

Date: Tuesday, October 10, 2006
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)
T. French Assistant Director of Current Planning
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager
T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

R. Acton Representative of the Design Professions
N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry
M. Braun Representative of the General Public
K. Hung Representative of the General Public
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public
M. Long Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)

Regrets

J. Scott Representative of the Development Industry
D. Chung Representative of the General Public
R. Keate Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

A. Molaro Development Planner
D. Wong Engineer, Rapid Transit Office
W. Pledger Manager, Rapid Transit Office
M. Thomson City Surveyor

Broadway - City Hall Station - 496 West Broadway - DE410704 - Zone C3-A

C. McCarthy InTransitBC
A. Parker InTransitBC
R. Louie Canada Line Rapid Transit Inc. (CLCO)
D. Harding Stantec Architecture Ltd.

Marine Drive Station - 8440 Cambie Street - DE410683 - Zone I-2

C. McCarthy InTransitBC
A. Parker InTransitBC
R. Louie Canada Line Rapid Transit Inc. (CLCO)
D. Rickard VIA Architecture
D. Chernoff Durante Kruek Landscape Architects
J. Herold TransLink

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of September 25, 2006 be approved with the following amendments:

Amend p.8, Note to Applicant, 2nd line to change "south" to *sought*.

Amend p.17, fourth paragraph, 3rd line to add *groups* after "city and".

Amend p.17, fourth paragraph, 4th line to add *to resolve any issues.* after "middle ground".

Amend p.17, fourth paragraph, 4th line to change "a" at the beginning of the sentence to *A* "correlation between".

Amend p.17, fourth paragraph, 4th line to add *activities* after "the church" and to add *has not been proven* after "the neighbourhoods".

Amend p.17, fourth paragraph, 4th line to delete "hasn't been working well" and add *doesn't appear to be working together*.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. BROADWAY - CITY HALL STATION - 496 WEST BROADWAY - DE410704 - ZONE C3-A (FOR ADVICE)

Applicant: InTransitBC

Request: To construct a rapid transit station and an at grade entry and below grade platforms and guideway.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ms. Molaro, Development Planner, presented this application for the City Hall Station located on the southeast corner of Cambie Street and Broadway. The station design is required to anticipate future adjacent development and the Millennium Line. Ms. Molaro briefly described the station design and reviewed the recommendations contained in the Development Permit Staff Committee report dated September 27, 2006, and advised they reflect the ongoing discussion between City staff and CLCO. The recommendation is for support of the proposal, with the advice and comments provided.

Questions/Discussion

Ms. Hung sought clarification on the proposed second elevator and the ticketing procedure. Ms. Molaro advised that this elevator would be near the exit stair and would be within the fare paid zone.

In response to a question from Mr. Timm, Mr. Molaro confirmed that not every entrance would be accessible and that some stairways are for emergency exit only.

Ms. French sought clarification regarding the retaining wall. Ms. Molaro advised that Condition 1.3 is to address the change in the grade on Cambie Street between the sidewalk and the station entry to allow for ease of movement in this area. Ms. French asked what Staff had in mind in terms of future development of City owned land. Ms. Molaro said that they are looking for a design analysis that would show a number of variations on how future development could integrate with the station.

Ms. Nystedt noted that in the open houses there had been a desire for the art deco theme of City Hall to be recounted in the station and asked why the architect had not incorporated that into the design. Ms. Molaro advised that there were no specific guidelines and referred the matter to the applicant's architect to address in their presentation.

Mr. Shearing asked if the east side Cambie Street setback extends along Cambie Street to the bridge and if there was a set back on West Broadway. Mr. Molaro confirmed that there is a twenty-five foot setback on Cambie Street but no formal setback on Broadway.

Mr. Timm, referring to Condition 1.3, sought clarification regarding the concrete seats being used to address the grade at the corner of Cambie Street and Broadway. Ms. Molaro advised that at a minimum Staff would like to see design development to the step treatment across the corner so the stairs are seen to disappear into the concrete seats.

Mr. MacGregor inquired about the wording in Condition 1.0. Mr. Scobie advised that the wording was what the Board had supported in its conclusions on previous submissions and sets an obligation on the part of the proponents to check back on the application before construction starts.

Ms. Long sought clarification on the maintenance of the station and wanted to know who would take care of the public realm. Mr. Pledger responded that City Engineering would look after the street area and the part of the station on private property would be looked after by CLCO. Mr. Wong explained that the street trees would be within the City street right-of-way and be maintained by the City. When they are on private property, trees are maintained by the owner as in the case of the Canadian Tire site to the north.

Ms. French inquired about the double row of trees and if they would be there in the long term. Ms. Molaro replied that there won't be a full double row of trees because of the bus stop.

Mr. Acton sought clarification on the second elevator and how it would improve accessibility in the station. Ms. Molaro explained that transit users would enter the station from West 10th Avenue and would use this elevator to get to the platform.

Mr. Timm inquired if another development permit was required for the reduction of the parking on the City owned parking lot. Ms. Molaro indicated there would be, and noted that the report comments on the parking available which is more than what is required and the amendment is needed to record the change in the over all numbers of the City Hall parking provisions. Mr. Scobie noted that the current application does not include the balance of the parking lot. Mr. Thomson added that the ownership of the parking lot is not material to the discussion.

Ms. French sought further clarification on who looks after the landscaping. Ms. Molaro advised that the responsibility falls to CLCO and they need to make arrangements with Real Estate Services on how that would be handled. Mr. Scobie added that the Access Agreement draws a clear line between the obligations of the transit facility and those of the City, and the proponent would work with Real Estate Services, on behalf of the City, for review and approval of any revisions.

Mr. Scobie inquired about the ownership of the site. Mr. Thomson confirmed that it is the City who is the owner on title and there is an amendment being made to the Access Agreement to add these additional lands being made available to the CLCO.

Mr. Scobie, referring to Page 10 of the Staff Committee Report, asked if the language described Staff's expectation of what's being sought under Condition 1.7. Ms. Molaro replied that it was and Mr. Scobie asked for the applicant to provide their comments on that condition.

Mr. Scobie inquired as to the distance between the westerly edge of the exhaust/intake vent and the curb. He wanted to know the width of the passageway on the sidewalk and if the vent was shifted to the south, would that reduce the width of the passageway on the sidewalk. Mr. Molaro referring to the drawings explained the access to the station entry from Cambie Street.

Mr. Acton sought clarification around the layout of the bike lockers. Mr. Molaro replied that the bike lockers are temporary until the City Hall precinct is developed.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Harding, Stantec Architecture, provided a brief overview of the City Hall Station. He noted that the design rationale was based on comments from the public consultation process as well as their own work. The significant factors for the design of the building was the City Hall and its gardens, the view to the north with the city and the mountains beyond and the steep slope on Cambie Street.

The applicant team responded to the recommendations in the report. Mr. Parker, InTransitBC, stated that Condition 1.0 would be addressed during design development in concert with the City except for Condition 1.3. He stated that shifting the vent had technical considerations as well as cost implications but was willing to see if there was some flexibility with the design. In Condition 1.4, the question of a second elevator would entail a redesign of the station with schedule and cost implications. Mr. Parker suggested addressing the second means of access to the station and the Millennium Line when the City owned lands are redeveloped. In Condition 1.7, he stated that although they have talked about future development of the adjacent City-owned site, there is no provision to accommodate any additional structural loading to accommodate future overbuild.

Mr. Louie, CLCO, noted that there will be a thirty percent design submission and a point by point response on the advice received detailing how they have accommodated the advice or what considerations have been made which will be included in the final design report to the City. Mr. McCarthy, InTransitBC, added that they would be submitting designs beyond the thirty percent stage after consulting with CLCO.

Mr. Parker responded to the question regarding A.1.4 noting that "retaining wall by others" is an error and the retaining wall will be constructed by SNC-LAVALIN Inc. as part of the development. Mr. Parker added that they would need clarification from the City in regards to Recommendation A.1.7 as he wasn't sure there is sufficient room for two rows of street trees on Cambie Street.

Mr. McCarthy, InTransitBC, advised that for legal reasons they won't be providing a wheel ramp for bicycles as asked for in A.2.8. It is their policy to have cyclists use the elevators.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. MacGregor asked the applicant to clarify their response to A.2.8 and asked if they wished to have the recommendation deleted to which Mr. McCarthy replied that they would. In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor regarding wheelchair access from the south, Mr. Harding referring to the drawings, advised that all access will be from Broadway and then once in the station the physically challenged would use the elevator to the lower level.

Mr. French inquired around the concerns of moving the vent shaft. Mr. Parker noted that this was a technical issue and would need further review.

Ms. Nystedt noted that in the open houses there was mention of art deco lighting and style and wanted to know why there wasn't any reflection of City Hall in the design of the station. Mr. Harding, replied that the intent of the design was to be consistent with the theme of the Canada Line so that the entire line reads as a family. He stated that recreating the art deco theme was not an appropriate direction and their mission was to produce a high quality building.

Ms. Nystedt inquired about the sustainability principles expressed in the proposal and Mr. Parker replied that there is a draft paper that deals with sustainability.

Mr. MacGregor sought clarification on the expectation of the Chair regarding information submitted to the Director of Planning with regards to the conditions. Mr. Scobie stated that the Director of Planning would address the submission and determine whether to bring the matter back to the Board.

Mr. Acton asked about the material on the triangular area on the roof. Mr. Harding replied that it would be SPS or metal flashing.

Mr. Timm asked if the applicant would be providing foundations for future overbuild. Mr. McCarthy replied that this was under review.

Ms. Nystedt wanted to know where the public art would be located as mentioned in Condition 1.8 and Mr. McCarthy replied that public art would be addressed by InTransitBC in conjunction with CLCO.

Ms. Long sought clarification on the vents and whether they were intake or exhaust and if they would have any impact on the plantings. She also inquired if they could be moved closer to the curb. Mr. McCarthy noted that in terms of the design, to shift them further to the north was constrained because of the tunnel but would look to see if there was any flexibility.

Ms. Hung asked if there was much public response to the loss of the heritage building. Mr. McCarthy replied that there were a number of responses from the residents of the building. Ms. Molaro added that when the report went to Council there were only one or two concerns raised.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie, Mr. McCarthy advised that the landscape plans portray correctly the location for the trees on Cambie Street. On page 17, Mr. Scobie inquired if the third and fourth bullets would be problematic to the applicant and Mr. McCarthy stated that they had been through a code analysis and they weren't an issue. Mr. Scobie inquired if any of the station proposals previously before the Board had come back to the City with the thirty percent design detail and Ms. Molaro stated that as yet they have not received any written responses. Mr. Louie added that they would review the timing with InTransitBC and give a schedule to City Staff.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Ms. Long agreed with the applicant with respect to Condition 1.3 that the concrete seat is better than disappearing stairs and would be a nice design gesture. In terms of Condition 1.5, Ms. Long noted that the applicant had chosen to create a simple public realm and she felt that from an Urban Design Panel point of view there being a fair amount of public space it would be beneficial to see further design development. In terms of Condition 1.6, she would like to see the vents made less obtrusive to the public realm. Ms. Long stated that Condition 1.8 was important as there had been many comments from the public and from the Urban Design Panel regarding adding public art to the stations. She felt that as a civic precinct, the station should be prominent and should be reflective of City Hall. Also she stated that it was a lost opportunity not having some retail on the site. The one concern she had was how the maintenance was going to be dealt with both on the civic as well as the transit side as she felt the public realm in most of the current stations is not being maintained. She also stated that there were many comments from the public that the corner plaza should be more green and she added that there is an opportunity for more design development especially with the planting on Cambie Street. Regarding A.1.7, Ms. Long mentioned that it was critical to have enough depth for the trees on Cambie Street otherwise they will be stunted.

Mr. Acton commented that the retaining wall and the curved roof were two strong generators for design but in the station they seemed a bit of complicated and looked weak architecturally. With regards to Condition 1.2, Mr. Acton stated that the skylight and existing stair glazing was inappropriate as it almost looks like an entry and he would like to see the design reviewed. He thought the concrete seats were a good way to transition from the stairs but felt they could be cut back. With regards to Condition 1.4, Mr. Acton didn't see why the applicant should have to provide the elevator at this time and thought it could be added in the future development. Mr. Acton felt there was an opportunity for some custom vents as asked for in Condition 1.6. Mr. Acton stated that the future interface as asked for in Condition 1.7 had been addressed to everyone's satisfaction. He supported the public art component and felt that the reference to the art deco would be inappropriate and could be anticipated in the future design of a new City Hall.

Mr. Shearing stated that it was unfortunate that there was an approach to a corporate "Canada Line" look and felt it was inappropriate for the intersection of Cambie Street and Broadway and would have made for a much stronger building and urban interface if there were a simpler building with clean lines, and clear articulation of the details. He commented that the form of the roof was completely inappropriate to the application. Mr. Shearing stated that the design team should go back and re-evaluate the design of the station and make it more appropriate to its urban setting. In terms of Condition 1.3, Mr. Shearing felt it was important to improve the public realm at the sidewalk level and suggested pushing the vent on West 10th Avenue at Cambie Street to the bulge and reconfiguring the vent to the shape of the bulge. As to the

vent on Broadway at Cambie Street, he suggested breaking the vent up into two smaller ones between the trees.

Mr. Shearing didn't think the second elevator was required as asked for in Condition 1.4 since the building is completely accessible. He felt that money would be better spent on figuring out the future structure on the site. Mr. Shearing stated that the conceptual design on Condition 1.7 was critical to sorting out what the building should be in its relationship to its future neighbours and to increase and enhance the plaza at the corner of West Broadway and Cambie Street.

Ms. Nystedt stressed the importance of this location noting that the corner of Cambie Street and Broadway is one of the busiest intersections south of downtown. Ms. Nystedt was disappointed with the design concept of the station and restated that what the public saw in the previous public meetings had not been met in the design of this station and although it works below the surface, the surface design needs to be reconsidered.

Ms. Hung said the design of the station was safe and would be integrated into the future design of the adjacent site. Ms. Hung stated that she agreed with the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.2. As for Condition 1.3, Ms. Hung would like to see the vent adjusted. Ms. Hung stated that she would like to see the second elevator as outlined in Condition 1.4. She agreed that the wheel ramp for bicycles as outlined in Recommendation A.2.8 was needed because of the number of riders attending UBC and using the B-Line.

Mr. Braun noted that in Condition 1.3 the concrete seat would be a safety benefit although it could be reduced for minimal impact. In Condition 1.4 Mr. Braun felt that a second elevator was an important feature. He agreed that there was an opportunity for more greenery especially on the stepped plaza. Mr. Braun would like to see the electrical room relocated. He recommended that Recommendation A.2.8 be deleted since it's the policy of InTransitBC for cyclists to use the elevators.

Board Discussion

Ms. French supported the staff recommendation, with some amendments. With regards to the architectural design question, Ms. French stated that the station design might not accommodate the art deco design of City Hall but suggested it could be dealt with in the public realm treatment.

Mr. MacGregor commented on the wording in Condition 1.0 that it might not be accurate but agreed to let it stand as is and suggested that Staff change the wording of the condition in future applications. In terms of the design, he agreed that the site needs to be integrated with future development and stated that the design could be improved. He noted that the station is fully accessible and the addition of another elevator should not be required. Mr. MacGregor agreed that that Condition 1.2 was needed.

Mr. Timm stated that he wasn't convinced the emergency exit should be glass enclosed as it looks like a public entrance and suggested that the design needs to be reconsidered to downplay its prominence. He agreed that the second elevator was not required. Mr. Timm supported the recommendation on making provision for future integration of the station into the development of the balance of the block.

Mr. Scobie stated that he hoped that InTransitBC wasn't discouraging the use of bicycles on the system and said it would be regrettable not to more fully facilitate cyclists to use the station.

Motion

It was moved by Ms. French and seconded by Mr. MacGregor and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Submission No. DE410704, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated September 27, 2006, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.3 to read:

Note to Applicant: The vent located adjacent to the station entry should be shifted further south along the Cambie Street station frontage located between two of the inner row of street trees. Design development *to enhance the steps should be undertaken without fully eliminating the concrete bench.*

Delete 1.4;

Replace 1.7 to read:

further consideration with Staff of providing a horizontal knockout panel to allow for future vertical support as well as consolidation of some underground station elements such as the transformer room to maximize flexibility for future development;

Add 1.9 to read; *reconsider the glazed exit stair to minimize its prominence.*

Delete first line in A.1.4 Note to Applicant to read:

Note to Applicant: *More information is needed on retaining wall dimensions including height.*

Amend A.1.7 to read: provision of a continuous planting trench *or other means of achieving adequate soil depth for the street trees on Cambie Street;*

**3. MARINE DRIVE STATION - 8440 CAMBIE STREET - DE410683 - ZONE I-2
(FOR ADVICE)**

Applicant: InTransitBC

Request: To construct a rapid transit station with at grade entry with elevated platforms and guideway including a portal structure that transitions the elevated guideway to a below grade tunnel system.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, presented this application for the Marine Drive Station located at the corner of Marine Drive and Cambie Street, and for the tunnel portal entry north of Marine Drive. The site will have the only elevated station on the system. There is to be a bus loop facility which will be a separate submission. Ms. Molaro noted that there are two principle issues to consider with one being the public realm and the other the relationship to future development of the site. Ms. Molaro briefly described the station design and reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated September 27, 2006. She noted the proposal generally reflects the ongoing discussions between the proponents and staff with further design development being sought.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Timm inquired as to whether there had been any comments from the residents adjacent to the portal and Ms. Molaro stated that there had been direct contact and the residents were aware of the planning process. Ms. Molaro also stated that all the residents had received notification in their mail boxes about the public consultations and the City had not received any written responses to date.

Mr. Timm sought clarification on the fire lane easterly adjacent the portal entry asking if it would be marked as fire truck access only. Ms. Molaro stated that it would be a fire truck access only with no private vehicle access. She noted that there is a condition in the back of the report asking for a change to the parking layout.

Mr. Timm questioned if there would be any improvement of the sidewalk on Marine Drive adjacent to Cambie Street. Ms. Molaro advised that one of the recommendations was asking for a 1.8 metre wide sidewalk and landscaping against the wall noting there are some challenges with circulation and the location of the platform. Mr. Timm asked if the pedestrian link to the station entry would be subject to the ICBC site redevelopment. Ms. Molaro stated that Staff had asked for clarification from the applicant team and it was her understanding that InTransitBC was designing and building the link as part of the station.

Mr. Timm stated that the Access Agreement doesn't permit CLCO to build stairs on sidewalks on City streets as stairs would make sidewalks inaccessible to those who are physically challenged and was not something the City Engineer would approve. Ms. Molaro stated that she has included a condition to have the stairway removed.

Mr. Scobie was not clear as to what the drawings indicated around the potential for retail at the ground plane in the station. Ms. Molaro stated that she too was unclear as to what was being proposed for retail in the station and had asked the applicant for clarification.

Mr. Scobie sought clarification on how the transition will be handled along the edges of the transition to the portal entry. Using the drawings, Ms. Molaro described the elevation as it transfers into the low concrete wall with a fence above as seen from the street. Mr. Scobie also

inquired about the narrow green planting strip. Ms. Molaro advised that there will be some low ground cover and hedging to keep the planting from falling into the guideway.

Mr. Scobie inquired as to whether the adjacent owners had been contacted and advised about the Development Permit Board meeting. Ms. Molaro replied that the only advertisement had been the ad in the paper for the DPB meeting and that the owners had not been individually contacted. Mr. Wong added that although the property owners hadn't been contacted about the DPB meeting they had been contacted on other occasions and were very interested in the opportunities to comment. Mr. Scobie asked if the owners had a positive response to the development and Mr. Wong agreed that their response had been positive.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie, Mr. Thomson stated that there would be only legal street access and not real street access on a portion of Cambie Street where the fire lane will be located. Mr. Scobie asked if there were other similar situations in the city and if there would be secondary access from the lane to the properties and Mr. Thomson confirmed that in both instances this was the case.

Mr. Scobie asked if the commercial development on the east side of Cambie Street, north of Marine Drive was predominately retail with office above and Ms. Molaro stated that there is some residential.

Mr. Scobie asked for clarification around the loss of area in the Cambie heritage boulevard. Ms. Molaro described the changes to the boulevard using the aerial photograph noting that there would be a loss of 10% but it would be reclaimed elsewhere on the boulevard.

Ms. Long inquired about the removal of the trees on the boulevard and Ms. Molaro stated that they have all been accounted for and would be replaced or relocated.

Mr. Scobie questioned what percentage of riders were expected to come or leave by bus. Mr. Wong stated that the expectation will be that between 70-80% will use the bus.

Mr. Timm inquired about access for wheelchairs between the bus loop and the station and Ms. Molaro advised that there will be an elevator from the plaza to the platform.

Mr. Scobie recommended changing the wording in Recommendation A.1.6 to read "provision of a separate *submission* for the bus loop and rectifier" and Recommendation A.1.1 to read "*submission of* complete and fully dimensioned drawings".

Mr. MacGregor inquired as to why the Director of Planning was noted in Condition 1.11 under Note to Applicant. Ms. Molaro agreed that the wording should be changed. Mr. MacGregor also asked about the overlook of the residential developments on the west side of Cambie Street from the station entry stairway and Ms. Molaro agreed that the development needed to be sensitive to the residents.

Applicant's Comments

Dale Rickard, VIA Architecture, briefly discussed the overview of the station noting that the station location is driven by the guideway which comes out of the ground, crosses Marine Drive and provides a platform for the location of the station. He said the station is intended to be simple and straightforward as well as functional however there will be some restriction on design because of Cambie Street. The plan is to make the station as transparent as possible with a police station at the lower level for security on the Canada Line. Mr. Rickard noted that

there will be landscaping on the west side to partly obscure the station from the adjacent residential.

Originally the station was flipped but with the addition of the bus loop, the plaza and the police station the layout was redesigned. He added that the link to the bus loop is temporary and will be replaced once the development for the ICBC site is completed. Provisions for temporary parking for the police and service vehicles will be negotiated as part of the redevelopment.

Dylan Chernoff, Durante Kruek Landscape Architects, briefly described the plans for the landscaping on the site which is to be similar to other stations along the line.

With respect to Condition 1.3, Mr. Parker, InTransitBC, stated that there were concerns around providing obscure or translucent glazing treatments as that part of Cambie Street won't have much foot traffic and there are security and CPTED concerns. He agreed that the applicant team would discuss these concerns with City Staff.

Commenting on Condition 1.4 (a), Mr. Parker advised that they will remove the stairs in the City sidewalk. Also Mr. Parker noted that with Condition 1.7, the walkway must be in place in time for the opening of the system but will be a temporary facility until ICBC redevelops their site.

Questions/Discussion

Ms. French asked the architects to elaborate on the architectural intentions of the different elements in the design of the site as related to Condition 1.1. Mr. Parker noted that some of the elements are functional and won't have a lot of expression while others are planned to be more visible with the use of glass. He added that all the stations will relate to one another along the line.

Mr. Scobie stated that he was having some difficulty interpreting the drawings and asked for some clarity on the perspectives. Directing Mr. Scobie to the drawings, Mr. Rickard described the layout of the station and portal.

Mr. Timm asked for clarity on the use and function of the police station. Mr. McCarthy advised that it will be a reporting station for the police on the line. Mr. Herold, TransLink Representative, added that the station is to be used by police officers who will report in at the beginning and end of their shifts. There could be access for the public although that was still under discussion. Mr. Timm asked who would be using the space and Mr. Louie replied that it would be used as part of the Access Agreement by the Transit Police who are required for the operation of the system. Mr. Timm noted that he didn't see the public benefits as described in the report as he had some concerns about the bulk of the station. Mr. Parker added that the station does require the plaza on the south side which is the entry into the station which automatically creates space under the station.

Mr. MacGregor inquired about the rectifier station. Mr. Louie stated that it is there to support the trolley bus loop and has nothing to do with the station but it is part of the bus integration that will meet the line.

Mr. Shearing sought clarification on the width of the sidewalk on Cambie Street. Mr. Rickard noted that the sidewalk varies in width and he agreed that it is narrow at the "pinch point", being less than 1.8 metres wide which is a result of the redesign of Cambie Street. Mr. Shearing asked if it was possible to compromise the bike lane to accommodate a wider sidewalk.

Mr. Wong added that it will be important to have the bike lane as there will be a new bike lane on the bridge and noted that the sidewalk is more generous than on a typical street.

Mr. Scobie asked about the grade elevation on Cambie Street and if the glazing on the stairs extending to the platform level would have a concrete façade. He noted that the façade could look hostile and unfriendly. Ms. Molaro advised that there will be opportunities to make the area more pedestrian friendly.

Ms. French sought clarification on the break in the roof line at the top of the escalator. Mr. McCarthy agreed that there is no cover between the top of the escalator and the roof of the guideway.

Ms. Long inquired about the location of the pedestrian link in the upper plaza and how the riders would get to the bus loop. Mr. Parker advised that the area is subject to the ICBC redevelopment and described the location of the pedestrian crossing and added that access to the bus loop is being re-examined. Mr. Herold added that there were safety issues and the design location of the pedestrian cross walk came out of a field study.

Mr. Scobie asked if the guideway configuration as it enters into the station from the south was split over a centre column. Mr. McCarthy replied that it would be two guideways with a single profile. Mr. Scobie sought further clarification on the entry at the top of the escalator and if there was a break in the roof. Mr. McCarthy confirmed that there was a break in the roof between the top of the escalator and the guideway.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Ms. Long stated that the Urban Design Panel found the application very difficult mainly because the decision had already been made as to where the portal would be located. The Panel also felt the circulation in the station was confusing and compromised with a lot of unresolved issues. The addition of the police station could help animate the plaza assuming it is not closed in with blinds or drapes. Ms. Long added that there seems to be a lot of paving on both the portal site and on the station site and suggested using permeable paving to soften the hard surfaces. She commented that the Urban Design Panel felt that the station needed to be part of the neighbourhood and that consideration needed to be given to the future development so that it can relate to the interface. The portal needs to be seen as a gateway and celebrated more so it is not expressed as just a hole in the ground. The Panel also felt that the width of the pedestrian connection beside the portal needed further design development.

Mr. Acton expressed his disappointment with the scheme. He stated that he didn't see any architectural concepts in the design at all and felt outraged as a citizen. He stated that the whole geometric swoop design was causing problems; he found it confusing and incoherent with too many unrelated elements. Coming up the stairs into the rain was just bad planning. The stair could have been rotated ninety degrees and with re-planning a park like landscape could be created and would provide visual buffering. The security fence at the portal is going to look like a welded wire mesh that's going to be a few hundred feet long. Here was an opportunity for a strong, imaginative, significant sculptural expression and there is none of that. He stressed that it would be a huge shame for the City if the application proceeded with this design.

Mr. Shearing agreed with the previous comments. He added that the portal is a critical and important piece in the overall experience of the line and it was hard to imagine how an elevated station and a gash in the landscape could be neighbourly and added that a lot of thought needs to go into making them neighbourly.

Mr. Scobie asked Ms. Long, Mr. Acton and Mr. Shearing if their comments to the Board were to not support the application and they agreed that was the case.

Ms. Hung noted that the recommendations in the Staff Report were well thought out however the station as presented wasn't very exciting and doesn't say "Welcome to Vancouver". If the intent was to keep the station design more simple and fitting the industrial nature of Marine Drive then the details could be played with to make a more interesting design. She noted that the Production Way Station in Burnaby with coloured glass made for a delightful design. Ms. Hung felt she couldn't comment on the Portal as there wasn't enough information on the materials.

Mr. Braun felt that Staff had given all the recommendations that were necessary and added that he agreed with the other members of the Advisory Panel in that the more design development was needed. He noted that he was expecting this above ground station to be similar to the Millennium Line stations. Mr. Braun recommended the Board add "*continuous covering*" in Condition 1.8 given the rainy weather in Vancouver.

Board Discussion

Mr. Timm was not prepared to support the design for the station. He stated that he could support the design for the portal but agreed with the Advisory Panel that the station needs significant design development. He noted that the pedestrian link on the back side of the station had significant CPTED issues and the station is far more bulky than it needs to be with a lot of occupied space set under the guideway.

Mr. MacGregor stated that the integration of the bus loop and entry to the station is not well done. The alignment of the portal may be in the right spot but some of the treatment was lacking and needs to be redeveloped. He added that the conditions as presented in the Staff Report were a good start for InTransitBC but he could not support the project as submitted.

Mr. Scobie asked the Board if there was any willingness to support only the portal piece and with non-support for the station. Mr. Timm noted that essentially the layout of the portal can't be changed.

Ms. French agreed that it was a difficult station to design, adding that the planning doesn't work and the architecture wasn't coherent. Ms. French stated that she could not support the application as it is not good enough for Vancouver and does a disservice to the other stations along the line.

Mr. Scobie remarked that he was looking forward to seeing the station and portal design and was disappointed to see that the architecture doesn't work and had trouble reading the perspectives. He noted that a lot of people are going to be using the station and the proponents need to work out something that provides a statement that the people of Vancouver would be proud to use.

Motion

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

THAT the Board NOT SUPPORT Development Submission No. DE410683, as described in the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated September 27, 2006.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:25 PM

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

F. Scobie
Chair