concern that need to be reworked are substantial but have been well addressed in the Staff Committee Report. When the application comes back there should be a substantial redesign of the southwest open space, linking through to Hebb Avenue as covered in condition 1.9. The areas along Renfrew Street, in relation to the parking lot particularly, needs reworking of the edge treatment, with a more substantial setback or screening, as requested in condition 1.7. The development is reasonably consistent with Council's intention for the area. However, given the kind of issues that arose with regard to the view analysis, he thought it should come back to the Board, as a complete application for buildings 1, 2 and 3. Mr. Scobie then reviewed the specific wording of the I-3 District Schedule and draft I-3 Guidelines in terms of the considerations the Board must give in considering building height increases above 60 ft., with specific references to setback areas and the effect of height, bulk and siting on views, daylight access and visual privacy.

Mr. Beasley wanted to second Mr. Rudberg's motion, after speaking to it, but first put forward three amendments. He moved a new condition 1.12 calling for further design exploration of buildings 4 through 8; an amendment to condition 1.3 so the effect will further consideration of the pedestrian permeability of the site from the west, and also amended condition 1.10, as suggested by the Design Panel. Condition 1.12 was put forward as an opportunity for exploration and not necessarily as a condition that must be met. There is a benefit to be served for the whole City by virtue of the reuse of an existing, older building. Mr. Beasley thought that Council should revisit policies requiring a 24 ft. setback on Renfrew Street, as discussed in the Hastings-Sunrise plan, in light of this new kind of development. He reiterated that this is a preliminary application and Council should be enacting the By-law to rezone this site to I-3 in November.

Mr. MacGregor asked about changes to 1.5 and 1.11 and the concern of linkages through the site. The north-south right-of-way is an internal road system, to ensure access for fire trucks, etc. but pedestrian rights-of-way need to be

established, including disabled access, so there is not the risk of closing off in the future. Mr. Rudberg would have staff identify the access routes which should come back secured through legal agreements. The Board clarified that buildings 1, 2 and 3 do not go back to the Urban Design Panel. **Motion:**

It was moved by moved by **Mr. Rudberg** and seconded by **Mr. Beasley**:

THAT the Board APPROVE (IN PRINCIPLE) Development Application No. DE404308 as submitted, the plans and information forming a part thereof, thereby permitting the development of this site for a comprehensive high technology office use complex consisting of three new buildings along East Broadway (Phase 1), five three-storey additions on top of the existing warehouse building, and alterations and use of the existing building for parking uses, subject to the following conditions and enactment of the I-3 Zoning by Council:

Amend condition 1.3 and Note to Applicant:

- 1.3 design development to improve the directness and safety of on-site pedestrian circulation systems by better announcing important site and building entries;

Note to Applicant: Provision of a more clearly identifiable, pedestrian-oriented entry to buildings 1, 2 and 3 fronting East Broadway is recommended. A more significant southern terminus of this axis, that increases casual surveillance, is recommended. The relationship of building 7 to the southwest corner of the site and the Renfrew Street SkyTrain Station could facilitate direct, and perhaps diagonal, pedestrian movement.

Amend and add to condition 1.5:

- 1.5 design development to create a safe pedestrian route between the proposed Renfrew Street SkyTrain Station and the neighbourhood to the north through *the site and along the adjacent street*.

Amend and add to condition 1.7:

- 1.7 design development to refine all site edge conditions *and internal streets edge conditions* to ensure visual quality and pedestrian interest/safety, and appropriate screening of parking/service areas;

Add the word 'storm' to condition 1.8:

- 1.8 design development to increase the extent of permeable surfaces and green aspects of the development, especially through the central area, and to incorporate site run-off requirements into the proposed *storm* water system, where possible;

Add and amend Note to Applicant , condition 1.9:

Note to Applicant: Vehicular/loading access through the southwest corner of the site should be minimized by providing a minimum *drive aisle width* and greater pedestrian emphasis. *Existing billboard or free standing signage shall be eliminated from these areas prior to park occupancy. (See also 1.11).*

Amend condition 1.10:

- 1.10 design development to increase the extent of open space.

Amend and add to condition 1.11 and Note to Applicant:

1.11 arrangements to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, Director of Legal Services and General Manager of Engineering Services, for the execution and registration of the right-of-way agreements for the proposed open spaces located at the northwest and southwest corners of the site, as well as the internal east-west access road, associated U-shaped loop road , *and the north-south pedestrian access.*

Note to Applicant: The northwest corner open space is to be completed *by the earlier of the completion of Building 1 and/or December 31, 2005.* The southwest corner open space is to be completed *by the earlier of completion of the Renfrew SkyTrain Station and/or December 31, 2005.*

Add a new condition 1.12:

1.12 Further design exploration of buildings 4 through 8 to replace building 5 with new buildings along Renfrew street and creation of an internal square in place of building 5.

Further changes to the DPSC Report of October 6, 1999 as presented by Mr. Thomson:

Delete third paragraph on page 12 and replace with the following:

Approval of the project must be linked to securing off-site infrastructure improvements to serve the overall site, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. At each development permit application, the City Engineer will determine which improvements (see conditions A.2.13 and A.2.18) are required for that specific phase of development. These infrastructure improvements will be designed and built by the City, with security/payment for their construction being delivered by the Applicant to the City prior to issuance of the relevant building permit.

Standard Condition A.1.5 - Amend condition and add to Note to Applicant:

A.1.5 delete portions of parking and loading spaces encroaching on the right-of-way along the south property line;

Note to Applicant: Once Hebb Avenue is widened, no manoeuvring, parking, loading or any other uses will be allowed in the nine ft. wide statutory right-of-way parallel to Hebb Avenue. *A plan is to be submitted showing how the proposed uses in the City's nine feet statutory right-of-way will be accommodated and/or relocated once Hebb Avenue is widened.*

Engineering Condition A.2.13 - Delete Note to Applicant:

Add Engineering Condition A.2.18 (v);

(v) registration of a servicing agreement to obligate the construction of off-site works, generally as described above.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Clerk to the Board
SH/RS/lc

Chair