

Date: Tuesday, October 15, 2002
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
D. Rudberg General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

W. Francl Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions (excused 1001 Homer Street)
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry (present only for 900 Burrard)
E. Mah Representative of Development Industry
D. Chung Representative of General Public
M. Mortensen Representative of General Public
C. Henschel Representative of General Public

Regrets

J. Leduc Representative of General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

J.O. Barrett Development Planner
A. Higginson Project Facilitator
S. Hein Development Planner
V. Potter Project Facilitator
M. Thomson City Surveyor

Item 3 - 900 Burrard Street

C. Brook Brook Development Planning Inc.
F. Rafii Foad Rafii Architects
C. Bosa Bosa Ventures Inc.

Item 4 - 1001 Homer Street

A. Chilcott Polygon Imperial Landing Ltd.
J. Hancock Hancock Bruckner Eng & Wright Architects
C. Philips Philips Wuori Long Inc., Landscape Architects

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

The Chair welcomed the following new Advisory Panel members, recently appointed by City Council:

Ed Mah, representing the development industry
Craig Henschel, representing the general public

Mr. Scobie also extended congratulations to Jim Hancock and Darren Chung who were reappointed to represent the design professions and general public, respectively.

1. MINUTES

The following amendments were made to the previous minutes:

p.3, line 7 under **Development Planner's Opening Comments**: delete "Site consolidation is being sought" and replace with "Buildings on this site will be demolished, ... etc.";

p.6: two references to 1238 Seymour Street to be amended to 438 Seymour Street.

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 30, 2002 be approved as amended.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 900 BURRARD STREET - DE406534 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE AFTER PRELIMINARY)

Applicant: Foad Rafii Architect

Request: To construct a 24-storey mixed-use complex at 8.056 FSR including: retail use; restaurant use; cultural/entertainment uses with nine cinemas (2,146 seats); 456 dwelling units; and 677 parking spaces of which 150 spaces are to be designated for "The Electra" building at 989 Nelson Street.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Jonathan Barrett, presented this application which was approved in principle by the Board on June 10, 2002. Mr. Barrett briefly described the development site, referring to the project model and posted drawings. The main conditions of preliminary approval related to the overall character of the building, the quality of the driveway linking Hornby and Burrard Streets, and residential livability. The current submission incorporates major changes to all aspects of the architectural character. The driveway has been substantially widened and improved, and light and modulation have been introduced into the corridors to improve residential livability. Staff have identified no major issues relating to the complete submission. There are minor concerns relating to the pedestrian canopy system, residential landscape, quality of the driveway and the retail frontage at the corner of Hornby and Smithe Streets. Conditions to address these concerns are outlined in the Staff Committee Report dated October 2, 2002, subject to which the Staff Committee recommendation is for approval of the application. The Development Planner tabled some additions and revisions to the conditions, for the Board's consideration.

Questions/Discussion

Responding to a question from Mr. Beasley regarding the issues raised by the Urban Design Panel, Mr. Barrett said he believed there should be ongoing refinement in some of the areas identified by the Panel, including treatment of the corner of Hornby and Smithe Streets, the material and colour contrast between the commercial and residential components, greater animation at the cinema entry, improved treatment to the blank walls at the corner of Smithe and

Burrard Streets, and treatment of the cinema facades, particularly in relationship to the adjacent Dal Grauer substation.

Regarding the interface with the Dal Grauer substation, Mr. Barrett agreed it may be useful to add a condition requesting design development to the walls and roof of the Dal Grauer to improve their visual character, subject to the agreement of BC Hydro, noting the issue could be included in the ongoing negotiations between the applicant and BC Hydro regarding the use of the private driveway. Mr. Beasley noted the landscaping concept addresses to some degree the interface with the east-facing wall, but the lower 15 ft. of the north-facing wall remains of concern.

Mr. Rudberg sought clarification regarding parking. Mr. Barrett explained the residential parking is at the lower levels and secured from all other parking. Further, the spaces being provided for the Electra are separated from this building's residential parking.

Mr. Scobie questioned the inclusion of condition A.1.11 which requires submission of signage details prior to development permit issuance, given that signage is regulated separately under the Vancouver Sign By-law. Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, agreed the condition could be advisory. He advised the Staff Committee intended to be helpful to the applicant in recommending that attention be given early to signage to avoid potential conflicts that could occur later. Mr. MacGregor commented that an earlier development application for this site proposed extensive internal signage that projected through the exterior glazing.

Mr. Scobie suggested condition A.1.13 is superfluous, and that condition A.3.1 should be a condition of the development permit.

Applicant's Comments

Chuck Brook advised they agree with the Staff Committee that there are no substantive issues. He noted the project has undergone constant refinement since its submission, and he assured the Board they are willing to continue working with staff on ongoing refinement. With respect to the Engineering conditions, Mr. Brook requested adding a preamble sentence calling for arrangements to the satisfaction of the City Engineer in addressing the conditions, noting they have already been working with Engineering Services in this regard.

Foad Rafii, Architect, reiterated they are working on improvements to the design and will continue to do so. Mr. Rafii noted the residents of Electra were concerned about privacy impacts in the preliminary submission. The revised scheme eliminates the previous stepping in favour of four larger landscaped areas. The 4th floor landscaping is for visual access only, except for adjoining suites which have patios at this level. The main landscaped area is on the 11th floor, furthest away from the Electra. The 24th floor has usable landscape and the 18th floor, closest to the Electra, has landscape which is designed in a way that discourages people from congregating and causing potential noise problems for the neighbours. Mr. Rafii said they have worked closely with both their independent traffic consultants and Engineering Services with respect to parking arrangements. With respect to the interface with the Dal Grauer substation, Mr. Rafii advised they have been in discussions with BC Hydro. He noted that BC Hydro has now initiated a renovation proposal for the Dal Grauer. He confirmed that condition 1.6 is acceptable to them because it is contingent on the agreement of BC Hydro.

With respect to condition 1.4 dealing with the retail frontage at the corner of Hornby and Smithe Streets, Colin Bosa, developer, said they want to maintain flexibility in order to accommodate potential tenants. Mr. Brook stressed they are willing to express the frontage so that it does not appear as one large tenancy from the exterior.

In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg concerning condition 1.3, Mr. Rafii said he would have no objection to this being a requirement rather than a consideration item, provided they know exactly what is required.

Comments from Other Speakers

Ken Charko addressed the Board and Panel on behalf of independent theatre owners, expressing opposition to the theatre use of the development. His concerns related to moving the entertainment district from Granville Street, the negative impact on all the independent theatres in Vancouver, and the lack of public awareness of the project because of the confusion caused by the earlier proposal not proceeding. He explained that he believes Famous Players will eventually dominate the market and cause the demise of all the city's independent theatres, as well as create a very negative impact on the Granville Street entertainment district. It will also eventually result in increased cost to the public for this type of entertainment because the existence of the independent theatres currently keeps the average cost of tickets low. Mr. Charko also thought the theatre traffic would cause serious traffic congestion in the area.

The Chair commented that Mr. Charko's statements are unfortunately not well timed given the application has already been approved in principle in terms of the proposed use and basic massing of the development. Mr. Barrett advised that, in July 1999, the previous application (which included 17 cinemas) was reported to Council when it was noted the Downtown South Guidelines encourage theatres and cinemas as part of theatre row. Staff believe that when Council approved the form of development it also took into consideration any impact this development may have on Granville Street. Mr. Barrett noted that 1,400 letters of notification were sent to neighbouring property owners. With respect to traffic, staff do not believe traffic congestion will be a major issue. In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg concerning the use, Mr. Barrett confirmed the CD-1 zoning for this site permits a variety of uses, including cultural and recreational. On this basis, staff have not debated the appropriateness of the theatre use.

Ben Bialek and Emil Schnabl addressed the Board on behalf of the residents of the Electra, 989 Nelson Street. Mr. Schnabl noted that while they had a number of concerns at the preliminary stage, they believe that many improvements have been made and they now support the current proposal. With respect to the Dal Grauer substation, Mr. Bialek said they are not clear what BC Hydro intends but would like to see rooftop improvements. Mr. Barrett confirmed that Heritage Planning staff is involved in BC Hydro's renovation proposal.

The meeting adjourned briefly for Board and Panel members to review the model and posted materials.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Francl noted the project has come a very long way since the initial submission. It was unanimously supported by the Urban Design Panel, with a lot of commentary in response to the scope and scale of the development. The articulation of the building massing is much improved, the various building volumes read much more clearly than previously, there is a much clearer distinction between the commercial and residential components, and there is a better hierarchy of the facade components. The blankness of end walls is also much improved. The driveway in its original design was very cramped and unsuccessful, but the revised driveway is much improved and is now supportable. Mr. Francl said he supported the recommended prior-to conditions, and the suggested amendments to require design refinements with respect to the driveway finishes, and amendments to allow for a larger usage provided the 15 m retail frontage remains clearly defined. Areas that still require some improvement include the differentiation of materials and colours and celebration of the theatre entrance.

Mr. Hancock commented the form of development is quite unlike anything else in Vancouver. Nevertheless, the massing of this complete submission is vastly improved over the initial scheme. The elements are very clearly expressed and it reads as a series of buildings that are related but distinct in some way from each other. As well, the way it frames the Law Courts precinct is very positive, and the relationship to the Electra is quite well resolved. Mr. Hancock said he had some concern about access to parking given the large number of cars that will use one ramp. He had no concern about the retail frontage being expressed as a 15 m rhythm with a larger single use behind. He agreed with Mr. Francl's concern about the differentiation of the elements which appears quite monochromatic. He had some reservations about the relationship at grade to the Dal Grauer substation which seems very restricted. In general, however, Mr. Hancock said he believed the scheme to be quite well resolved. He recommended approval with the conditions as recommended.

Mr. Kavanagh also supported the application, with the recommended conditions. He recommended amendments to 1.3 and 1.4 and deletion of A.1.11 and A.1.13, and the addition of A.2.15.

Mr. Mah supported the application. He commented that retail space can be quite challenging to fill so it is important to be flexible to ensure it does not remain empty. He therefore supported the frontage having the appearance of 15 m width but allowing a larger retail space behind, as the market dictates.

Mr. Mortensen said this submission is considerably better than the preliminary scheme, with benefits to the general public. Removal of some of the blank walls is also beneficial. He recommended approval with the recommended conditions. He agreed it makes sense to allow a larger retail space but to give the appearance of a smaller rhythm.

Mr. Chung recommended approval. He also had some concerns about the single ramp access to the parking. He also supported allowing greater flexibility with respect to the retail frontage.

Mr. Henschel supported the application. He agreed with Mr. Hancock that the proposal is not very typical of Vancouver developments but it has the potential to reflect well on the Law Courts precinct. He thought the elevations had been improved although he considered the previous, stepped iteration to be more friendly to the Electra. He had serious concerns about the darkness in the interior corner which will be very shadowed. Mr. Henschel found the modified driveway to be very exciting and unusual in Vancouver. Overall, he thought the project was much improved over the preliminary scheme.

Board Discussion

Mr. Rudberg said he liked the development because it is somewhat different than the more typical tower and 3-storey podium scheme. He liked the direction of the design development in terms of the refinements that have been made. He moved approval, with amendments and additions to the conditions. With respect to the driveway, Mr. Rudberg said traffic control and signage will be important at peak hours to avoid congestion. He said he hoped the project can proceed, noting earlier proposals that did not come to fruition. He thought the development would be a good addition to the neighbourhood. Mr. Rudberg said he had some concerns about the issue of the use, and hoped there would be no negative impact on the independent theatres because it is important that they continue to operate and flourish in the community. However, given the zoning has been approved and the issue has been addressed by City Council, the Board is not able to reconsider the matter.

Mr. MacGregor recommended a further amendment to 1.6 regarding the Dal Grauer substation, and sought the retention of A.1.11 regarding signage details. He stressed that in this type of entertainment development there will likely be interior signage that is visible from the exterior of the building, which could be argued is not within the provisions of the Sign By-law. Mr. Rudberg concurred. With respect to parking, Mr. MacGregor noted there is very little commercial parking in the development so peak exiting will be fairly minor. On the issue of use, Mr. MacGregor said he, too, did not want to see the loss of the independent theatres but noted that this application has thirty percent less seats than the previous proposal which may lessen any impact. With respect to the design, Mr. MacGregor said the applicant has gone a long way to improving it since the initial submission. He said he was particularly encouraged to learn that the neighbours were now supportive.

Mr. Beasley supported the motion. He said he was also sympathetic to the comments made by Mr. Charko in regard to the industry. He said it is difficult to predict exactly what might occur and also expressed the hope that the independent theatres will continue to operate. However, Council did give some consideration to the matter when it dealt with the initial proposition of there being theatres on this site and was supportable. On the question of whether this is an appropriate form of development, Mr. Beasley said he did not believe it was an anomaly in this neighbourhood. It will also help to engender some diversity in this part of the city. With respect to the application process, Mr. Beasley commended the design team on working closely with staff to bring the project to its current stage, and for working hard to gain the support of the neighbours. The building is significantly simpler and clearer and will be a much better piece of architecture. The interface with the Electra is significantly better. The driveway was a particular concern with the preliminary submission but is now a much better solution. He appreciated the strengthening of the condition dealing with the treatment of the adjacent Dal Grauer substation.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 406534 in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated October 2, 2002, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.3 to delete "consider"; and change "considered" to "addressed" in the **Note to Applicant**;

Amend 1.4 to read:
design development to *articulate and* more closely comply with the retail frontage guideline of 15 m (49 ft.) for the retail unit at the corner of Hornby and Smithe Streets;

Add 1.5:
consider design refinement to the overall building character;

Note to Applicant: The aspects that should be considered include, among others, the following:

- the corner of Hornby and Smithe Streets;
- the general differentiation of architectural elements, such as cornices, by both material and colour;
- the material and colour contrast between the commercial and residential components;
- the cinema entrance; the wall facing the Dal Grauer substation;
- the blank walls at the corner of Smithe and Burrard Streets; and
- the treatment of the cinema facades;

Add 1.6:
design development to the east facing and north facing walls and roof treatment of the Dal Grauer substation to improve their visual character, subject to the applicant using best efforts to finalize an agreement with BC Hydro and to complete any approved improvements, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning;

Amend A.1.11 to read:
submit a comprehensive plan showing details and locations of *interior* signage *which may be visible from the exterior of the building* for an overall assessment;

Delete A.1.13;

Add an introductory sentence after **A.2 Engineering Services**:
Arrangements shall be made to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services, for the following:

Amend A.2.11 to read:
arrangements shall be made, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services, for street trees *and standard treatment of sidewalks*

Add A.2.14:
delete reference to lane from all drawings;
Note to Applicant: The area shown as lane on the landscape plan is a private driveway, albeit affected by a number of registered charges.

Add A.2.15:
submit a copy of the landscape plan directly to Engineering Services for review;

Note to Applicant: The landscape plan continues to refer to Downtown South colours which are not applicable in this area, and plans show significant non-standard sidewalk treatments. Arrangements to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services will be necessary to ensure maintenance and clean up of the proposed trash receptacles.

Delete A.3.1;

Add B.2.8:

The Occupancy Permit will be held pending issuance of a Certificate of Compliance from the Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection for this site.

4. 1001 HOMER STREET - DE406854 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Polygon Imperial Landing Ltd.

Request: To construct a 24-storey residential tower with 130 units including four townhouses and three levels of underground parking.

(Mr. Hancock withdrew from the Advisory Panel for this item, due to conflict of interest)

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Scot Hein, introduced this application which includes a ten percent heritage density transfer. He briefly reviewed the site context, noting the proposal is the third in a series of Nelson Street fronting developments by this developer. All three projects include amenity uses at grade, noting that retail is not required in this location. Mr. Hein advised the project performs well against the Downtown South Guidelines, with the exception of the larger floorplate to accommodate the extra ten percent density. It is below the allowable height and exceeds the minimum 80 ft. tower separation that is generally sought in Downtown South. The proposal also adequately meets the intent of the guidelines with respect to open space. Given the assemblage of the three adjacent properties with the same designers, staff believe a very exciting public realm interface will be achieved. Issues identified with respect to the proposal relate to the Nelson Street fronting uses at grade, tower siting, and appropriateness of the ten percent heritage density transfer. Mr. Hein briefly reviewed the conditions outlined in the Staff Committee Report dated September 18, 2002, subject to which the recommendation is for approval.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley noted the Urban Design Panel recommended that the townhouses read as a *continuous* frontage. However, the condition to reduce the height of the southernmost unit will result in some blank wall. Mr. Hein agreed the condition could be amended to raise the other three townhouses to meet the scale of the southernmost unit.

With respect to the size of the floor plate, Mr. Rudberg commented that the applicant's contention that the larger size is required to achieve economic viability could apply to every tower height. Mr. Hein advised that staff are willing to consider the larger floor plate given the building is lower than the maximum permitted height and creates no view or shadow impacts. Market economics are not part of staff's evaluation.

Applicant's Comments

Jim Hancock, Architect, advised the proposal is for a classical type of building which they believe is an appropriate transition in this location. He advised they are generally satisfied with the recommended prior-to conditions, noting that design development has been ongoing and is progressing to the point that they have no major concerns. With respect to the request for weather protection, Mr. Hancock commented that the three buildings have a particular landscape pattern along Nelson Street which involves a series of alcoves with landscape elements between them. On the previous two buildings weather protection has been provided at the entrances only, which they believe should also apply to this proposal, given they think it would serve little public purpose because the pedestrian route is well away from the edge of the building. Mr. Hancock noted the low end of the podium is almost 32 ft. high which is consistent with the podium expression of the other two buildings. With respect to the height of the townhouses, Mr. Hancock said they have no objection to raising them a little, noting there would be some impact on the residential unit at the southeast corner of the tower. He added, the amount of exposed wall could be mitigated quite easily given the townhouses on the Domus project are quite shallow.

Andre Chilcott, Polygon Imperial Landing Ltd., said the three sites present a unique opportunity for the Nelson Street frontage with the provision of active amenities. He noted they are all very small suites and the floor plate sizes of all the towers is \pm 5,500 sq.ft. which is small compared to many other towers in the area. He briefly described the proposed program for the amenity space which they believe will be interesting and highly animated, particularly at night. With respect to condition 1.4, Mr. Chilcott pointed out there is a fair amount of grade change along Homer Street so it would assist them if there could be some flexibility with respect to the townhouse entry height.

Chris Philips, Landscape Architect, said the Nelson Street streetscape is a unique hybrid. It allows people to engage the amenity spaces, at the same time providing some greening to the street in an interesting pattern.

Questions/Discussion

With respect to condition 1.4, Mr. Beasley said he agreed with the need for flexibility but noted a major factor in the livability of townhouses in Downtown South has been the separation from the sidewalk. With respect to weather protection, Mr. Hein noted the guidelines encourage weather protection where appropriate on non-retail streets. Continuous weather protection is not being sought. Mr. Hancock reiterated his earlier position that weather protection is inappropriate given the landscape approach being proposed. It would also limit some planting opportunities which may conflict with the basic landscape concept. Mr. Hancock confirmed they have no concerns about providing weather protection at both building entrances.

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Francl said the direction of the conditions is supportable. He agreed the townhouses could be raised rather than lowered, as initially suggested. Mr. Francl agreed with the applicant's rationale with respect to weather protection. With respect to the colour palette, Mr. Francl said he would suggest some lightening from that presented. He recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Mah also supported the project.

Mr. Cheng recommended approval. He thought all the townhouses should be the same height.

Mr. Henschel said weather protection could be achieved if the right species of street tree is chosen. With respect to the design of the building, he thought the top seemed too restrained and could be more exuberant.

Mr. Mortensen said it is an attractive building and he recommended approval. He said he would appreciate any opportunity for pedestrian weather protection, especially given its absence on the other two buildings. He urged that it be provided where possible.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley said it is a good project, consistent with other developments in the area. He said he had some concerns, however, with respect to the Downtown South Guidelines which should be followed up by Planning staff. Firstly, that the Nelson Street frontage is composed of amenity spaces. Despite the applicant's assurances that it will be an interesting and animated frontage, experience has shown that most of the amenity spaces in the downtown are very passive, in some instances to the extent of screening the windows. Mr. Beasley said he did not believe it was good planning to have three block faces containing resident amenities at grade. It is also not good planning to have three block faces with no weather protection which, while it may be good for the architecture, is not good for the community. He urged Planning staff to review the guidelines with respect to what occurs on Nelson Street because this could become a very significant negative trend. As well, staff should look at how weather protection is interfaced with landscape features. In this instance, he said he could agree not to press for weather protection since this was the majority view of the Advisory Panel.

Mr. Beasley moved approval, with a number of amendments to the conditions, agreeing to a suggested change to 1.5 from Mr. MacGregor, to retain the reference to the Nelson Street frontage.

Mr. MacGregor commented that the size of the floor plate is about twenty percent greater than that recommended in the guidelines. However, based on the fact that the development across the lane was approved at about the same floor plate size, he said he would be prepared to second the motion of approval. He stressed that on these smaller sites there should be more clarity in the guidelines about what will result. He said there needs to be some consistency with respect to what the Board approves and how the guidelines are interpreted. In discussion, Mr. MacGregor said that rather than revising the guidelines, the Staff Committee Reports need to address this issue more particularly in terms of how applications earn the floor plate size being requested.

Commenting on the issue of weather protection, Mr. Rudberg stressed that achieving a streetscape pattern is desirable, particularly in Downtown South where there are a lot of disparate developments. To now introduce weather protection where it was apparently not sought in adjacent developments, takes away from what the applicant is trying to achieve with the three contiguous sites. Weather protection is certainly appropriate at the entries, but beyond that is not helpful from an overall perspective. Mr. Rudberg noted the Board has been very flexible with respect to floor plate sizes, with a number of developments having floor plates beyond the recommended 5,000 sq.ft., even without a heritage density bonus. He concurred with Mr. MacGregor that greater attention needs to be paid to the issue. Mr. Rudberg said he believed it to be good project overall and he supported the direction it was going.

Mr. Scobie said he appreciated the flexibility introduced to condition 1.4. With respect to weather protection, he commented he found the proposal to be entirely consistent with the guidelines. However, if the intent is to provide a more continuous weather protection environment throughout the Downtown, then the guidelines need to be revised. Mr. Beasley noted that the weather protection guideline is clear that it should be continuous on retail streets and in other areas it speaks to offering opportunities for weather protection. This is very consistent with the Transportation Plan which emphasizes encouraging people to walk in the downtown. The revised condition allows the applicant and staff to conduct a final review to see if any other weather protection can be included. Mr. MacGregor added, he believed there are opportunities to provide refuge for pedestrians within the setback area. This could be an alcove rather than a canopy or awning.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 406854 in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated September 18, 2002, with the following amendments:

Amend the approval preamble to add, after "underground parking,":
including receipt of 10,500 sq.ft. of heritage density bonus transferred from the donor site at 626 West Pender Street;

Amend 1.3 to read:

design development to the Homer Street townhouse component to *make all the townhouses the same height by increasing the height of the row of townhouses to be similar to the southernmost townhouses, acknowledging there may be practical difficulties to achieving the exact height of the southernmost townhouse;*

Amend 1.4: to read:

design development to the Homer Street townhouse component to reduce the extent of patio area in lieu of soft landscaping and to achieve *as close as is practical to 3.0 ft.* entry/patio height above prevailing grades;

Amend 1.5 to read:

design development to introduce weather protection for pedestrians along the Nelson Street frontage *at residential entries, in accordance with the guidelines;*

Add 1.7:

the 626 West Pender Street Heritage Revitalization Agreement registered in the Land Title office be amended to reduce the transferable heritage density by 10,500 sq.ft., to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Director of Legal Services;

Amend A.2.5 to change "staff" to *stall*.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6.35 pm.

C. Hubbard
Clerk to the Board

/ch

F. Scobie
Chair