

Date: Monday, November 20, 2006
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)
B. Toderian Director of Planning
J. Forbes-Roberts General Manager Community Services
T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

W. Francl Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
R. Acton Representative of the Design Professions
N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry
M. Braun Representative of the General Public
D. Chung Representative of the General Public
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public
J. Burton Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

Regrets

J. Scott Representative of the Development Industry
K. Hung Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

D. Morgan Development Planner
J. Greer Project Facilitator
R. Segal Senior Development Planner
M. Thomson City Surveyor

#309 and #703-1238 Seymour Street - DE410656 & DE410682 - Zone DD
None.

4575 Clancy Loranger Way - Hillcrest Park - DE410676 - Zone CD-1

S. Rothnie Hughes Condon Marler Architects
R. Roelofsen City of Vancouver, Parks & Recreation
J. Waugh Vancouver Olympic Committee (VANOC)

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of May 23, 2006 be approved with the following amendments:

Amend, p. 1, *Tuesday*, May 23, 2006

It was moved by Mr. Timm, seconded by Ms. Forbes-Roberts and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of June 5, 2006 be approved with the following amendments:

Amend p. 7, Motion to read: THAT the Board SUPPORT Development *Submission* No. 410358, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 24, 2006, with the following amendments:

Amend p. 10, Motion to read: THAT the Board SUPPORT Development *Submission* No. 410274, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 24, 2006, with the following amendments:

Amend p. 13, Motion to read: THAT the Board SUPPORT Development *Submission* No. 410273, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 24, 2006, with the following amendments:

Amend the spelling of C. *Nystedt*.

It was moved by Mr. Timm, seconded by Ms. Forbes-Roberts and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of October 10, 2006 be approved with the following amendments:

Amend p. 14, Motion to read: THAT the Board NOT SUPPORT Development *Submission* No. DE410683, as described in the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated September 27, 2006.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Mr. Scobie noted a letter received from Beryl Wilson regarding the September 25, 2006 Development Permit Board meeting and the application for 11 West 10th Avenue (DE410943).

3. 1238 SEYMOUR STREET - DE 410656 & DE410682 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE)

Applicant: D. McKewan, C. Kientz & E. Fricke

Request: Interior alterations to construct a 157.0 sq. ft. addition to the existing mezzanine in Suite #704, and 210.0 sq. ft. addition to the existing mezzanine in Suite #319 of the existing Multiple Dwelling/ Residential Unit with Artist Studio - Class A building on this site, thereby requesting an increase in the Floor Space Ratio using a Heritage Density Transfer.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mr. Scobie presented the applications for Suite 319 and Suite 704 being complete applications in the Downtown District for heritage density transfers to suites in the building. The purchase of the heritage density will be 157 square feet from 52 Water Street and 210 square feet from 522 Beatty Street. Mr. Scobie reminded the Board that at the August 14th Board meeting dealing with a similar application for this site said he would request a status report of residual capacity before the 10 percent maximum was exhausted. He received an update from the District Building Inspector on the number of units with outstanding alterations that are expected to come forward in the future. There will be sufficient residual floor space ratio left without having to exceed the 10 percent maximum permitted and therefore it is unlikely that those applications will first have to seek rezoning approval for an increase in FSR.

Questions/Discussion

None.

Applicant's Comments

None.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

There were no comments from Advisory Panel members. Members confirmed that their absence of commentary would be interpreted as support for the applications.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Timm and seconded by Mr. Toderian, and was the decision of the Board with the following amendments:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Applications No. DE410656 and DE410682, in accordance with the Staff Report dated November 20, 2006, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.0 to read: That the condition set out in appendix A be met prior to the issuance of *each* of the Development Permits.

Amend 2.0 to read: That the Notes to Applicant and Conditions of the Development Permit set out in Appendix B *and applicable to both applications*, be approved by the Board.

4. 4575 CLANCY LORANGER WAY - HILLCREST PARK - DE410676 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE)

Applicant: Hughes Condon Marler Architects

Request: To construct a 2-storey recreational facility which includes the Legacy Community Centre & Percy Norman Aquatic Centre.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced this application for the Hillcrest Park Recreation Complex which is the 2010 Winter Games venue for curling. This application applies to the legacy mode, which represents the conversions of the Olympic Curling venue after the 2010 Winter Games. Mr. Morgan stated that the project had gone through extensive public involvement and was reviewed by the Urban Design Panel in September. The key issue for the Panel was the choice of roof material however the Panel unanimously supported the project.

In 2000 the Parks Board put together a Master Plan for Riley Park to replace the aging facilities and in 2002 Vancouver entered the competition for the 2010 Winter Games. The Community Centre will be used as the host facility before turning over to community uses and will accommodate the curling venue after which there will be a conversion to a hockey rink and a smaller curling rink.

The site was rezoned CD-1 for the development to be permitted with a provision for the density. The allowable density is 30,000m² with this development being 28,000 m².

As there were parking concerns in the community significant parking is to be provided with 920 parking spaces of which 440 are temporary and 480 are permanent.

Mr. Morgan stated that the plan was revised from what was shown at the rezoning stage, in response to conditions of rezoning approval established by Council. There was a reduction in the overall foot print, a reduction of floor area of 2,400 square meters and the building has been pulled back. Also, the parking was relocated between Nat Bailey Stadium and the proposed Aquatic centre. The field layouts have been revised, and apron run-offs reduced, but still meets the requirements for soccer fields, noting the applicant had to add two more lanes to the pool at Council's request.

Mr. Morgan explained the Urban Design Panel's (UDP) discussion of the roof material and he also talked about the mechanical units on the roof, the centre concourse where the two buildings come together and the use of skylights. The Panel also asked about canopies and Mr. Morgan noted that the applicant was still going through a detailed design review and the canopy design had not been addressed as yet. Staff has asked for the canopies to be shown on the drawings as well as solar shading on the western elevation where there is a lot of glazing and therefore heat and glare considerations.

In conclusion, Mr. Morgan stated that subject to the conditions the Staff Committee recommends approval of this project.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Timm inquired about the Urban Design Panel's discussion about the roof and asked if the concerns were on durability or architecture. Mr. Morgan stated that there were two issues: one on how long the material would last and the second was with cost. Mr. Timm also inquired on the concourse stating that it appeared small. Mr. Morgan replied that there hasn't been any discussion during the review as to its adequacy noting that there are several ancillary entrances. Mr. Timm sought clarification on Condition A.2.8 asking for a clearer description. Mr. Thomson noted that there is to be a fence around the outdoor pool and connected to the aquatic centre building. He stated that Staff had concerns about the circuitous path for pedestrians around the outdoor pool in inclement weather when the outdoor pool is closed.

Ms. Nystedt inquired about LEED certification. Mr. Morgan stated that the project aspires to obtain LEED Gold. Ms. Nystedt also inquired about the Heritage aspects of the existing community centre and Percy Norman pool building and if there would be any the elements included in the new development. Mr. Morgan stated that he was not aware of any discussion on heritage elements of the existing buildings. Ms. Nystedt asked why there hadn't been any consideration given to building parking structures. Mr. Morgan stated that there was a cost factor and parking structures were therefore not a consideration.

Mr. Burton asked if there would be any disruption around the use of the parking lot outside of the Nat Bailey Stadium for the farmer's market. Mr. Morgan wasn't aware of the parking lot being used as a weekend market. Mr. Roelofsen noted that to the east of Nat Bailey Stadium is a farmer's market and the development will not impact it and it will be up to the Park Board to decide on the continuation of the market.

Mr. Toderian noted the importance of civic architecture and asked if Staff felt the project was worthy of the site and profile. Mr. Morgan noted that it has been a challenging project and the roof form was striking and helped mask what is a large, bulky building. He added that overall it is a well conceived building. Mr. Toderian noted that there are a number of other buildings on the site and asked if the view opportunities had been captured. Mr. Morgan stated there is a slope across the site so the building will be highly visible as well as the roof form, but there are no prominent public views across the site that the proposed development would impact.

Mr. Toderian inquired about the "scope of work" noting the slight difference between the drawings in the report and those on the context boards. Mr. Morgan replied that some of the parking was taken out of the scope of work because it will replace the existing parking for the Millenium Sports Facility and be used as a staging ground during construction. Mr. Toderian sought further clarification on this parking lot to the southwest of the Stadium and if there will be sidewalks along Midlothian Avenue. Mr. Morgan replied that the landscape drawings address the edge on Midlothian Avenue and there will be sidewalks but this interface is not part of the current application.

Mr. Toderian sought further clarification as to how the application was going to get LEED certification. Mr. Morgan stated that since 2004 all City building over 500 square metres are required by Council policy to achieve a minimum of LEED Gold certification.

Mr. Toderian inquired as to how visually permeable the building edge is at grade and what people will see while walking around the building. Mr. Morgan replied that there is a path around the perimeter of the site and connecting paths throughout the site. Mr. Toderian also inquired as to the permeability of the windows and walls and whether every opportunity had been taken to minimize the number of blank walls. Mr. Morgan replied that given the use for the building, it is very transparent. There are some blank walls but most of the elevations are

animated including the first and second levels. He added that in terms of glazing it is around fifty percent of the building.

Mr. Toderian stated that one of the conditions mentions the new Nat Bailey Plaza and sought clarification on where that space would be located. Mr. Morgan, using the context boards, indicated the location and noted that it is part of the final stage of development of the site.

In response to a question from Mr. Toderian regarding the size of the soccer field, Mr. Morgan advised that it will still meet the minimum requirements.

Mr. Braun asked as to where spectators would sit to watch those on the ice and if it would accommodate the TV cameras for the 2010 Winter Games use. Mr. Morgan stated that there was seating and indicated the location of the 2010 curling configuration on the context boards noting there would be room for the cameras.

Mr. Scobie gave some background on the revised motion that was circulated to the Board and Advisory Panel by Mr. Greer, Project Facilitator. He noted that there will be a variety of uses that need to be accommodated in the development permit approval although many will not be developed until the end state which won't be until 2011. The program will be a lengthy one and the Building Permit is not expected to remain valid to this date. While the development permit may then also expire. He added that the Director of Planning would commonly extend the Development Permit and the wording in the motion was intended to accommodate all the intended uses.

Mr. Scobie asked for Staff to explain the commentary in the report related to provisions for traffic control along Ontario Street asking if it deals with existing or anticipated traffic impacts. Mr. Thomson stated that the issue was identified through the public process where neighbours expressed concern about the traffic load. The application contains a condition that seeks a Traffic Management Plan prior to the conversion of the Olympic Curling Venue.

Mr. Scobie asked about the reference to off-site improvements that are not being made as a condition in the application. Mr. Timm replied that capital works (sidewalks around the site, traffic lights, etc) were normally paid out of Engineering Services capital budgets when adjacent to parks. Engineering Services will be covering the costs and Mr. Timm noted that it will be important that the Engineer determine the time frame in order to have them in place prior to the 2010 Winter Games. He added that capital works were not made a condition as the site is City owned the City would take care of these improvements.

Mr. Scobie asked if the Board should be dealing with Condition A.1.8, A.1.9, A.1.10 as well as Condition, B.2.3 and A.2.17 as they relate to landscaping and are within the jurisdiction of the Park Board as they are responsible for park improvements. He asked if the Park Board would reply to this question.

Mr. Scobie questioned the wording in A.2.13 and suggested adding after Building Permit the words, "*for the legacy facility*" which means the Building Permit post Olympics when the conversion would occur.

Mr. Toderian sought clarification on the issue of Condition 1.1. He wanted to know if the roof material was an issue of up front ascetics or long term life cycle costs. Mr. Morgan stated that in terms of the life cycle costs he didn't have a detailed analysis but added that given the original intent of a metal roof and in terms of durability and maintenance metal would be a

superior product. Mr. Scobie noted Condition 1.1 is a consideration item and not a design development condition.

Mr. Timm provided further information on the Development Permit noting that the project would be staged over a long period of time and that they already know there will be delays. Mr. Scobie added that Mr. Greer had confirmed that under the Zoning and Development By-law a Development Permit is only valid for a year unless there is a valid, companion building permit and construction doesn't stop for more than six months. The Director of Planning can extend the Development Permit if the need arises. Mr. Timm wanted to make sure that this issue was recorded in the minutes. He wanted to know if there would be a fee if the Development Permit needed to be extended. Mr. Scobie said that there would be an application fee for an extension. Mr. Greer added that part of the procedure is to send out a reminder of an extension thirty days before the development permit is to lapse. The applicant noted that the construction will cease for more than six months between commencement and the completion of the Legacy Facilities in 2011.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Rothnie, Architect, advised that with regards to the metal roof in Condition 1.1 it was abandoned for several reasons. One of the primary motives behind the loss of the metal roof was related to cost. He noted that there was a considerable premium and within the limits of the budget they had to look at alternative solutions. He added that the TPO roof is an excellent product and has been used in this type of application and has an adequate service life. To complement the metal wall assemble they are looking at the use of a complementary colour and the addition of ribs. He added that the proposed TPO roof would provide the best alternative and would prefer to stay with the material. Mr. Scobie asked if they were asking to delete condition 1.1 and Mr. Rothnie replied that he would like it deleted.

Mr. Rothnie stated that they recognize the provision of daylight in the central concourse space is vital and agreed with the intent behind the condition. He added that they are currently looking at the detailed development of the mechanical equipment on that roof. He noted that the Condition referred to continuous skylights and that it might not be possible because the mechanical roof-top units and duct work need to be on that roof. He stated that they have tried to move the mechanical hardware to the perimeter edge of the building to limit the impact but it does tend to congest the central area of the concourse. He noted that in the legacy mode some of that mechanical equipment will be deleted as it is only required for the Olympic phase of the project. He stated that they would be willing to looking at adding skylights but his only concern was the use of the word "continuous".

Mr. Rothnie stated that there is considerable concern with the Park Board and themselves regarding the potential logistics and operations of the requirements of the condition in Appendix A.2.8 with regards to the pedestrian connection and the outdoor pool. He noted that the outdoor pool will be inactive for six to seven months of the year and there is a public safety issue that needs to be addressed. The fence would have to be erected and de-erected every year, the fence can't be temporary, and the Park Board is concerned about the additional capital cost. There would also be a conflict between pedestrians and vehicles as this is the service entry to the aquatic centre's mechanical space. He added that there are several operational and logistical issues that come into conflict in this area and would prefer not to have the condition.

Mr. Rothnie stated that Condition A.2.12 should refer to school buses and not charter buses and would like the word "charter" removed from the condition. He added that they are looking at the configuration of the turn-around to accommodate school buses.

Mr. Rothnie stated that there were some concerns with the wording in B.2.1 and the parking provision noting that given the phasing of the project they would be seeking an occupancy permit for the pre-Olympics facility and at that time the parking area will not be completed. Parts of the parking will be available and will be part of the overlay for the Olympics and he would like to see that transferred back to the Legacy mode.

With regards to the question brought up by the Board regarding the concourse, Mr. Rothnie stated that they have been challenged between the need to provide sufficient space in the concourse to meet the operational day-to-day demands and the need to develop a building of a limited footprint on the site to maintain adequate access for parking and accommodate the playing fields. He noted that the concourse does meet the requirements and that there will be times when there will be a high demand in the reception areas and the other areas along the concourse could be used at those times. He stated that they have had discussions with the Park Board and it is satisfied with what is being proposed.

Mr. Rothnie confirmed that they are pursuing LEED Gold for the application which does not relate to the Olympic venue but to the Legacy facility and will be pursuing the application for certification post-Olympics.

In replying to the question regarding the reuse of materials from the Percy Norman pool, Mr. Rothnie stated that because of the phasing of the project the new Legacy facility will be completed before any demolition of the Riley Park Community Centre occurs.

With regards to building parking structures, Mr. Rothnie stated that because of capital cost this was abandoned at the early stages of the rezoning proposal.

Mr. Rothnie stated that they have had meetings with Social Planning regarding child care guidelines and with Provincial licensing people and are in the process of finalizing the agreements and the proposal will satisfy both the guidelines and licensing requirements.

With regards to the view, Mr. Rothnie stated that they did studies from various locations in Queen Elizabeth Park and the proposed building, as with Nat Bailey Stadium, will not be visible. The primary view of the building in terms of the roof impact is from the residential neighbourhood from the other side of the park.

In clarifying the question on the parking off Midlothian Avenue, Mr. Rothnie stated that they will be starting that work soon and is shown on the submitted application drawings as being the subject of a separate application. The parking is lower than the street and there will be a retaining structure to disguise some of the impact of the parking on the street edge and as well as maintaining the mature trees on the park side. Sidewalks are being provided through the City development.

Mr. Roelofsen stated that it had been their intention to retain the pre-existing playing fields for baseball/softball and soccer noting that they have maintained the soccer fields at their existing size and have moved the fields slightly to the north and decreased the run-off area between the fields.

On the issue of the Park Board jurisdiction, Mr. Roelofsen noted that on facility developments, the Park Board submits the proposals regarding landscaping that normally goes with the facility and they won't have a problem with the requirements recommended by the Staff Committee in its report.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Braun asked the applicant if they analyzed the possibility of a green roof. Mr. Rothnie stated that they did look at the green roof but because of the large span and achieving the additional loading, along with the cost, the idea was abandoned.

Mr. Shearing asked what the percentage of cost would be between using a metal roof over TPO. Mr. Rothnie stated that a metal roof had a forty percent premium.

Ms. Forbes-Roberts asked if either of the roof materials would be more sustainable. Mr. Rothnie replied that probably the metal roof was a better option for recycling. From a LEED perspective a lighter coloured roof to reduce the heat was also important and the TPO would offer a better option in this respect.

Ms. Forbes-Roberts inquired about deleting the word "charter" in A.2.12 but accommodating school buses and wanted to know how much of a difference that would make to the design in the turn-around. Mr. Rothnie replied that the current turn-around design did not accommodate any buses. He noted that charter buses require a larger turning radius and they would have to take out a tree to accommodate charter buses making the turn. Mr. Thomson added that the word "charter" was used to denote the difference between transit buses and other buses using the site. He also added that buses need to access the site and leave without having to back up and was open to changing the wording to *"provide for manoeuvring of buses that are anticipated to use the site"*.

Ms. Forbes-Roberts had a question for staff with regards to B.2.1 suggesting to change the wording to reflect the legacy project. Mr. Thomson stated that the condition should remain as is to reflect the Zoning and Development By-law and doesn't believe the applicant is a risk. He added that B.2.2 addresses the matter of the legacy mode as there will not be an occupancy that requires more parking.

Mr. Toderian asked if Staff had any concerns with changes or deletion of A.2.8. Mr. Thomson replied that he did not have concerns either way.

Mr. Toderian noted that Condition 1.4 already states "as continuous as possible" and asked if Staff had any concerns or advice. Mr. Morgan stated that "continuous" was put into the condition to recognise the mechanical restrictions and wanting to maximize day lighting of the concourse. Mr. Timm added that one of the issues was the mechanical equipment and was a conflicting use for the concourse roof and he was concerned that the mechanical would be relocated. He suggested leaving the language as is and to delete the word "relocated". Mr. Morgan reminded the Board that some of the mechanical equipment will be removed in the final legacy stage.

Mr. Toderian asked Staff if there is anything in the conditions to ensure that the applicant be required to achieve LEED Gold certification. Mr. Timm noted that the applicant wouldn't get any LEED certification until after the project was completed.

Mr. Toderian asked Mr. Roelofsen to clarify the life-cycle costs in the choice of roof material and if the Park Board would be responsible for the costs over time. Mr. Roelofsen stated the cost of the metal roof would be a \$1.25M premium which is too much for the project budget to absorb. He noted that considering the curved nature of the roof and its size, a metal roof would have challenges particularly in the assembling of the roof whereas TPO solves those challenges. He added that any roof can leak and the metal roof will last for fifty years as opposed to thirty years for the TPO. The Park Board would be responsible for re-roofing.

Mr. Toderian questioned whether there was an opportunity on the east elevation to be more permeable by opening it up to more windows. Mr. Rothnie replied that from a curling perspective it was preferred that there not be any openings within the curling ice as the sunlight penetration needs to be controlled. Mr. Roelofsen added that they are committed to transparency but they do need to manage the daylight very carefully.

Mr. Timm inquired about the opportunities for the public to view the ice rink and Mr. Rothnie replied that there were many opportunities including the concourse area and a community lounge at the rink level.

Regarding the metal roof, Mr. Francl asked what type of metal roof the applicant had looked at as he felt that with the size of the roof and the amount of thermal expansion, proper assembly detailing and installation would be a technical challenge. Mr. Rothnie replied that they had looked at a pre-painted Galvalume metal roof with a standing seam.

Mr. Shearing asked if the \$1.25M increase for the metal roof had factored in the manpower and Mr. Rothnie replied that it was the full cost of the application.

Ms. Forbes-Roberts questioned the landscaping along the blank wall. Mr. Rothnie stated that they hadn't proposed any additional landscaping as the area is the run-off from the adjacent soccer field and there would be additional security issues with any planting.

Mr. Scobie asked Staff if there was a condition regarding graffiti and Mr. Thomson replied that Condition A.1.11 dealt with CPTED issues on the north and east elevations.

Mr. Braun questioned the location of the bike storage. Mr. Rothnie noted that the bike storage would be for staff and not the public. Mr. Thomson added that Condition A.1.3 dealt with bicycle parking spaces.

Mr. Chung sought clarification as to the location of the bike trails and walking paths on the site. Mr. Morgan noted that there are several gravel paths and a perimeter path around the outer edge of the site. Mr. Thomson added that Condition A.2.17 refers to cycling access.

Ms. Nystedt inquired if the closest Canada Line station would be King Edward and if there were other provisions being taken into consideration for transit. She also asked why the green roof was abandoned. Mr. Rothnie confirmed that the King Edward station would be the closest Canada Line station. In terms of the roof, he advised that there were cost implications, as well as the additional weight of the roof and the impact on structural loads, and so it wasn't feasible.

Mr. Acton asked if the materials being used were a true masonry or tile. Mr. Rothnie replied that they would be using a true masonry with masonry block on the lower levels and the upper levels will be metal studs with metal cladding. Mr. Acton also inquired as to the amount of fenestration on the roof and Mr. Rothnie replied that they were trying to avoid fenestration on the curved roof and so most of the fenestration will be through the side walls.

Mr. Scobie sought clarification on Applicant's Response to rezoning condition (b) iii on page 8 of the Staff Committee Report regarding the loss of the T-Ball diamond. Mr. Roelofsen replied that the diamond would be gone from 2007 through 2010 and then after the Olympics would be added back to the field.

Mr. Scobie questioned if the applicant had any concern with the right of way conditions and Mr. Roelofsen replied that they weren't a problem.

Mr. Scobie sought further clarification on the scope of work regarding the landscaping. Mr. Rothnie replied that everything outside the scope of work was landscaping intended to be done post legacy and was beyond the scope of the development permit.

With regards to Appendix C, Mr. Scobie inquired if the applicant had any concerns with the conditions and if there would be a Certified Professional on the project. Mr. Rothnie replied that they didn't have any problems with the conditions and that they would be have a CP on the project.

Comments from other Speakers

Mr. Alan Buium, resident, spoke of his concerns around the lack of transit in the neighbourhood and asked the Board to consider having a closer liaison with TransLink. He also asked the Board that future parking in Parking Lot 3 be a parking structure and that cars exit only from the parking lot off Midlothian Avenue.

Katey Grist, representing West Side Soccer, had some concerns about the designated change rooms. She asked for four designated change rooms as opposed to the two now in the plan as they will be used by opposing men's teams and there won't be any change rooms for the women. She would like to see two change rooms designated access for women only on Saturdays and Sundays and also an access entrance for the field user change room with a small receiving area for children, spouses, etc.

Mr. Roelofsen stated that the Park Board had heard from the delegation at their public meeting in September. Mr. Scobie asked if the same issues had been raised and Mr. Roelofsen replied that they had, noting that the change rooms were for both men and women and that there is a 7 ½ foot overhang outside the change rooms with about 800 square feet of covered area.

Ms. Nystedt sought further clarity on the change rooms and Mr. Scobie noted that the problem appears to occur when there are multiple teams seeking access and wanting a separate room for each opposing team. Mr. Burton asked if there was a way to manipulate the circulation so that the hockey teams and the soccer players could have access to the change rooms at all times as there are ten change rooms in total. Mr. Burton pointed out that perhaps this was more an operational issue. Mr. Rothnie confirmed that with the current configuration the change rooms could be used by the field players.

Mr. Roelofsen, replying to a question from Ms. Nystedt, noted that there will be change rooms available for the swim teams, with one for men as well as one for women and also a universal change room. Mr. Timm noted that facilities being provided are an issue for the Park Board and not within the scope of the Board. Mr. Forbes-Roberts agreed that the Board can't govern the operation although consideration could be given to the design of the change rooms to ensure maximum flexibility with their use. Mr. Scobie added that there isn't any applicable zoning regulation, guideline or Council policy to consider. Mr. Francl suggested that the full change facility could be open when there are not hockey teams needing change rooms to accommodate access for all the teams.

Jeff Cantliff, President of West Side Soccer, stated that they have 1,000 players at Hillcrest Park every weekend and at the change over point there are between 200 and 300 players looking for change rooms all at the same time. He added that what is being provided in the

facility is undersized compared to other municipalities. Mr. Cantliff did not believe their concerns had been addressed at previous public meetings with the Park Board with regards to the change rooms. He noted that there won't be an overlap of use between hockey and soccer as the teams will use the facility at different times and would like to see the change rooms designed for multi sport use. He was concerned about the shadow studies noting that they often need to wait for the fields to thaw in the morning during the winter months. He added that he was glad to hear that the field sizes were being maintained although the distance between the fields would be tight, with consequential disruptions of play.

Mr. Toderian asked if shadow studies done for December would have a larger impact on the usability of the soccer fields and Mr. Morgan stated that there would be a longer shadow.

Mr. Brian Wilms, long time soccer player and women's soccer coach, stated that Vancouver is the only area in the lower mainland where it is inconvenient for players to change and is more so for women players. He added that there has been increased space for many other programs at this venue except for soccer which is growing, especially among female players. He thought the suggestion about using the change rooms for multi sport was a good idea as it would give them more access to the change rooms.

Mr. Timm stated that although it is not the Board's jurisdiction he asked the speaker if he would appreciate a condition from the Board advising the applicant to consider design development which would improve and maximize accessibility of field and hockey designated change rooms to both and to both sexes. Mr. Wilms stated that this would be a step in the right direction.

Mr. Toderian sought clarity on the Board's jurisdiction. Mr. Scobie replied that the development application process is a mechanism through which the City administers zoning regulations as well as related Council policy. There is neither in this case.

Ms. Forbes-Roberts noted that the Board has given advice to applicants and imposed conditions in the past regarding design of interior space and wanted clarity on the difference between giving advice and establishing a requirement. Mr. Scobie stated that the Board has often gone into establishing conditions that may not be within the jurisdiction of the Board. Since this is a CD-1 application, Council approval is required for the "form of development" and there is considerable ambiguity as to what this might entail so there may be more latitude for the Board to delve into interior space design if it wishes to but he would not encourage it. Mr. Timm advised that even if this became a consideration of the form of development, Council would be hesitant to step into the jurisdiction of the Park Board. Mr. Roelofsen quoted the minutes from the Park Board meeting where there were fourteen delegates who spoke on the topic of the change rooms: "The members discussed the need for adequate allocation of change rooms for women. Staff said that it is both a design and management issue and that options exist for sharing within the new facility." Mr. Scobie asked if both the design and operation were being looked at and Mr. Roelofsen replied that they are open to looking at reconfiguring the space.

Mr. Toderian asked if the Board worded it as an encouragement would the Park Board give it further consideration and Mr. Roelofsen replied that they would as they want this to be a fully accessible building with change rooms for both men and women.

Rosalyn Henderson, resident, stated that she was excited that a lot of consideration has been taken to maintain the Ontario Street greenway. She also stated that she was disappointed that a parking structure wouldn't be built to minimize the site area consumed by parking. As she is

a soccer player she asked to be consulted in scheduling the use of the change rooms and believes that with proper consideration there is enough square footage for both hockey and soccer, male and female players. Ms. Henderson added that there didn't seem to be any consideration given to transit. She also noted that the field clearances were tight and would restrict the game play and also she would like to see a baseball/soccer lounge similar to the skate lounge.

Mr. Chung asked what had happened at a previous Board meeting regarding the conflicting use of the float plane facility in Coal Harbour and the Rowing Club and how they revolved similar issues. Mr. Timm stated that there was zoning already in place that addressed the matter in that instance, Council had made the decision for the location of the temporary float plane facility, and the Board administered the Council policy.

Mr. Toderian asked if Staff could comment on how the site would be served by transit. Mr. Morgan replied that transit considerations were not extensive given that there will be considerable parking on the site. He noted that there will in the future be a RAV station at West 33rd Avenue and Cambie Street. Mr. Timm added that will be an area transit plan developed for integration with the King Edward Canada Line Station with a cross town transit line. When implemented this will enhance transit access to the facility and will provide local transit linkage to the Canada Line.

Mr. Toderian asked Mr. Roelofsen what opportunities the public have had to address the issues and he replied that there were a number of opportunities early in the design stage, with open houses and the Park Board meeting on September 23, 2006.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Francl said that he had some knowledge of the public process noting that it had been extensive over a number of years. He noted that the Urban Design Panel minutes didn't speak to the enthusiasm of the Panel members in reviewing the project. The Panel felt it was an exemplary response to the site. The commentary on the metal roof was made by one or two Panel members who felt it would make a great building even better. Mr. Francl said that in looking at the building he felt the architects would have trouble putting a metal roof on the building and felt the technical detailing would exceed the 40% premium over the TPO and would hesitate to ask the applicant to use a metal roof. Mr. Francl stated that he felt the conditions recommended by the Staff Committee were entirely achievable and supportable. He noted that having daylight in the concourse was important but he would allow some flexibility to the applicant on how it was achieved. He agreed that the mechanical units should be screened. Mr. Francl also agreed that a degree of rain protection at the front entrance was important and that there needed to be a mechanism for solar control.

Mr. Acton commended the applicant, Park Board and Staff for all the work on the project. He agreed that this was an exemplary project and that the external and internal public views were tremendously exploited and would be an exciting building for activities or as a spectator. Mr. Acton stated that blank walls were not always bad and provided a counter point. Mr. Acton agreed with Mr. Francl regarding the metal roof and felt that TPO would be the best solution as he has had some experience with the material. Mr. Acton suggested either deleting Condition 1.1 or leaving it as a consideration. He agreed with the content of Condition 1.2 which addresses the interface between the wall and the roof system. He also agreed that the mechanical units should be screened as noted in Condition 1.3 and he suggested that the first sentence could be deleted in Condition 1.4. With regard to Condition 1.5, Mr. Acton suggested that adding "canopies should be complementary to the architecture" in the Note to Applicant. Mr. Acton suggested deleting Condition A.2.8. He noted that there is a need for field houses

and more washrooms and hoped that the Park Board would identify this as a concern for any future development.

Mr. Shearing congratulated the team on a well designed building. He stated that the metal roof would be a natural for this style of building but realized the cost was prohibitive and recommended leaving Condition 1.1 in the report. Mr. Shearing stated that the interface between the roof material and the wall was critical and supported Condition 1.2. He acknowledged that the architect had worked hard to address the fenestration on the curved roof. He also agreed that the mechanical units needed to be screened and he noted that they could be relocated within the flat roof further away from views. Mr. Shearing agreed that the first sentence in Note to Applicant in Condition 1.4 should be deleted. He had some concern about the width of the concourse with all the uses being interconnected. Mr. Shearing supported the deletion of Condition A.2.8 and in Condition A.2.12 he stated that he would support the applicant in changing the wording to school buses which would help to define the size of the turn around. He also supported making design changes to the changing rooms to accommodate all the users of the facilities.

Ms. Nystedt had concerns about leaving out any condition or statement about the applicant obtaining LEED certification noting that reference is made for CPTED and Vancouver Coastal Health in the report. She stated that she felt it would be important for the Park Board to look at expanding the change space. Mr. Nystedt suggested the Heritage Commission should look at retaining any heritage elements from the existing community centre buildings before they are torn down. She also would like to see the Park Board revisit building parking structures in the future for the long term development of the site.

Mr. Chung congratulated the team for the design of the community centre. He was in agreement with Conditions 1.2 through 1.6. He added that minimizing the roof top mechanical made sense and felt it was up to the architect to design the layout. He stated that he was disappointed that the Park Board didn't have a transportation plan for the area noting that Stanley Park has a shuttle bus from the transit station to the Stanley Park facilities and felt that this would be a good opportunity to offer the same service. Mr. Chung would like to see the Park Board and the applicant work together with the groups who use the facilities around making the change rooms accessible to all. He added that he supported the project and felt it was a great addition to Riley Park Community Centre.

Mr. Burton stated that the Heritage Commission is delighted that the design respects the Nat Bailey Stadium. He noted that it will be good for the stadium's future. He had some concerns about the continuation of the Farmer's Market and being able to secure the parking lot to the east of the stadium. The market is a tradition on the site and asked that it be accommodated. He noted that the Percy Norman Pool has a lot of history and he agreed that the building should be looked at carefully before it is torn down.

Mr. Braun recommended approval of the application. He agreed that Condition 1.1 should be deleted recognizing the cost implications. He also recommended deletion of Condition A.2.8. He suggested having some landscaping on the blank wall of the curling rink. Mr. Braun was in agreement with all the other recommended conditions. He added that he would like to see something done with the change rooms to accommodate all the users.

Board Discussion

Mr. Timm noted that the application had only five public delegations and felt this was a sign of a much better public process that the Park Board went through to have the application achieve its approval. In terms of the design he agreed that this was an iconic design and would be a

significant structure that will be seen around the world during the Olympics and will reflect well on the City. He moved approval, with some amendments to the conditions.

Mr. Toderian congratulated the architect and supported Mr. Timm's amendments to the conditions. He stated that he struggled on the issue of the roof but agreed to delete Condition 1.1, while encouraging the Park Board to fully consider lifecycle costing in their ultimate selection of roof materials noting that there is an obligation to the taxpayer to make the best long-term fiscal decision. Mr. Toderian had concerns about the lack of conditions regarding LEED certification. Mr. Scobie added that there is an implicit expectation that the building would achieve LEED Gold certification consistent with Council's resolution of July 8, 2004. Mr. Toderian also thanked the public for their participation.

Ms. Forbes-Roberts and Mr. Scobie supported the resolution. Mr. Scobie also noted the Board's strong stand on the issue of the change rooms and hoped the Park Board would look at the design in a positive manner.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Timm and seconded by Ms. Forbes-Roberts and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE410676, in accordance with the Staff Report dated November 8, 2006, with the following amendments:

Delete Condition 1.1;

Amend Condition 1.4 to read;

Note to Applicant: Rooftop mechanical units should not be visible or shadow the skylights and need to be screened or relocated as required. (See also related design condition 1.3)

Amend Condition 1.5 to read;

Note to Applicant: Canopies *should be* complementary to the architecture and indicate a clear visual hierarchy to the various points of access. Consideration should be given to pedestrian paths of travel with a view to providing some reasonable degree of rain protection.

Amend Condition 1.6 to read;

consideration of design development to limit and control solar heat gain for the windows on the west-facing building elevation, by providing solar shading devices;

Add Condition 1.7;

consideration of design development to improve and maximize access to the field and hockey designated change rooms to both user groups and to both sexes and consideration for the addition of a small foyer in consultation with stakeholders;

Add Condition 1.8;

design development to the east elevation of the curling facility;

Note to Applicant: *Consideration to be given to the landscaping and or architectural treatment at this location to articulate this façade (See also related condition A1.11).*

Delete Condition A.2.8;

Amend Condition A.2.12 to read;

arrangements to be made to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services *to provide for manoeuvring of buses that are anticipated to use this site.*

Amend Condition A.2.13 to read;

arrangements to be made to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services for provision, prior to the issuance of the Building Permit *for the legacy facility*, of a Transportation Management Plan for site traffic, access, parking and servicing relating to the post-Olympic operation of the Hillcrest sports/community facilities, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services;

5. OTHER BUSINESS

On November 2, 2006, Vancouver City Council concluded its review of Advisory Bodies and came to several conclusions. Council identified the "Development Permit Board and Panel" as a "Type C committee" in that it performs statutory functions. Mr. Scobie referred to proposed amendments to the DP Board Procedures to reflect the Council priorities its motion asked be considered. As there were questions from the Board regarding amending the procedures Mr. Scobie suggested the discussion be tabled until further clarification could be sought from the City Clerk's Office as to the intentions of Council as it relates to both the Board and the Advisory Panel.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:10 PM

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

F. Scobie
Chair

H:\Clerical\DPB\Minutes\2006\20 - Nov 20th.doc