

Date: Tuesday, October 11, 2005
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)
L. Beasley Co-Director of Planning
B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager
T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

A. Endall Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
R. Acton Representative of the Design Professions (Item #1-3 only)
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission
K. Hung Representative of the General Public
C. Henschel Representative of the General Public

Regrets

J. McLean Representative of the Development Industry
J. Scott Representative of the Development Industry
G. Chung Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

R. Segal Senior Development Planner
B. Adair Development Planner
J. Greer Project Facilitator
V. Potter Project Facilitator
M. Thomson City Surveyor

100 Keefer Place

J. Hancock Hancock Bruckner Eng & Wright
H. Heyvarts Hancock Bruckner Eng & Wright
J. Carney Henderson Development

1010 East 17th Avenue

J. Tamaki Nicolson Tamaki
J. Shuttleworth Structural Engineer
Mr. Ahking Vancouver School Board

700 Hamilton (CBC) - Other Business item

D. Negrin Concord Pacific Group Inc.
W. Francl Walter Francl Architects

Recording Secretary: D. Kempton

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of September 12, 2005 be approved.

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of September 26, 2006 be approved following minor housekeeping amendments.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 100 KEEFER PLACE - DE409456 - ZONE CD-1
(PRELIMINARY APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Hancock Bruckner

Request: To construct 2 residential towers (33-storey and 35-storey), an 8-storey mid-rise (Abbott Street), and townhouses on the podium level (Keefer Place), with retail at grade, for a total of 458 units, and parking for 653 cars accessed off the lane and Keefer Place.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ralph Segal, Development Planner, introduced this application for a significant development in the last market site for International Village. Mr. Segal referred to the extensive context model to describe the surrounding buildings such as the Paris Place tower with a half circle forming half of Keefer Circle, the Firenze F2 tower development which was recently approved and is under construction, and the Costco site.

This proposal is for ground floor retail at Abbott Street and Keefer Place, two residential towers (tower A and tower B - westerly, taller one), townhouses and mid-rises. Mr. Segal noted that the proposal is generally in conformance with the CD-1 By-law and consistent with the Design Guidelines as well as having all urban design issues reasonably well resolved including those flowing from the text amendment approved at the October 4, 2005 Council meeting.

Mr. Segal said that staff are recommending a number of refinements but there is nothing in the conditions that would cause a radical reworking of the scheme. The towers are in the right location and everything is generally configured correctly. A few changes are sought, addressed by the recommended conditions of approval as follows:

With respect to condition 1.1, Mr. Segal clarified the difference between Engineering comments and the wording of the condition regarding vehicular access. The principal access to the site will occur beneath the SkyTrain off a lane from Expo Boulevard, with a second vehicular access from Keefer Place. Mr. Segal said that condition 1.1 talks to the exploration

of, as a relief valve, use of an access point from the existing parkade into the Beatty Street lane (lane east of Beatty Street) as a tertiary access; noting that the Expo Boulevard lane will be heavily used by the Costco development as well as this development. Mr. Segal stated that staff are seeking as many possibilities for efficient vehicle access as they can.

Mr. Segal explained that for condition 1.14 regarding delivery of community facilities, there are legal agreements that apply to the CD-1 By-law and as a result would see these facilities located on the east side of the Firenze site next to the park. Delivery of these facilities (school, daycare and community space) will be triggered by construction of the 175th family unit. Mr. Segal explained that condition 1.14 seeks specific performance on the delivery of those facilities.

With respect to specific urban design refinements, Mr. Segal said that condition 1.2 relates to Tower B, the taller tower, to address the geometry in how it relates to Keefer Circle and how it impacts views from neighbouring buildings and also the massing. The condition talks to reducing the tower width to 95 ft. which is overly prescriptive and is acknowledged will be a difficult task. Staff would, however, like to exercise some flexibility in the reduction of tower width. The overall issue is that staff want to retain the architectural form of the building and at the same time see if perhaps two end units might be adjusted or reconfigured to reduce some of the width.

Mr. Segal noted that a new condition 1.3 was distributed to the Board which is significantly less cumbersome than the original condition 1.3. This condition addresses issues of overlook, privacy and livability by confirming that separation between Tower A and the Firenze building achieves a minimum of 80 ft. separation.

Mr. Segal also noted that condition 1.13 addressing sustainability is a consideration item. Staff are trying to alert designers and the development community that sustainability is something they should be pursuing although it is not direct policy.

The remainder of the conditions, from 1.4 to 1.12, have to do with refinements of various urban design matters. The conditions address privacy, livability or public realm issues of buildings or surface treatments at six very challenging interfaces on this site.

Mr. Segal reviewed the results of the neighbourhood notification and then corrected an error in the report as follows:

Page 18 under the section Staff Response to traffic at Keefer Place should read: ***Staff recommend that Keefer Place parking access use be minimized as much as possible at this location.***

Generally the approach taken in this preliminary scheme is positive and supportable with some further refinements. Mr. Segal stated that Development Permit Staff Committee recommendation is for approval in principle subject to the conditions outlined in the report calling for a number of refinements.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley sought clarification of the proposed completion of Keefer Circle. From the detail provided in the drawings it appeared that the applicant's proposed side of the circle does not replicate the existing Paris Place side of the circle. Mr. Segal responded that the proposed double height colonnade wraps and takes on the form of the Paris Place colonnade. This proposal is of a different character than the Paris Place side in that it has a simpler pier configuration and the townhouses behind are set back from the colonnade in a similar way but

the materials are different and they are not as high as the backdrop in Paris Place. Mr. Segal stated that staff have asked for further study with respect to the proposed different treatment of the remaining half of Keefer Circle (condition 1.6 and the Note to Applicant).

Mr. Timm sought clarification with regard to Mr. Segal's suggested change to the Note to Applicant in condition 1.2. Mr. Segal responded that in this case, it might be best to delete the reference to the figure 95 ft.

Mr. Timm expressed concern about the proposed parking and access to the site, particularly the proposition of a second access off of the Beatty Street lane because of the load that would put on a lane that already has traffic challenges. Mr. Segal responded that the Beatty Street lane would be a relief valve or emergency route in case either of the two primary access points are under repair or blocked or Expo lane proves to be overloaded or problematic. The intent is to explore possible use of the Beatty Street lane, which staff understand has its own problems.

Mr. Scobie asked Mr. Segal to explain how the access issue is to be resolved. Mr. Segal responded that the issue remains of where it is suitable to create a relief valve to the Beatty Street lane and whether that is even reasonable or desirable. With more than 600 cars on this site staff are looking for as much latitude as possible to examine options to accommodate the various circumstances.

Mr. MacGregor asked what the plan was for parking when development on this site was to be commercial space. Mr. Segal responded that parking would have come off Keefer Circle and the Guidelines reference that; however over time it was recognized that that was not ideal.

Mr. MacGregor asked for clarification regarding the agreement with Translink in terms of access off of the lane under the SkyTrain station. Mr. Thomson responded that the Note to Applicant in condition 1.1 refers to the Translink right of way and that the applicant and staff will have to meet with Translink and potentially modify the existing right of way.

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor regarding secondary parking access, Mr. Thomson confirmed that the plan is to provide secondary access via Keefer Circle.

With respect to condition 1.15, Mr. Thomson explained that the area is subject to a number of modifications to the original right of way which will take some time to work through. Translink has raised concerns regarding the need for access to their façade and Mr. Thomson noted that there is considerable work to be done in resolving this condition.

Mr. MacGregor questioned how disabled access was being addressed. Mr. Segal responded that this submission did not include a new arrangement for disabled access. There is a condition that calls for the applicant, at the complete application stage, to provide better disabled access than the existing Paris Place elevator access which is not satisfactory. Mr. MacGregor said that he would like to see that condition amended to become a condition calling for further design development.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley regarding condition 1.2, Mr. Segal explained that the tower width reduction staff are looking for is modest and focused on two end suites so as not to disrupt the angular geometry of the building while drawing in the overall width. Staff are working with the architect and think that by reducing each suite by about 7.5 ft. the intent of the condition can be achieved.

Mr. Beasley stated that the urban design intention for the lower street wall encompassing Keefer Circle was for a coherent assembly; not to have two sides of a circle that are different. He was concerned that the massing proposed was absolutely different, not balanced and not symmetrical. Mr. Beasley asked if it is the intent of condition 1.6 that those issues such as general massing, not just details, be reviewed in the complete application stage to come up with something more as the Guidelines intended. Mr. Segal responded that the intent of the condition is that that space read as two sides of a circle. Staff have not concluded that the colonnade has to be exactly the same as the Paris Place side of the circle. Mr. Segal confirmed that the massing of the colonnade is included in condition 1.6; however it tries to combine Abbott Street and Keefer Circle and the Board may want to separate them into condition 1.6a and 1.6b.

In answer to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding clarification of condition A.2.3 as to whether all portions of Lot 203 are included in application or what parts the recommendation deals with, Mr. Thomson advised that the legal parcel is separated by the Beatty Street lane. There is a small portion of the parcel that fronts on both Beatty Street and backs onto the lane, and the main portion of Lot 203 is the area addressed in the comment proposal. Mr. Thomson stated that the application drawings do not seem to do anything with the Beatty Street fronting portion of Lot 203, and Engineering wishes to clarify the applicant's intent. Mr. Thomson said that area of Keefer Steps has been, for a number of years, problematic for the City in terms of graffiti and use of staff time to deal with the many issues that could be resolved if we take another look at Lot 203 at this time.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. J. Hancock, Hancock Bruckner Eng & Wright Architects, stated that it was discussed at length whether the opposite side of the crescent could be treated differently and the applicant team feels that the proposed massing will allow more sun to penetrate into Keefer Circle and also notes that many European plazas are treated differently on each side. He indicated he was open to comments from the Board regarding the treatment of the crescent.

Ms. Heyvarts, Hancock Bruckner Eng & Wright Architects, spoke to issues regarding specific conditions as follows:

Condition 1.1, regarding parking access, needs to be discussed further with Engineering Services.

Condition 1.2 which addresses the width of tower B, would require a reduction in tower width to less than 100 ft. and would result in a redesign of the tower.

Condition 1.6, regarding the proposed building massing and design adjacent Keefer Circle, Ms. Heyvarts said that the applicant team believes the proposed height will better serve the circle in terms of access to sunlight.

Condition 1.10, regarding the feature in the centre of the turnaround, Ms. Heyvarts stated that this is not part of the development and should be an issue for the Planning and Engineering Departments to resolve between themselves.

Condition 1.12, concerning the colonnade, Ms. Heyvarts stated that the applicant team does not believe that it should be a specific copy of the existing Paris Place half of the circle.

Mr. Scobie asked if the applicant received a copy of the additional condition 1.15 that is being added by staff. Mr. Hancock stated that he did receive a copy and it is his intention to maintain an 80 ft. separation between the buildings.

Questions/Discussion

With respect to condition 1.2, Mr. Beasley asked the applicant if they were comfortable with the new wording, deleting 95 ft., providing that the width adjustment is a modest change. Mr. Hancock responded that the applicant team can work with staff to adjust the proposed tower width and the proposed new wording of condition 1.2 is acceptable.

With respect to condition 1.10, addressing the feature in the middle of Keefer Circle, Mr. MacGregor said that he feels it is legitimate to consider that feature as part of this development and encouraged the applicant to work with the Engineering Department on any issues of underground utilities in that space. Mr. Carney, Henderson Development, said that he does not have a problem with the condition and will work with City staff to find a solution.

Mr. Timm questioned the nature of the frontage referenced in conditions 1.7 and 1.8. Mr. Segal responded that the majority of the frontage from the corner and along Expo Boulevard is taken up by lobby for the tower. There is no specific reference to retail uses but with all of the SkyTrain traffic in that area retail might be appropriate at that location.

Comments from other Speakers

Mr. Goodall, resident of 550 Beatty Street, stated that the building he lives in was the first warehouse conversion in the downtown area. Mr. Goodall was generally supportive of the new developments going on around his building because he believes that all of the new residents will make his neighbourhood better.

Mr. Goodall said that when he purchased his fourth floor suite he was told that the site under construction would have two towers right against the SkyTrain track. The concern for residents of 550 Beatty Street is for their views; being able to see the sky, some open views between new towers and Science World from their building. Their biggest concern is tower B which will be located right outside their windows and will block a big part of the view that is not already being blocked by the Firenze development.

Mr. Goodall said that he would like to see tower B as wide as it wants to be on the south face, narrow on the west face and pushed back as far into the SkyTrain corner as the site allows. Mr. Goodall stated that tower B location would be detrimental to 550 Beatty residents and anyone living on that block of Beatty Street. He also expressed concern with the proposed 8 or 9 storey mid-rise building along the Abbott Street frontage.

In terms of massing adjacent to Keefer Circle, Mr. Goodall stated that if the south side is as tall and massive as the north side it would block the views of 550 Beatty residents. In addition, the retail that is being planned is not needed or wanted since there is an abundance of empty retail space available within a block of this site at Tinseltown.

In summary, Mr. Goodall said that his issue and those of the residents at 550 Beatty Street is view impacts while recognizing that they live downtown and are not entitled to unobstructed views.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley regarding Mr. Goodall's suggestion to slide tower B to the south and maybe west, Mr. Segal responded that the siting in the Guidelines is very prescriptive which causes the centre of this tower and the classical framing of Keefer Circle to

be located as proposed. If the tower was moved to the south there would be greater shadow impact on Keefer Circle which is an important public area. In addition, Mr. Segal stated that moving the tower would have other implications that haven't been assessed such as how far the tower core would get from the entrance and it's relation to the Paris Place tower. Ms. Heyvarts outlined some concerns with moving the tower from the applicant's perspective.

Mr. Beasley suggested further discussion between the applicant and the 550 Beatty residents to examine tower B siting and view implications.

Mr. D. Almus, 550 Beatty resident, said he was really concerned about the height of the proposed mid-rise on Abbott Street. Mr. Almus said that there is a shortage of facilities in the area and the problems with drug use and the lack of public washrooms reflect that. Mr. Almus also expressed concern about the proposal to use the Beatty Street lane because it is already a problem in terms of traffic and adding more would make it worse.

Ms. J. Langdon, Europa Building resident, stated that she was concerned with graffiti along Keefer steps, securing of a feature in the centre point of the circle, and improved disabled access including more signage to indicate where to find that access.

Ms. Langdon said that in terms of retail she found the Tinseltown mall to be dismal. The direction the mall has taken has been a discouragement to residents.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Endall said that this application was reviewed by the Urban Design Panel and received unanimous support, with some concerns regarding the planned form of tower A. The Panel thought this was a thorough document package which provided a lot of confidence that, through design development at the complete application stage, the Panel's comments could be adequately addressed. The Panel did not have any issues with the proposed tower heights or floor plate sizes; however the Panel did express some discomfort with the proposed width of tower B which should be appropriately addressed via the conditions proposed.

Mr. Endall's personal comments regarding the colonnade were that he is strongly supportive of the direction that the applicant has taken. Mr. Endall felt the proposal respects aspects of the existing colonnade on the opposite side of the circle while introducing a variation of materials. Mr. Endall suggested that the applicant work more closely with delegates from neighbouring towers to examine possible adjustments of the siting of tower B and reduction of its width. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley regarding the minutes of the Panel meeting, Mr. Endall explained that there was not a consensus by the Panel that tower B was too wide.

Mr. Acton noted that this is an important project to consolidate and realize the original concepts. Mr. Acton was supportive of the proposed conditions, but indicated his disappointment in not hearing any response from the applicant with respect to sustainability as proposed in condition 1.13. Mr. Acton also said that disabled access has been sorely missed and he would like to see it expanded upon and further enhanced with a plan to incorporate more disabled access.

Ms. Hung said that the conditions listed in the Development Permit Staff Committee Report should lead to a pleasing complete application. Ms. Hung noted that the skybridge, which connects the mid-rise to the tower, seems to be a bit of an afterthought and, in terms of livability, felt it would be inconvenient for residents to share the elevator. Ms. Hung stated that the 11 ft. separation between the mid-rise and tower A is too close and she is interested

in seeing the updated drawings to see the relationship between the two, particularly with respect to separation.

For such a large development in downtown with close proximity to shopping, Ms. Hung said that she hoped the residents would adopt a car-free lifestyle and she would like to see some of the residential parking spaces made available as car co-op spaces. Lastly, Ms. Hung stated that she was looking forward to seeing Keefer Circle completed.

Ms. Maust echoed Mr. Beasley's comments and encouraged the applicant to meet with the residents of 550 Beatty Street to discuss possible view impacts and options. Ms. Maust also noted that moving the tower may not benefit the 550 Beatty Street building as a whole and asked the applicant to give that careful consideration.

Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor said that the towers are located in accordance with the Guidelines adopted by Council; therefore he does not see tower location as an issue. Mr. MacGregor stated that the conditions in the report would go a long way to make improvements to this development which he was happy to see proceeding.

Mr. MacGregor expressed concerns about both the proposed completion of the colonnade and the parking access. He stressed that there must be adequate access off of Keefer Circle and he will look to staff to pursue that option.

Mr. MacGregor moved approval in principle with all of the conditions in the Development Permit Staff Committee Report, dated September 28, 2005 as well as recommended changes introduced by Mr. Segal.

Mr. Beasley seconded the motion for approval in principle, posing a couple of suggestions for further changes to conditions, for Mr. MacGregor's consideration. Mr. Beasley stated that he did not have comfort that all of the project's interfaces would be well handled.

Mr. Beasley supported condition 1.17 as put by Mr. MacGregor. With respect to the area underneath SkyTrain and the interface with that lane, Mr. Beasley said that it was an important façade of this project; it must be finished and not a utility façade. Mr. Beasley was very supportive of the new condition added by Mr. MacGregor regarding vertical circulation at the interface with Keefer Steps.

Mr. Beasley proposed adding a condition that acknowledged tower B is most likely in the right location suggesting that the applicant and staff work with the neighbours to finalize the location and ensure that there aren't any improvements that haven't been considered.

Mr. Beasley suggested adding several more conditions, the specific wording of which was crafted with Mr. Timm. Mr. MacGregor stated that the additions and changes were acceptable with the exception of the proposed condition 1.19 which Mr. MacGregor did not support.

Mr. Timm stated that he would support further revision to condition 1.19 to make it a consideration item. He supported Mr. Beasley's comments. Mr. Timm said that important issues such as Keefer Circle and the design have been addressed; however the area under the SkyTrain platform and station entry plaza were not adequately addressed in this preliminary application and need to be addressed at the complete application stage.

With respect to additional parking access off of the Beatty Street lane, Mr. Timm said that he is hesitant to think that that can be done without creating unacceptable impacts on the lane.

Mr. Scobie asked the applicant to comment on items in Appendix C to concerns at the building permit stage. Mr. Hancock responded that those items will be taken into consideration.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE IN PRINCIPLE Development Application No. 409456, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated September 28, 2005, with the following amendments:

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in 1.2 to delete "to approximately 95 ft.";

Delete 1.3 and replace it with a new condition 1.3:
confirmation that Tower A achieves a minimum separation of 80 ft. from Firenze F2 across Abbott Street;

Revise the **Note to Applicant** in 1.6 to delete "Further study of Keefer Circle's proposed relationship to the existing Paris Place colonnade is required. Provision of details and materials is required illustrating the design resolution and completion of Keefer Place and Keefer Circle";

Amend 1.7 to read:
design development to create a positive sidewalk interface on Expo Boulevard (west side) by relocating the proposed mechanical room away from the street *and placing active uses along the street and adjacent to the transit entry plaza*;

Delete the **Note to Applicant** in 1.7;

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in 1.8 to delete the last sentence;

Add condition 1.15 and **Note to Applicant**:
design development to the area beneath the SkyTrain Platform to create an attractive environment through decorative screening and surface elements, lighting, colour, etc. while addressing CPTED matters;

Note to Applicant: Eliminating chain link fencing and barbwire, repairing damaged surfaces, etc. should be pursued.

Add condition 1.16 and **Note to Applicant**:
design development to ensure adequate, safe and accessible public disabled access between upper Keefer steps and the lower Keefer Place and enter into agreements to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services and the Director of Legal Services for the provision of this access;

Note to Applicant: Access times must be compatible with the transit station operation and the solution must provide access from the lower Keefer steps to Beatty Street.

Add condition 1.17:
replicate the existing Keefer Place colonnade to the design, massing, detailing and materials in this application;

Add condition 1.18:
design development to explore completing the treatment of the plaza in front of the SkyTrain station with final cost sharing to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services;

Add condition 1.19:
consideration to finalize the specific location of Tower B with advice from the neighbours on Beatty Street, acknowledging that the tower is generally in the optimal location;

Delete A.2.1.

4. 1010 East 17th Avenue - DE409382 - ZONE RS-1
(COMPLETE)

Applicant: Nicolson Tamaki

Request: To construct a 2-storey Elementary School on this site, with one-level of underground parking for 20 cars, with associated playfield and green space.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Bob Adair, Development Planner, presented this application for a new Charles Dickens School. Mr. Adair described the proposal to construct a new school consisting of three main blocks: a teaching/classroom block; a more public multi-purpose area with a roof garden in the centre block; and a gymnasium block. The site would have specialized play areas and the proposal includes extending the play area over Glen Drive. The garbage would be located off 18th Avenue as would loading, with the music program located in a portable classroom near the loading and garbage.

Mr. Adair provided some background on this application, noting the most prominent issue is the proposed demolition of the existing school. There is funding in place for seismic upgrading; however, the Vancouver School Board (VSB) determined that it would be less expensive to build a new school than to upgrade the existing school. There were public meetings to explain the seismic program and plans for the new building. A report went to City Council in July 2005 and staff were instructed not to delay the processing of an application for a new school while continuing to explore the possible retention of all or part of the existing school. City staff and the VSB looked at five options which are summarized in the report and more fully described in one of the Appendices.

Mr. Adair said that after reviewing the options and impacts on costs and timing the VSB indicated that they wanted to pursue this application before the Development Permit Board. There will be further exploration of Option 1 which shows the new school with the old school left standing during construction to allow the children to remain in the old school. Mr. Adair said there may also be an opportunity to find a lessee to take the southern portion of the existing school, at a cost of 2 million dollars which would go towards upgrading.

Mr. Adair noted that any sale of land for residential uses in order to fund retention would go against VSB policy to not give up any school land.

Mr. Adair stated that the notification results were split between those who, from a safety standpoint, want a new school, and those that wanted more exploration of possible retention options. Mr. Adair said that although the site is not on the Vancouver Heritage Register, recent evaluation indicates it should be, and while staff regret to see any heritage building demolished they believe that this development is supportable.

With respect to conditions 1.1 and 1.2, Mr. Adair explained that portable structures cannot be approved as part of this application and would have to be submitted for approval separately. Staff however, encourage the VSB to find space in the new building so that portables are not required. Condition 1.2 proposes deleting the portable building and shifting the playing field back to the west, off of the Glen Drive street allowance which staff feel is a better formal solution for Glen Drive.

In summary, Mr. Adair said that the new school is approvable within the District Schedule and staff acknowledge the VSB mandate. The Development Permit Staff Committee recommendation is to approve the application, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

Mr. Scobie reminded the Board and Panel about which decisions will constitute a relaxation of the By-law versus the Board exercising it's discretion. He also asked the Board and Advisory Panel to note that a couple of aspects of this application will not be decided by the Development Permit Board as those decisions exclusively rest with the Director of Planning.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley asked if staff have been given any advice from the VSB about further exploration of Option 1. Mr. Adair responded that there has been nothing further than VSB's intention to take Option 1 to their Board for consideration. Mr. Adair said that it is anticipated the VSB Board will support Option 1.

Mr. Scobie sought clarification with respect to the VSB's use of Glen Drive and whether the existing portables are covered under a lease with the City. Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, responded with a broader history of Glen Drive noting that in 1955 City Council recommended the closure of Glen Drive to traffic to provide a safer crossing from the school to Sunnyside Park. In 1968 City Council approved the placement of a portable and further approvals for portables were made in 1989 and 1997 with letters from the VSB to indemnify the City and agreement to removal of the portables within 30 days of receiving notice. Mr. Thomson stated that on May 2, 2005 the VSB approached the City with a request to lease Glen Drive; this request does not include portables.

Mr. Timm said that he did not find, within the report, any policy context that would suggest that the Development Permit Board should take into account the retention of the old school when considering approving the new school. Mr. Adair responded that there is no applicable policy. Unless the building is designated there is always a risk of demolition. Mr. Adair said that staff are recommending approval; however they would like the VSB to explore possible retention options.

Applicant's Comments

James Tamaki, Nicolson Tamaki Architects Inc., acknowledged Mr. Adair's detailed description of the application and said that the applicant team sees no significant issues with the

conditions recommended by the Staff Committee. Mr. Tamaki said that the applicant team will deal with the issues addressed in the conditions if they receive approval to proceed with this application.

Henry Ahking, Vancouver School Board (VSB), said that all five options for possible heritage retention were recently presented to the Trustees and they concur that Option 1 is the only viable option that they would support exploring further since all of the other options would incur costs for which the VSB does not have funding. With escalating construction costs, Mr. Ahking said that the VSB feels a sense of urgency to tender the replacement school for this project.

Mr. Ahking said that this building was identified as a "high risk" building and support was given 2.5 years ago to study the feasibility for a replacement building or an upgrade to the existing building. Some of the factors against upgrading are that the replacement school under current area standards is smaller than the existing school and the oversize school was a terrible disadvantage to start off with in terms of operating costs and trying to make a business case to the Ministry of Education. In addition, the extent of remediation work needed to such an old building was truly extensive.

From a sustainability aspect, the VSB has committed to pursuing a LEED rating with a chance at achieving LEED silver. This is the first VSB project to undertake a green design. The existing site has 6 percent green area and the new proposal will have 65 percent green area.

Mr. Shuttleworth, structural engineer, described the results of the seismic assessment of the existing school. He explained that a seismic upgrade would entail stripping the building down to the bones with only the concrete frame and exterior walls remaining. Not only would this be very expensive and onerous but the children would have to be relocated while this process took place. Mr. Shuttleworth also noted that such a seismic upgrade would not have the ductility that there would be in a new building which could be designed to achieve higher seismic performance, reflecting a 1.3 "importance factor".

In summary, Mr. Ahking stated that the VSB is attempting to serve the education needs and is looking at a functional improvement by getting a better school than what could be achieved in retaining the existing school. The construction of a new school will also provide a lower disruption factor, as well as costing less to maintain over the long run. All of these factors contribute towards replacement as the most advantageous option in this case.

Questions/Discussion

In response to a request from Mr. Endall for clarification of the 5 options for retention, Yardley McNeill, Heritage Planner, reviewed all 5 options as per Appendix H pages 7 and 8.

Ms. Maust asked if the existing building could be 100 percent seismically upgraded and designed to a 1.3 importance factor. Mr. Shuttleworth responded that the design force level could be accommodated with the old building and that it could be designed to a 1.3 importance factor.

Ms. Maust asked whether the applicant considered the number of LEED points they would receive if they preserved the existing building, noting building retention and re-use is one of the LEED criteria. The applicant responded that they have not looked into that.

Mr. Beasley asked the applicant to comment on condition 1.5 with respect to lowering the parking structure. The applicant responded that it could be difficult to get all of the parking

structure underground. The applicant stated that they could look at lowering it slightly and creating a steeper ramp or another option would be to move the vehicle ramp further west.

Mr. Scobie asked staff to comment on the parking structure, in terms of natural light into the parking and any street tree conflicts. Mr. Adair responded that the applicant indicated that school staff would feel safer if the parking was open to the daylight outside; however from a CPTED standpoint safety is a matter of having controlled access not day lighting. Mr. Adair also noted that the applicant would still need to install mechanical ventilation even if the parking was open to the outside. With respect to the street trees, Mr. Adair said that if the ramp was narrowed and moved to the west it might be able to fit between the existing street trees. Mr. Adair suggested an amendment to the second sentence in the Note to Applicant under condition 1.4 to state that the ramp should be located to minimize conflict with pedestrian entry and other parking access locations may be considered.

Comments from other Speakers

The following delegations spoke in support of this application:

Mr. Clark, Parent Advisory Committee Co-Chair
Ms. Claudia Schaberg
Ms. Martha Christenson
Mr. G. Chamia
Mr. Perpich, Principal, Charles Dickens School
Ms. M. Karen

Comments in support included:

- existing school is seismically unsafe;
- the safety of children and staff is a primary concern;
- the new design takes into account the alternative classroom teaching methods employed at Charles Dickens School;
- the new school will benefit the community by providing a gymnasium and meeting space for after hours use;
- the new gymnasium and multipurpose area will be designed as a post-disaster facility;
- there will be less disruption to the staff and students by building a new school rather than renovating the existing school;
- this will fulfill the need to deliver quality education with minimal disruption;
- the LEEDS design will set a standard for the community and for the construction of other new schools; and
- the sustainable design features incorporated into the new school design demonstrates the VSB's commitment to protecting the environment and will provide an example for teaching the children about energy efficiency.

The following delegations spoke in opposition to the application:

Mr. Russ St. Eloi
Mr. Ed Levinson
Ms. McGeough
Mr. Luxton, Heritage Vancouver
Mr. Amrolla

Comments in opposition included:

- the school has historic merit and holds memories for residents of the neighbourhood;
- the new school will be too small for the planned higher density for this area;

- there are other heritage schools that have been seismically upgraded and so can this school;
- the proposal for the new school is smaller with narrow hallways, less windows and no outdoor covered areas;
- the proposal does not blend with surrounding buildings;
- Charles Dickens School should be on the same plan for upgrading as the rest of the heritage schools in the City;
- the new school is not about safety or educational improvements but about saving money;
- the existing school is beautifully set symmetrically on the lot;
- the safety standards for seismically upgraded heritage schools are acceptable;
- Charles Dickens School is a landmark heritage building in the neighbourhood;
- the Vancouver School Board needs to go back to the Province and discuss funding to save heritage schools;
- there should be a larger public process;
- the possibility of preserving part of the existing school is not enough;
- it seems to be a choice between safety or heritage, a green building or heritage, and that attitude puts all public buildings at risk of demolition;
- there was support for Option 4 rather than this proposal;
- the idea behind seismic upgrades is to improve safety not to replace buildings;
- there are precedents for retrofits of historic schools for modern education layouts in other districts.

A memo was submitted to the Board by the Vancouver Heritage Commission that outlined their concerns for the proposal and their desire to see Option 4 or other avenues for heritage retention pursued.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Endall noted that when this application came before the Urban Design Panel there were just enough Panel members present for a quorum. At that meeting the application received unanimous support from the Panel members present.

The Panel concentrated on reviewing the application as submitted, not with disregard to heritage but with retention as a side issue. The Panel found this to be a very rational proposal taking into consideration the budgeting challenges. The Panel was particularly supportive of the commitment to sustainable design. Mr. Endall stated that the conditions listed in the report cover most of the Panel recommendations quite comprehensively.

The most important Panel comments and most important corresponding conditions recommended by the Staff Committee are 1.4 and 1.5 as they address the parking edge treatment and the entrance to the parking. Mr. Endall said that he would reinforce those conditions. The Panel did comment that retaining a portion of the existing building should be investigated.

Mr. Endall said that typically he is a staunch advocate of heritage retention and there is no doubt that the loss of this school would be a huge loss for the neighbourhood. Mr. Endall said that there are very compelling arguments for both sides. To sum up, Mr. Endall said that he feels we may be looking at the best option at this point in terms of preserving heritage options because this proposal, as submitted, still leaves an option for retention. Mr. Endall

recommended that strong encouragement be included in the conditions for the applicant to continue to seriously examine options and ideas to retain as much as possible of the existing building.

Ms. Hung said that she strongly supports retention of heritage buildings in Vancouver; however, the reality with this application is that the existing building is unsafe for occupants and there isn't the money to retain the building. Ms. Hung stated that she finds the proposal for the replacement school to be pleasant and contemporary in design and believes it will offer a safe and excellent learning environment for kids.

Minor concerns that Ms. Hung had were that she would prefer to see the parking structure fully underground and more thought given to the amount of uninterrupted brick wall presented by the gymnasium to the single-family homes opposite. Given the safety and funding issues, Ms. Hung said that she supports this application and hopes that a portion of the existing building can be retained and strongly urged concerned parents and members of the heritage community to pursue that.

Ms. Maust said that the existing Charles Dickens school does have heritage value. The Vancouver Heritage Commission made a motion on October 4, 2005 asking that Option 4 be revisited and pressure applied in any way to make heritage retention a possibility. Ms. Maust noted that what the Development Permit Board has before it is a Council mandate to consider the application as submitted. Ms. Maust said that the Vancouver Heritage Commission will pursue the issue of heritage retention with City Council.

Board Discussion

Mr. Scobie reminded the Board members that the proposed use is conditional in the context of the redevelopment of the site and that this entails a discussion by the Board using its discretionary authority. The Board is also being asked to use its authority to relax the Zoning and Development By-law provision to allow for more than one building on the site while the new building is being constructed. This aspect of the decision would be subject to appeal to the Board of Variance. The Development Permit Staff Committee has recommended a time limit for demolition of the old building.

Mr. Scobie also noted that it is implicit in the report that some aspects of the application will require that decisions be made by the Director of Planning. Mr. Beasley responded that as Director of Planning he would follow the advice of the Board and exercise his authority consistent with the advice of the Board. Mr. Scobie cautioned Mr. Beasley in expressing his position in that manner.

Mr. Thomson asked that the Note to Applicant in condition A.2.5. be deleted from the report as it should not have been included in the report.

Mr. Timm clarified for members of the public that attended this meeting, the Development Permit Board does not set policy but rather administers policy on behalf of Council and in this instance Council has instructed staff to process the application for a replacement school while possible retention options continue to be explored. Mr. Timm noted that the exploration of viable options must not affect the construction of a new school. For the Board not to approve this application would go against Council direction.

Mr. Timm said that there is no question that this is a significant building to the community and it would be unfortunate to lose it. Mr. Timm said that he understands building ductility and

fully accepts the advice of the structural engineer regarding the inherent seismic limitations of this building.

Mr. Timm moved approval of this application subject to the conditions of the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated September 28, 2005 with minor amendments to conditions.

Mr. MacGregor seconded the motion and added that it is difficult for the Board to try and deal with the heritage issue. Mr. MacGregor stated that the proposal for the new school is before the Board and Council has given instructions for the Board to proceed. Mr. MacGregor said that he believes there should be a broader policy discussion with the VSB, about which schools have heritage merit.

Mr. MacGregor recognized that people in the community feel strongly about the heritage issues and the safety of the children and he hopes that staff will have further discussions with the VSB around retention options. Mr. MacGregor said that he is supportive of the Staff Committee recommendations and the amendments made by Mr. Timm.

Mr. Beasley said as Director of Planning there are instructions from Council that go beyond the Board today to pursue the need to retain a heritage building and provide safe schools. Mr. Beasley said that there is not anything in existing Council policy or the Zoning and Development By-law that allows this application to not be approved.

Mr. Beasley stated that there are two aspects of this application that are important to him and they are the need to get parking below grade or as close to below grade as possible, and the integrity of Glen Drive as a right-of-way. Mr. Beasley said that he did not think it is the right decision to remove the significant trees flanking this right-of-way in order to put in a playing field, so condition 1.2 is very important.

Mr. Beasley said that he felt energized to go back into discussions with the VSB and the Ministry of Education and he hoped that the Heritage Commission would attend and argue for heritage retention. Mr. Beasley said that people have always identified the school as an important historic building in the community and that can't be set aside.

Mr. Scobie said that it is not the Board's decision to retain the existing building, it is the decision of the property owner, the VSB, to retain the building and the VSB are subject to limitations set by the Provincial Government.

Mr. Scobie noted that Council has asked the Director of Planning to update the Vancouver Heritage Register to investigate other schools and buildings that may warrant being on the register. If Charles Dickens School had been on the Vancouver Heritage Register there would have been a different obligation for examination of retention alternatives before a new school could have been advanced.

With respect to Director of Planning decisions, Mr. MacGregor said that the Board's advice to the Director of Planning is to, within the authority of the Director of Planning, deal with specific relaxations or judgments under the various sections of the By-law to reflect the decision of the Board to approve the new school proposal.

Mr. Timm said the Board's advice to the Director of Planning is a recommendation for approval of this application. Mr. Timm noted the Director of Planning decision should be made consistent with the Board's decision.

Mr. Scobie stated that he will leave it to the Director of Planning to reach his decision and convey it to the applicant.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Permit Application No. 409382, in terms of use for the school and site redevelopment in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated September 28, 2005 with amendments; and

THAT the Board relax section 3.2.4 of the Zoning and Development By-law limitation on the site to allow for two buildings on the site for a time limited period of 90 days after the occupancy of the new school, to allow for further exploration of retention options.

Amend the second sentence in the **Note to Applicant** in 1.4 to read:

The ramp should be located *to minimize conflict with the pedestrian entry, noting other parking access locations may be considered.*

Delete the Note to Applicant in A.2.5

4. OTHER BUSINESS

a) 700 Hamilton (CBC) - DE409307

Mr. Scobie noted that the preliminary application received approval in principle at the August 29, 2005, Development Permit Board meeting, subject to conditions to be addressed in submitting a complete application. One of the conditions established by the Board sought a significant reduction in tower floor plates. The complete application has recently been submitted with revised floor plates. The applicant is seeking some early feedback on the adequacy of the floor plate response and has asked that the scheme be presented for informal commentary by the Board.

Mr. Segal, Development Planner, provided staff's preliminary thoughts on the complete application submission with regard to floor plate sizes, stating that staff believe the new application is going in the right direction. Mr. Segal also provided the Board with a survey of floor plate sizes in surrounding buildings.

Mr. MacGregor said, subject to the advice of the other Board members, the revised design of the taller tower is going in the right direction; however he is still concerned with the size dimension of the proposed floor plates since it does not reflect the floor plate size of the surrounding towers. He said the floor plate size of 8,350 sq.ft. for the smaller, slimmed down tower is a trade off for achieving wider separation between the two towers. Mr. MacGregor noted that achieving a narrower tower dimension was an important issue for him at the preliminary application stage.

Mr. Beasley said that this site is in a transitional zone between the residential buildings and the commercial area. He said that there may be more tolerance for larger floor plates in this block than there would be in the middle of the Downtown South District. Mr. Beasley said the design is going in the right direction and he can see the logic for the scale that is proposed.

Mr. Timm said that by narrowing the east-west dimension of the tower the design becomes similar to the intent of the Downtown South Guidelines which calls for smaller floor plates to achieve better tower proximity, maintain views, etc.

With respect to the complete application, Mr. Timm said that the Board would need to hear from the public and the Urban Design Panel before they could comment any further.

- b) Discussion of circumstances - and possible criteria/procedures - for entertaining future requests for informal commentary from the Board regarding applicants' design response to conditions of approval.

Mr. Scobie asked the Board to consider the criteria or circumstances in which they would be willing to consider an applicant returning to the Board to get a sense of whether their design is headed in the right direction.

Mr. Beasley said, in this case and it should seldom be done, he was willing to consider providing informal commentary to the applicant because two of the regular Board members did not have the opportunity to see this application at the preliminary stage.

Mr. MacGregor said, in this case, there had not been sufficient information about the surrounding tower floor plate sizes for the Board to feel comfortable with the proposal.

The voting members of the Board did not favour criteria for when an applicant may seek informal advice from the Board, although there was agreement there may be excessive demands to do so.

In reflecting on the 700 Hamilton (CBC) situation, Mr. MacGregor thought the preliminary approval may have been premature in terms of establishing conditions without the benefit of complete information. In future situations perhaps, the Board should consider whether it is best to defer a decision until more information is available.

There was consensus among the Board members that if this circumstance arose again the item should be noted on the Development Permit Board meeting agenda under Other Business and the Board will have a discussion about whether they are prepared to give advice at that time. The overall feeling was that these types of requests should not be a regular occurrence, but rather applicants should follow the standard process of returning to the Board after a full staff review has been completed on a formal application.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

D. Kempton

F. Scobie
Chair