

Date: Monday, September 13, 2004
 Time: 3.00 p.m.
 Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall and Plaza 500 Hotel

PRESENT:**Board**

I. Adam Assistant City Engineer (Chair)
 L. Beasley Co-Director of Planning
 B. MacGregor Deputy City Manager
 D. Rudberg General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

M. Ostry Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
 J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions
 J. McLean Representative of the Development Industry
 E. Mah Representative of the Development Industry
 K. McNaney Representative of the General Public
 C. Henschel Representative of the General Public
 G. Chung Representative of the General Public

Regrets

D. Chung Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

M.B. Rondeau Development Planner
 M. Mortensen Project Facilitator
 R. Segal Development Planner
 V. Potter Project Facilitator
 M. Thomson City Surveyor
 M. McKay Engineering Services - Projects
 D. Robinson Sr. Social & Cultural Planner

2520 Manitoba Street

A. Johnson Downs Archambault Architects
 D. Galpin Downs Archambault Architects
 C. Clay Developer

1055 Canada Place

R. Anthony Vancouver Convention Centre Expansion Project Ltd.
 K. Grassi Vancouver Convention Centre Expansion Project Ltd.
 J. Brown LMN Architects
 F. Musson Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

1. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of September 8, 2004 were not available.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING**550 Pacific Street - DE408264**

This application was to add one typical floor to an already-approved 22-storey residential building. At its meeting of September 8, 2004, the Board deferred a decision on the application pending receipt of additional information with respect to view impacts to the neighbour of a 22-storey vs. 23-storey tower at 550 Pacific Street, and whether the neighbour was provided with a disclosure statement at the time of her purchase which included disclosure of potential height increases in the adjacent 550 Pacific Street building.

Mr. Beasley noted that he was absent from the September 8 meeting and would abstain from the discussion, noting, however, that he had briefed himself on the topic and would be prepared to participate in the event the other two voting Board members are unable to reach agreement.

Vicki Potter, Project Facilitator, advised that, in considering the application, the Board heard from a neighbour, Bahara Hafizi, regarding the view impacts of the additional floor on her unit in the adjacent building (Azura II). Ms. Hafizi also indicated she had not received a disclosure statement when she purchased the property that would have informed her that there might be additional height added to this building.

Ms. Potter referred to a more detailed view analysis which identifies the lowest level of Ms. Hafizi's suite in relation to the proposal at 22 and 23 storeys. The analysis shows that Ms. Hafizi's view would have been blocked in some way in either case. With respect to the disclosure statement, Ms. Potter advised the neighbour purchased the suite from her father who was the original purchaser. Concord Pacific's records indicate the unit was assigned to Ms. Hafizi in June 2004. Concord Pacific has advised that the original purchase and sale contract to Ms. Hafizi's father included recognition that a disclosure statement had been provided and had been acknowledged by the purchaser.

Mr. Henschel said it is important that the public is able to trust that a building already under construction will be in accordance with its development permit when they purchase another property nearby, and developers should fully disclose when they intend to seek additional massing. Regardless of whether a neighbour's analysis is correct, which in this case appears not to be the case, purchasers should be entitled to trust the process.

Mr. MacGregor stressed there is no guarantee that buildings that already exist will remain indefinitely and that sites will be redeveloped with the same massing. The only reliable source of information as to what may be constructed is the zoning itself, and for the development in question the zoning allows considerably more height than the

23 storeys requested. Mr. MacGregor confirmed his previous motion to approve the application.

Mr. Rudberg said he was now prepared to second Mr. MacGregor's motion given the information received today. He commented that staff need to be careful about information provided to the public, notwithstanding what is permitted under the zoning.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 408624, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated August 18, 2004.

CARRIED
(Mr. Beasley abstained)

3. 2520 MANITOBA STREET - DE408554 - ZONE C-3A (PRELIMINARY APPLICATION)

Applicant: Downs Archambault Architects

Request: To construct a seven-storey mixed-use retail and residential building, with one storey of retail use at grade on both the Broadway and Manitoba Street frontages, 51 dwelling units on the second through seventh stories, and two levels of underground parking to accommodate 77 vehicle spaces, with access from the lane.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mary Beth Rondeau, Development Planner, presented this preliminary application for the site at the corner of Manitoba Street and West Broadway, noting the proposed massing reflects the guidelines for the area. The applicant has made a preliminary application on the recommendation of staff given experience on the neighbouring Elements building, a recently constructed mixed-use retail/residential development at 2515 Ontario Street on which neighbours had expressed considerable concern about view impacts. After analyzing the response to notification as well as input received at public meetings in the neighbourhood, staff recommend a reduction in height of two storeys to about 58 ft. Staff believe this alternative would also achieve a good resolution of the streetscape by matching the massing of the Elements which is 59 ft. at its highest point. A re-massing of the easterly "gap" portion of the site is also recommended given this is a less view sensitive area for neighbours to the south. This alternative brings the building closer to the Elements, impacting specifically the 07 and 08 units, although it was noted these units were specifically designed to orient living rooms to the south and north. Staff further recommend reducing by one storey the most easterly portion directly adjacent to the Elements to reduce this impact. More detailed discussions between the developer and the affected neighbours are also recommended as the project proceeds. Ms. Rondeau briefly reviewed the recommended conditions of approval.

Staff recommend approval in principle, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report dated August 18, 2004. It was noted that two letters of support for the proposed conditions have been received since the report was published. Staff consider that,

with the recommended conditions, the application will earn the additional density and height by providing a landscaped setback on Manitoba Street, significantly improving the pedestrian environment on both Manitoba and West Broadway and for its well resolved architectural treatment.

Questions/Discussion

Ms. Rondeau provided the following information in response to questions from the Board and Panel:

- the request for architectural treatment to reduce the scale of frontage of the street does not preclude a single retail tenancy;
- with the suggested re-massing, it is expected there will be a smaller semi private open space and associated amenity space at the ground level;
- the roof will be landscaped but there will be no roof garden, partly in response to privacy issues for Element residents and to view concerns;
- the most negative impact of the suggested re-massing is on units 207 and 208 of Elements. Beyond the third floor, Element residents benefit from the suggested height reduction.
- Approximately 40 homeowners on Quebec and Manitoba Streets and West 10th Avenue prefer the suggested massing alternative;
- the 0.91 m wide easement referred to in condition A.2.3 should be 0.091 m;
- the application does not include sustainability features;
- residents on 10th and 11th Avenues tend to value views of the mountains more than views of the city;
- staff would not consider a massing proposal that did not positively contribute to West Broadway.

Applicant's Comments

Al Johnson, Architect, noted there were two public meetings as well as discussions with individual neighbours who had concerns about the height. He advised they accept the proposed compromise re-massing and generally support the recommended conditions. With respect to the open space in the proposed revised massing, Mr. Johnson said the 4- and 5-storey components will not have roof decks off the penthouse level, in response to privacy concerns for Element residents, although the roof will have some decorative treatment for improved overlook. The access stair from the parking garage which opens onto Broadway is for servicing of the underground public parking. Mr. Johnson advised they will be exploring sustainability issues in the design development of the project. He stressed they have made a significant compromise in response to concerns of the neighbours.

Mr. Johnson responded to questions from the Board.

Mr. Rudberg suggested that the applicant should seriously consider including sustainability measures as a means of earning the extra density, particularly in respect to how storm water is handled. Mr. Johnson advised they will be exploring sustainability as the design develops.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, Ms. Rondeau advised there is currently no Council policy on sustainability but in the past in C-3A staff have sought storm water retention and landscaped roofs which contribute to the general amenity of the area. Mr. Beasley said he agreed with Mr. Rudberg that it would be appropriate to include some sustainability measures in the ways this project could earn its extra density.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, Mr. Johnson said they believe the proposal earns the additional density by a combination of the setback and treatment of Manitoba Street,

particularly at the corner of Manitoba and Broadway and the creation of a public plaza. The interface with the lane is also considerably improved.

Comments from other Speakers

Marilyn Bell, 28 West 10th Avenue, noted the Elements building has proved to be a wonderful addition to the neighbourhood. With respect to views, Ms. Bell commented that she considers the view of the city to be just as important as that of the mountains. She noted their neighbourhood is not against development and is about compromise. She said the proposed re-massing is a good fit compared to the submission scheme and it retains the most views for the most people in the neighbourhood. Ms. Bell expressed some concern about rooftop gardens and said the rear elevation should be treated as well as the front. She also thought the developer should be held accountable for sustainability issues given the amount of extra density being sought.

John Davis, resident on West 10th Avenue, said the Elements building has been an excellent addition to the Broadway streetscape and the neighbourhood. Mr. Davis said that while the neighbourhood is not opposed to development, he objects to the notion that a proposal such as this will be selling the views of the neighbours and provide nothing in return. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley about the massing options, Mr. Davis said he preferred the suggested re-massing scheme.

Majorie McLean, 46 West 10th Avenue, said she appreciated the very consultative process that occurred when the Elements building was developed. She expressed appreciation to City staff in reaching out to the neighbourhood to bring them to the table, and thanked the architects for their part in the process. With respect to the proposal, Ms. McLean strongly supported the proposed revised massing.

Laurie Young, resident of West 11th Avenue, said the view and privacy impact on 11th Avenue residents is very significant. She expressed concern about the parking entry in the lane which will result in increased traffic on West 11th Avenue. She strongly supported the suggested revised massing as a compromise solution and agreed with the importance of sustainability in the project. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley about traffic impacts, Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, said this has been evaluated by staff and he noted the neighbourhood has undergone an extensive traffic calming process in recent years. The analysis indicates there will be no measurable increase in traffic on West 11th Avenue.

Tony Tham, Strata Chair of a neighbouring fourplex building, said they were concerned about the view impact of the height. He favoured the suggested re-massing as a compromise they can live with. Mr. Tham noted the city views are more important to him than mountain views. He said he did not believe the proposal offers enough to earn the requested height and density.

Ross Trythall, 207-2515 Ontario Street (Elements), said the proposal will cause him to lose a large amount of his existing views. Mr. Trythall questioned the proposal for the commercial elevator to have access to the underground, noting there have been serious security problems in the Elements building which also has this arrangement. He was also concerned about traffic congestion in the lane, including during the construction period. Mr. Thomson confirmed the lane is the standard 20 ft. width.

Paul Brisset, 208-2515 Ontario Street (Elements), said he preferred the original scheme because the suggested revised massing brings the building much closer to Elements. Ms. Rondeau advised the treatment of the facing wall will be determined at the complete

application stage and there is a condition that the applicant should work with the neighbours on material treatments.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Ostry advised the Urban Design Panel supported the applicant's proposal and had a number of suggestions for improvement, including landscape design on the roofs and at ground level. However, the proposal is potentially changing to a degree that precludes commenting on the response without reviewing a revised submission. Mr. Ostry noted the Panel's recommendation for design development to the lane does not appear in the conditions, and he agreed with Mr. Beasley's recommendation for a condition dealing with sustainability criteria. He recommended approval in principle, subject to conditions relating to the lane treatment and sustainability measures.

Mr. Hancock said the proposal as submitted is quite handsome. He commented that he found it difficult to get a good sense of the various view impacts, particularly for the uphill residents, and suggested greater effort should have been made to more clearly illustrate views. He said he believed that, overall, the problems are reconcilable with further consultation. The compromise scheme is likely to be the end result but the concerns of the residents of the Elements can be addressed. He recommended approval, subject to the recommended conditions, and noted that at the complete stage he would like to see more analysis of the view impacts as well as some demonstration of sustainability initiatives to earn the requested density.

Mr. McLean commended staff and the applicant for the amount of public consultation. He said the complete submission should include rooftop gardens and improved treatment of the lane. He noted that with the proposed revised scheme an alternative technology can be considered for the elevator, which would further reduce height impact. He said he believes the interface problems with the Element can be resolved with some creative solutions. He recommended approval in principle.

Mr. Mah said that since the majority of the neighbours seem to prefer a shorter and squatter building as opposed to a taller and slimmer solution he would support the proposed revised massing. He urged the applicant to work closely with the neighbours in the Element to ensure that any negative impacts are mitigated as much as possible. He noted the intent for the rooftop treatment seems to be somewhat vague in terms of how much will be green and accessible. He urged the applicant to provide many more details on this aspect of the scheme at the complete stage. He recommended approval in principle.

Mr. McNaney commented that many developments typically result in someone losing something, but when someone loses everything it is a problem. This is the case with Units 207 and 208 of the Elements and the impact does not necessarily relate to view loss but to the proximity of the building. Mr. McNaney questioned whether the amount of benefit achieved for residents of 10th and 11th Avenue was a reasonable trade-off for the negative impact on the Element residents. He therefore supported the proposal as submitted. Mr. McNaney added he did not believe the application yet earns the additional density. He said he would like to see sustainability addressed in a substantive way including storm water management, green roofs and possibly a parking space allocated to a co-op vehicle.

Mr. Henschel supported the application with the recommended conditions except 1.1. He said he did not believe the view analysis provided is sufficient to require the change in massing. He suggested condition 1.1 be amended to add "unless a detailed view analysis can show that the

current massing is preferable." Such view analysis should illustrate the different qualities that will be gained and lost in order that a more thoughtful judgment can be made.

Ms. Chung appreciated the concerns expressed by the residents of the Element, noting that views are used as a major marketing tool by developers. She urged that there be a clear consultation process between the staff and applicants and the public.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley said there are some trade-offs about views that need to be considered. He agreed that at the complete stage the best analysis should be sought regarding views gained and lost. He noted that a significant number of neighbours have indicated concern about the proposal as submitted and are more comfortable with the alternative massing. Mr. Beasley said he also empathized with the Elements neighbours who expressed concern about negative impacts, but, on balance, he thought the revised scheme suggested by staff, having worked with the applicant and the neighbours, is supportable. It will be necessary, however, for the applicant to continue to work with neighbour in Unit 207 to further shape the building to improve views, and with Unit 208 to ensure the treatment of the facing wall is attractive and neighbourly. Mr. Beasley strongly supported the streetscape on Broadway, noting the Elements building has set a good precedent in this regard. However, the façade treatment on the lane needs to be improved, noting it is the primary façade for the neighbours. Mr. Beasley said he had some concern about the earning of the extra density and suggested that at the complete stage there needs to be further articulation of how this is achieved. He also agreed with the advice of the public and the Advisory Panel regarding the need for sustainability measures. He added that Council has instructed staff to develop a sustainability policy, and to develop a policy for when sustainability measures are applied in discretionary circumstances, and these policies will be brought to Council in due course. In the meantime, it is not outside the existing practice to call for some sustainability measures for earning the extra density. Mr. Beasley said the "green linkages" with public benches are also very important, particularly for the elderly, and high quality materials on the rear façade will also contribute to earning the extra density. At the complete stage there needs to be an explicit demonstration of how the extra density is earned. Mr. Beasley added it is not a practice to apply a condition relating to impacts during construction; however, it is socially responsible of the applicant to be in close liaison with the neighbours, particularly the residents of Units 207 and 208 of the Elements. He noted it is not unusual for developers to offer regular window cleaning and dust removal to impacted neighbours.

Mr. Rudberg said this proposal has clearly benefited from being a preliminary application because it allows for a reasonable balance of all the interests. He supported the recommendations of staff, noting that additional shaping of the building can further improve view impacts. Mr. Rudberg supported requiring sustainability measures towards earning the extra density. He agreed that additional treatment of the roofs is appropriate, although not necessarily landscaping, particularly on the higher roof surface. Mr. Beasley concurred. He also suggested reference to security issues in condition 1.4. Mr. Beasley concurred. Mr. Rudberg confirmed it is appropriate for the complete application to come back to the Board.

Mr. MacGregor said he tended to favour the applicant's original submission, noting the revised massing creates livability problems for some units. He agreed there needs to be more view analysis at the complete application stage as well as a clear articulation of how the livability issues are addressed with respect to Units 207 and 208 of the Elements. He said he was less concerned about the need to mirror the Elements, suggesting something different might be preferable. With respect to how the maximum density is earned, Mr. MacGregor said the

maximum conditional density is in the zoning as a clear incentive for achieving developments such as this where the applicant is taking time to consult with the neighbourhood. It also contributes to achieving buildings that are acceptable in the community. He agreed that how the extra density is earned will need to be articulated more clearly at the complete stage. He supported the Board's decision.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE IN PRINCIPLE Development Application No. 408554, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated August 18, 2004, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.0 to read:

Prior to submission of a complete application and a final decision, the applicant is to carry out the following;

Amend the last sentence in the Note to Applicant in 1.1, to read:

Material treatments, window placement, balcony screening and wall elevations should be designed *in consultation with the adjacent neighbours* to ensure that the near views and privacy of neighbours are also considered.

Add the following sentence to the Note to Applicant in 1.1:

The final alignment of the walls of the re-shaped massing should be determined in consultation with the resident of Unit 207 of the Elements building in order to preserve as much view as possible;

Amend 1.2 to delete "roof" and add *on the roofs, including gardens where practical and supported by neighbours;*

Add to the Note to Applicant in 1.2:

Including some greening where practical;

Amend 1.4 to add:

and further review of security issues;

Amend 1.5 to add:

, including on the south elevation;

Add a new condition 1.7:

design development to include sustainable building features including storm water retention and landscape roof treatments as well as consideration for facilitating car co-op participation;

Amend A.2.3 to change "0.91 m" to read *0.091 m*.

The meeting adjourned at 5.20 p.m. and was reconvened at 6.05 pm at the Plaza 500 Ballroom.

4. 1055 CANADA PLACE - DE408490 - ZONE CD-1
(PRELIMINARY APPLICATION)

Applicant: Downs Archambault/MCM + LMN Architects

Request: To construct a convention centre with approx. floor area totaling ~~96 085408-000~~ m² (1,034,284~~162,500~~ sq.ft.), including exhibition hall, associated ballroom, meeting rooms etc., retail/service, parking (442 cars) accessed off Canada Place ~~Way~~, loading (24 bays along north water side of site) accessed off Waterfront Road, a perimeter walkway/bikeway, and a major public plaza (west part of site at foot of Thurlow).

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ralph Segal, Development Planner, presented this preliminary application. The site is governed by the CD-1 zoning and site specific design guidelines adopted by Council in 2002. An amendment to the anticipated form of development occurred in 2003 when Council released its option on the arts complex site to accommodate a larger convention facility. Given the complexity of the proposal, Mr. Segal confined his comments to the areas of greatest concern and challenge with respect to the zoning and design guidelines and noting that the review deals with conceptual design issues at this preliminary application stage. The Vancouver Convention Expansion Centre (VCCEP) intends to begin piling and foundation work on the site in February 2005. Mr. Segal briefly described the various components of the scheme, referring to models and posted diagrams.

Mr. Segal described the areas of concern, noting that none are a challenge to the convention centre program or the basic configuration of the building. These issues are addressed in the recommended prior-to conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report and relate to Roof Design (conditions 1.1 - 1.4), and the "Master Plan" (conditions 1.5 - 1.7). Mr. Segal noted that some amendment to the zoning will be necessary with respect to floor area, and to the Coal Harbour Official Development Plan to address the anticipation of some minor intrusions into the Burrard and Thurlow street-end view corridors. He briefly described the concerns about the roof design. With respect to the "Master Plan", Mr. Segal stressed that VCCEP is not programmed to address the non-convention centre uses which will be pursued in the private sector by a Request for Proposals. However, these uses are essential to the animation sought in the guidelines and staff believe significant focus and resources will be required by the applicant to advance this important aspect of the overall development to the level expected at the complete development application stage. Of particular concern is the basic infrastructure, including servicing, fire access, parking and loading, and public access to the waterfront uses. Given the uncertainty that exists with respect to the "Master Plan", staff recommend that, at the very least, the infrastructure be incorporated into the complete development application and that VCCEP commit to deliver this infrastructure at the date of substantial completion of the convention centre (condition 1.6). Mr. Segal briefly reviewed the other areas of concern, as addressed in the recommended conditions.

In summary, the recommendation is for approval in principle, subject to the conditions outlined in the Staff Committee Report dated September 2, 2004. Staff are optimistic that, with the continued cooperation of VCCEP, a fabulous facility will evolve that is worthy of this spectacular site and a boon to Vancouver.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley noted that at a workshop review of the proposal, Council made it clear that there was a strong expectation for the public to be able to experience and interpret the proposed "living roof". Mr. Segal advised that staff did not recommend a condition requiring public access to the roof; however, there could be some access where the roof "fold" contacts Thurlow Plaza. As well, the roof could be viewed from an observation area, which is among the recommendations.

Mr. Rudberg sought clarification with respect to the timing of the items in the "Master Plan" and what assurance is provided that everything will be done to facilitate these activities as they come about. Mr. Segal explained that conditions 1.5 and 1.6 intend to address these issues, seeking to advance the "Master Plan" to the level of a Preliminary Development Permit to be integrated functionally and architecturally with the design of the convention centre and the westerly Park "transition zone". Incorporating it into the RFP will then provide some direction to the private sector in their responses. Staff recommend that VCCEP pursue the RFP prior to submitting a complete development application for the convention centre so that the RFP responses can be reviewed with staff when the complete application is reviewed and processed. Staff are also seeking a commitment from VCCEP to incorporate the infrastructure that will be necessary to implement the "Master Plan" components and that this infrastructure be in place at the time of completion of the convention centre. Staff anticipate submission of the complete development application in late November/early December 2004, returning to the Development Permit Board about March 2005. Staff therefore hope that VCCEP proceeds with the RFP as soon as possible so that the responses are available at the time the Board considers the Complete Application.

Mr. MacGregor sought clarification regarding the various civic approvals called for in conditions 1.14 and 1.15. In discussion, Mr. Segal confirmed that no waterfront development applications have been approved that did not consider a "master plan", noting that previous applications have responded to the applicable guideline and zoning objectives for commercial use at the waterfront.

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor with respect to proposed 442 parking spaces, Mr. Thomson advised there has been considerable work done with the City's parking experts in this regard. The applicant's traffic consultant study determined that 420 parking spaces would be needed to satisfy the key objective to meet demand when the site is at 90 percent capacity, and Engineering Services concurs with this analysis. This would leave 22 parking stalls available for other uses on the site.

Mr. MacGregor raised a question about the interface at the water's edge. Mr. Segal advised this is of concern to staff because the convention centre footprint has been substantially pulled further in from the water to reduce costs, which leaves the loading docks exposed along virtually the entire length of the north face and parts of the east and west faces. The intent is that the loading docks will be screened. Staff are concerned about the quality of this screening so that it does not appear as a relentless treatment and are seeking greater variety in the proposed precast concrete treatment. Staff are also hopeful that the private sector will respond such that the west face and the northwest corner will be wrapped with commercial uses, either fixed or floating, so that the utilitarian uses are not exposed, at least not on the westerly side of the site.

Mr. Beasley confirmed his understanding of conditions 1.5 and 1.6, namely that they seem to indicate there is trust that a number of the "Master Plan" items will be delivered in the future; they will not be secured now but we are optimistic that they are deliverable in the future. The

only commitment being sought now is the process to deal with the issues of how and when and on what basis, but the specific infrastructure for those items - particularly the lower level walkway from the west, the central vertical circulation and the various utilities, etc. - are part of this project. However, it is acknowledged that they do not have to be approved now, either by the City or other authorities, because they may change as more detail is available from the ultimate operators of the "Master Plan" facilities, but that VCCEP will guarantee that they will be in place by the time the convention centre opens. Mr. Segal confirmed that this strategy is not inconsistent with the City's typical practice.

Mr. Segal responded to questions from the Advisory Panel.

Applicant's Comments

Russ Anthony, VCCEP, said they have participated in an unprecedented collaborative process for a project of this kind, and he thanked City staff for their participation and constructive efforts in working with them and their design team. He said they are proud of what they are presenting to the City. He requested that a number of the recommended conditions be directed for consideration and discussion rather than being mandated requirements at this stage, particularly on some of the issues which they consider to be premature. Mr. Anthony stressed that, as a Federal-Provincial project, they have a defined, tight budget and schedule, with a projected completion date of 2008, noting the facility has to be completed in order to transfer already-booked conventions into the new facilities so that the existing facilities can be retrofitted. Both facilities have to be completed in 2009, in time for the requirements of the 2010 Winter Olympics. As well, they have a very defined mandate from the governments and VCCEP has an obligation to find a balance between all the requirements of a properly functioning convention centre, noting a number of changes have already occurred to make it work within the budget. He urged that conditions not be applied that they cannot comply with as part of the convention centre.

Jim Brown, Architect, described the overall vision for the project and their approach to the design of this landmark feature for the City of Vancouver which they believe will catapult Vancouver to the forefront of not only convention centre design but architectural design. They have analyzed every aspect of the project and integrated it into an architecture which is unlike anything else in the world. They believe the process of engaging the environment and the ecology will place Vancouver at the forefront of new modern architecture. He noted they are in an ongoing process with the City and are confident that the landmark quality aspired to will be achieved. He briefly reviewed the concept of the land forms and the roof design.

Ken Grassi, VCCEP, said the progress made to date is going in the right direction and will evolve further in the design development process. They are confident they can achieve conditions 1.1 and 1.2.

Mr. Anthony addressed the conditions relating to the "Master Plan". He asked the Board to acknowledge that the mandate given to VCCEP by the governments does not include the design and construction of a master plan. They therefore request that the City not include detailed master plan conditions in this process: the Master Plan will be the subject of its own CDP process. There are, however, a number of things they can do to facilitate it being a very successful and exciting addition to the project. They will not construct anything that will prevent the master plan from proceeding, and they will make available the services needed for the master plan component. As well, they will commit to issue an RFP as soon as possible, without tying it the very difficult timelines they are under for the convention centre. The RFP will include the requirement for a float plane terminal. Mr. Anthony stressed it is in their best interest to proceed as rapidly as possible to issue the RFP, but the master plan includes various

approvals and legal requirements that have to be addressed that could hamper their own CDP process. He said they understand the importance of the lower walkway and vertical circulation to the City and they will ensure that if they are not completed by 2012, VCCEP will ensure that they are installed. He added, it is too important to them and to the City to rush the process until there is a better indication of the requirements for the Olympics and until it is known what can be constructed in that area. Mr. Anthony said they are prepared to continue to work with the City but the timelines proposed and the very specific nature of some of the conditions are very difficult for them to achieve. With respect to the parking, Mr. Anthony said the expectation is that there will be three operations taking place rather than one large operation using all the space, which will ease the parking demand.

In response to a question from the Chair as to VCCEP's preferred schedule for the master plan process, Mr. Anthony said they would like to spend more time discussing it with the City and with potential proponents, with the issue of the RFP in the first half of 2005. He noted that the most successful RFPs are those where there has been sufficient dialogue with the approval authorities before going to the marketplace. The intent would be for the process to be completed as soon as possible, but not prior to issuance of the CDP. Mr. Grassi added they envisioned that between now and the complete application they would give the City an update on the timelines and strategy for the RFP process, giving enough detail to allow the City to better understand their approach, including infrastructure items. Mr. Grassi and Mr. Anthony specifically addressed concerns regarding conditions A.2.12 and A.1.12. In discussion, Mr. Thomson advised that the inclusion of reference to floatplane parking in condition A.2.12 was incorrect. With this deletion, Mr. Grassi confirmed the condition was acceptable. Mr. Beasley commented that condition A.1.12 appears to reflect VCCEP's intentions. In discussion, Mr. Anthony said their concern is about the ability to have a meaningful discussion about float plane fuel storage, for example, because it would be in a vacuum between now and November since they do not have a proponent who is designing it.

Mr. Brown then addressed condition 1.7 which deals with the westerly retail space (the "sliver"). He said their approach is to pursue a substantial upgrade to this area in an architectural way but they do not believe its footprint can be expanded.

Mr. Grassi requested amendment to the Notes to Applicant in conditions 1.8 and 1.9 to be consideration items, noting all the issues can be addressed as part of their ongoing design development effort.

With respect to condition 1.15, Mr. Anthony said they clearly agree to the community use but believe the exact details are immature at this preliminary stage. Mr. Segal advised the intent is that Thurlow Plaza will be programmed for major public events and it will be necessary for there to be access to public washrooms, either in the convention centre facility or elsewhere. Doug Robinson, Senior Social and Cultural Planner, confirmed the condition is intended to ensure there is some discussion about access to services during public events. In discussion, he confirmed Social Planning would be satisfied with resolution of these items upon completion of the complete application.

Regarding condition 1.18, Mr. Brown explained the current design has a fish habitat screen that extends from low-low to high-high tide and there will no exposure of the underside of the building up to the top tide level, beyond which is a truck dock loading screen element. He said they can continue to work with the City on this matter and are confident they can arrive at an acceptable design.

Mr. Brown addressed condition A.2.9 which seeks deletion of the drop-off at the west end of Canada Place. He said they believe the drop-off will be essential if there is a restaurant developed on Thurlow Plaza. Mr. Thomson explained the drop-off is not on the applicant's site and relies on another property. In discussion, Mr. MacGregor said he did not believe a drop-off is necessary for a restaurant to be successful.

With respect to condition A.2.17, Mr. Anthony said they are prepared to do all the roadwork required in the immediate area of the site. They will also demonstrate the right of access during construction and beyond. He said their concern is with the inclusion of all the issues because they do not believe that solving the Waterfront Road access problems should be a condition of this application.

Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor, Mr. Anthony confirmed they would find it acceptable to add to condition 1.0 "or identify the schedule for completion, all for consideration of the Board at the complete stage". Mr. Anthony added, their concern is with their very tight schedule and the need to avoid complicated environmental and other reviews that would be triggered by going beyond the scope of their mandate.

Mr. Ostry questioned the architect about how the public will experience the ecological, architectural and cultural excellence of the building, noting it is an ambitious and challenging undertaking. Mr. Brown briefly explained how they believe the facility will be experienced by the public, and Don Wuori, Landscape Architect, described the ecological approach to the project.

Mr. Ostry questioned why the roof is not publicly accessible. Mr. Brown explained the shallow soil depth makes it very sensitive to human interaction. As an ecological approach to the building, they prefer it to be a sanctuary, noting also that parts of the roof will extend to Thurlow Plaza where it can be experienced by the public. In discussion, Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect, noted that one hundred percent of the roof will have extensive landscaping (six inches of soil) and the whole Thurlow Plaza area will have intensive landscaping.

With respect to sustainability, Mr. Anthony advised they are aiming for LEED gold standard for the facility, and Mr. Brown added they may exceed LEED gold measurements in some areas.

Questioned further by Mr. Ostry about the roof, Mr. Brown confirmed they believe the piece that extends to the Thurlow Plaza is essential to the concept, noting that there are also a number of other ways in which the roof engages the ground.

Mr. Hancock questioned the applicant's attitude towards the vertical "signature" element called for in condition 1.6. Mr. Anthony advised the lower walkway and the vertical circulation, of whatever size, design and location, will be part of the master plan exercise.

In response to a question from Mr. McNaney regarding the retail space, Mr. Anthony confirmed they have conducted retail feasibility studies, the details of which will be provided to the City as the project proceeds.

Mr. Mah questioned whether the applicant had considered having less sensitive landscaping on the roof so that at least a part of it could be accessible to the public. Mr. Anthony said they consider that the roof is a gift to the city as a sanctuary in the heart of the downtown. They do not believe there needs to be public interaction everywhere on the project.

In response to a question from Mr. McNaney regarding public transportation connections to the site, Mr. Grassi noted they are required to provide a traffic management plan which will also address public transit issues and how they mesh with the convention centre operations.

Comments from other Speakers

Loretta Sieben was concerned about the enormous scale of the building and its extent over the water. She said that if there is any doubt about the ownership of the right to the water and foreshore then the application should be denied. She also questioned where the float plane industry will be located, and suggested it should be on land. Ms. Sieben urged the Board to refuse the application in its present form.

Bob Ransford, Hyack Air, strongly supported condition 1.5. He stressed it is important to recognize the existence of the present float plane facility in Vancouver Harbour and the potential for it to expand, noting the terminal currently serves 300,000 passengers annually. Clearly, there needs to be greater certainty as to how the float plane facility will be accommodated in the future. He recommended adding reference to accommodating multiple users to the Note to Applicant in 1.5. Mr. Ransford said there needs to be certainty about the execution of the master plan and he urged that the application not be approved without some assurance about the float plane terminal. The Chair also acknowledged a letter from Hyack Air dated September 2, 2004.

Chuck Brook, Brook Development Planning, Rick Baxter, West Coast Air, and Greg McDougal, Harbour Air, addressed the Board. Mr. Baxter advised that Tourism Vancouver made a \$90 million contribution to the convention centre project and understood it would include a long term, common use float plane facility and marina. Mr. Baxter expressed concern at the applicant's contention that a float plane facility is not necessarily in the budget for the convention centre, noting that neither the float plane operators nor Tourism Vancouver have been notified by VCCEP that the float plane terminal is no longer part of the project's mandate and \$550 million budget. He explained they are required to move to a temporary facility and a solution needs to be found so that they can continue to operate in the short term. The Port of Vancouver has advised the east side of Canada Place is not an option and there are serious operational and safety concerns about that location. Mr. Baxter said they believe that west of Canada Place and further west of the proposed convention site is the only option for the temporary relocation. He stressed the importance of public access to the waterfront and fuel storage and Mr. Segal provided clarification on these issues, as outlined in conditions 1.5 and 1.6. Mr. Baxter stated that the float plane operators are ready to come to the table to discuss the long term plan for the facility, including participation in the design aspects to ensure the facility is functional.

Mr. McDougal said the timing and certainty are the critical issues for them, noting the development permit for their temporary facility, if approved, would expire in 2008. He said they share the concern expressed by some of the Coal Harbour residents that the three year term will be extended. He urged that the RFP process be expedited and said they are ready to participate in that process.

On behalf of the float plane operators, Mr. Brook strongly urged the Board to adopt conditions 1.5 and 1.6 as recommended by staff.

John McLean, Tourism Vancouver, strongly supported the application and said the float plane operation is an important part of making it work. He urged the Board to approve the application to allow the convention centre expansion to proceed.

John Singleton, on behalf of the Coal Harbour Residents' Association, representing 5,000 residents, said they are concerned about the application for the temporary relocation of the float plane facility, to be considered by the Board on September 21, 2004. The residents are concerned about the proposed temporary relocation of the facility in front of their homes, also noting that VCCEP has indicated they might not be able to accommodate a relocation of the facility until 2012. Mr. Singleton urged the Board to adopt conditions 1.5 and 1.6.

James Cardero, Vancouver Rowing Club, said he saw little in the proposal to protect people who enliven and animate the harbour. He was concerned about the omission of the float plane facility, the marina and the commercial component as part of this application. There are no guarantees or assurances there will be a permanent place for the float planes, which are an integral part of the harbour. Mr. Cardero urged the Board to retain conditions 1.5 and 1.6 and that a time limited permit be implemented.

The Board adjourned for 5 minutes and reconvened at 9.35 p.m.

The Chair also acknowledged receipt of a letter dated September 13, 2004 from UD&D, representing Barbary Coast Marina and the owners and operators for the commercial passenger vessels, Pride of Vancouver and M.V. Antibi.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Ostry advised the Urban Design Panel reviewed this application three times. The Panel did not support the application and thought the project had some inherent problems. Mr. Ostry stressed the Panel has no objection to the use, density or the general form of development; its concerns relate to the applicant's expectations for a design of landmark quality which demands a high level of scrutiny from a design point of view. The Panel's vote of non-support reflects its lack of confidence that the design is moving in a direction that will deliver a project of landmark status and quality. At this time, the design of the roof fails to deliver the Panel's expectations. There was a strong consensus from the Panel to increase the "dynamics of the roofscape", specifically calling for modifications to the sculptural qualities of the roof because, from a pedestrian point of view, from most vantage points the building will appear as a large, glass-skinned building with a flat roof. Mr. Ostry acknowledged that the architect's argument that the roof is a sanctuary is very compelling but said he failed to see how this roof would be any different than any other green roof. The Panel also had concerns about the skin of the building and urged that it be a requirement of the complete application that a much greater degree of detail be provided, including samples of the glazing system. With respect to the master plan, Mr. Ostry advised the Urban Design Panel felt very strongly that the items considered to be components of the master plan requiring approvals from other jurisdictions be part of the PDP package. Mr. Ostry said the Panel would hope that its vote of non-support would initiate some modifications to the concept to be able to express it more clearly, noting the Panel believes the concept is right and appropriate, and has the potential to be excellent. At this time, however, the Panel is not confident it will be achieved without more information about the skin of the building and a rigorous clarification of the concept of the folded land form which needs to be experienced at the ground level. The one point where the roof touches the ground is too tenuous and could easily be seen to be disconnected, completely losing the concept.

Mr. Hancock concurred with the design issues raised by the Urban Design Panel. He agreed the project has great potential but it has not yet been fully realized. The one area where the roof comes to the ground is tenuous and the roof form itself, while it shows promise, needs more sculpting or modulation. The scale of the building is enormous and the roof is not yet being

expressed in a convincing way. Mr. Hancock said it is unfortunate the mandate of the project is so restricted to the building and does not include the surrounding area. He urged the inclusion of conditions 1.5 and 1.6 to address the float plane issue.

Mr. McLean stressed that this is a public sector project and a gift to the city in many ways. He said he believed it comprises three projects: the convention centre, which is being handled very successfully, the marina, and a float plane facility. He suggested that what is being referred to as a master plan is, in fact, a business plan and it should be considered before final approval of the convention centre. The Board needs to see the RFP details for the two other businesses, which is best run by the private sector, and those business plans must meet the objectives of the larger community. Mr. McLean urged approval of the application with the proviso that the City provide ongoing support to address the issues so that the project can proceed.

Mr. Mah recommended rewording condition 1.0 to include "or provide a timeline for" which may make the conditions easier to comply with. He added, however, that there is a fairly clear message for the applicant that at the complete stage there should be a demonstration of more work on the roof as well as definite progress on conditions 1.5 and 1.6. He recommended approval in principle.

Mr. McNaney said this is a very important public site and therefore requires scrutiny from the general public. He said he did not accept that excellence could not be achieved but thought excellence should be expected because it is such a prominent site. Mr. McNaney said he agreed the roof design is not yet iconic and needs more development. The public circulation also needs more work, noting the north-facing walkway will be quite dark and cavernous. He was also not convinced that Thurlow Plaza will work year-round. With respect to the master plan, Mr. McNaney said it must be implemented, noting the success of the convention centre is contingent on the activities occurring around it and is absolutely part of this proposal. Finally, Mr. McNaney said it is essential that the roof is publicly accessible.

Mr. Henschel supported the application. He stressed that the project needs to look good from every vantage point and in this respect it needs more work. He urged that the applicant not be timid in making changes to the roof because it needs a major re-sculpting. He did not accept the contention that the roof is a fragile eco system, not able to accommodate access. Mr. Henschel supported all the conditions and recommended adding a condition to provide visual or actual public access to the roof.

Ms. Chung said her concerns had already been iterated and she had nothing to add.

Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor concurred with the comments of the Advisory Panel. He congratulated staff for the report and said that, overall, the conditions are very good. He said he believed that a major project such as this has to be broken down into smaller components. He acknowledged the applicant's budgetary concerns but said the Board's role is to look at the overall design for the city in the future. Part of City Council's decision to release the arts complex site to the project in order to achieve a completed foreshore and transition from the park was to ensure that a well considered design and urban space was achieved. The Official Development Plan has always included provision for float planes and a commercial marina, and this application provides much better access around the facility than the previous proposal. With respect to the roof design, Mr. MacGregor said the Board will expect to see major changes at the complete stage in order to meet the expectations of the Urban Design Panel and the Board's Advisory Panel. The temporary location for float plane terminal is to be the subject of another

Board meeting, but the intent is to have the facility at the north of the facility at the time the convention centre opens. Mr. MacGregor recommended a number of amendments to the conditions. With respect to the roof, he said he did not believe the small area on the plaza is sufficient for the public to appreciate it. With respect to the various legal arrangements, Mr. MacGregor commented there will likely be some modifications in how these are made.

Mr. Rudberg commented that this is a big building in a very strategic location and he acknowledged the work done by staff and the applicant in trying to work through the issues. He agreed there should be better public access, at least visual, to the roof itself. Mr. Rudberg said he was reassured by staff's belief that a workable design is evolving for the roof in order to achieve the excellence being sought. He strongly concurred with conditions 1.5 and 1.6, noting that greater certainty must be achieved. He agreed with Mr. McLean that it is a business plan that must be put together in order to have greater certainty for not only the potential tenants but the general public. With respect to the "sliver" area, Mr. Rudberg said he did not believe this needs to be expanded to a significant retail space and was persuaded by the applicant that there may be other opportunities to deal with it. He said he believed the Note to Applicant in 1.7 adequately addressed his concerns. Mr. Rudberg said he believed the conditions are an appropriate response and there is a need to respond to the schedule, particularly with respect to legal agreements. He said he hoped these requirements would be acknowledged in the complete submission so that delays do not occur.

Mr. Beasley agreed that this project represents an extraordinary collaboration of staff and the applicant. He also acknowledged that this is an extraordinary project given an alternative could have been a "black box". He said the conditions address the issues that have caused him some concern, especially with respect to the roof. He did not believe that the design has yet evolved sufficiently and there is a strong message to the applicant arising that requires more than simple refinement. Some fundamental changes on the roof are necessary so that it is something much more expressive of its ecological nature. Mr. Beasley said he believed conditions 1.1 and 1.2 are essential, including Mr. MacGregor's amendment. With respect to the master plan items, Mr. Beasley noted that staff believe the project will not perform adequately without them. He concurred with conditions 1.5 and 1.6 because they force the process forward aggressively and force collaboration, and indicate that at some point some infrastructure must be a part of this project if the convention centre cannot find anyone else to pay for it. The commercial marina and float plane facilities are essential to the function of downtown Vancouver. The walkway/bikeway must be dealt with, as called for in condition 1.8. As well, the whole skirt of the facility must be articulated well and there cannot be utility areas showing at any time. All areas must be screened and there must be diversity in that screen. With respect to the "sliver" area, Mr. Beasley said he did not believe it was a modest item but attention to detail in this area will contribute considerably to the pedestrian experience in the approach to the facility. He strongly supported 1.7 in this regard and did not accept the architect's conclusion that only architectural treatment would be necessary. Mr. Beasley added, the transition area is also very important to this scheme so bringing forward a good solution is essential.

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. 408490, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated September 2, 2004, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.0 to add
or identify the schedule for completion, all for consideration by the Development Permit Board at the complete development application stage;

Amend 1.1 to add:
and further design development and arrangements for over-viewing, experiencing and interpreting the "living roof" from locations around the site and, if possible, from locations on the roof itself, acknowledging that actual access onto the roof is not practical or desirable;

Amend the Note to Applicant in 1.5 to add, after "urban design,":
including design for multiple ~~use~~ users of the float plane facilities;

Amend 1.6 to delete "~~along with necessary~~ environmental approvals" from the first sentence, and to amend the last sentence to read:
AND FURTHER, that the above infrastructure and any integral elements be constructed on a schedule agreed at the complete application;

Amend the Note to Applicant in 1.14 to replace "A.2.17 (f) and (n)" with "A.2.17 (b) and (i)";

Amend 1.22 to add:
in consultation with the General Manager of Engineering Services with regard to the integration of the walkway;

Amend 1.23 to read:
legal arrangements in replacement of the existing park agreements securing the delivery of the park, to the satisfaction of the Director of Director of Legal Services, the General Manager of Engineering Services and the General Manager of the Park Board;

Amend 1.24 to read:
legal arrangements allowing for project-related encroachments onto park land, to the satisfaction of the Director of Legal Services, the General Manager of Engineering Services and the General Manager of the Park Board;

Add to the preamble in Appendix A:
or identify the schedule for completion, all for consideration by the Development Permit Board at the complete development application stage;

Amend A.2.9 to read:
further design development to support consideration of a drop-off location at the west end of Canada Place;

Amend A.2.12 to delete "floatplane parking".

5. OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

C. Hubbard
Clerk to the Board

I. Adam
Chair

Q:\Clerical\DPB\Minutes\2004\sep13.doc