

Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2004  
Time: 3.00 p.m.  
Place: Council Chamber, City Hall

---

**PRESENT:****Board**

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

**Advisory Panel**

B. Haden	Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
D. Chung	Representative of the General Public
K. McNaney	Representative of the General Public
C. Henschel	Representative of the General Public
G. Chung	Representative of the General Public (left at 7.30 pm)

**Regrets**

J. Hancock	Representative of the Design Professions
J. McLean	Representative of the Development Industry
E. Mah	Representative of the Development Industry

**ALSO PRESENT:****City Staff:**

A. Molaro	Development Planner
V. Potter	Project Facilitator
M. Thomson	City Surveyor
M. McKay	Projects Branch
N. Losito	Director of Environmental Health, Vancouver Coastal Health Authority

**1075 Waterfront Road**

C. Brook	Brook Development Planning
L. Schmidt	Brook Development Planning
R. Baxter	West Coast Air
G. McDougal	Harbour Air
P. Evans	Harbour Air

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

---

## 1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of September 8 2004 be approved with the following amendment:

p.10, under **Other Business**, to identify the application discussed as "DE408662 (1075 Waterfront Road)."

## 2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

## 3. 1075 WATERFRONT ROAD - DE408662 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Brook Development Planning

Request: Relocation of and alterations to the floats of the existing marine terminal for float planes from 1055 Canada Place Way, and construction of a modular accessory office/check-in building on a barge and land access for pick-up, drop off and emergency vehicles, for a temporary limited period of time, expiring three years from Development Permit issuance.

### Development Planner's Opening Comments

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, presented this application, referring to posted diagrams and the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated September 15, 2004. The proposal is for the temporary relocation of the existing float plane operation to a site west of the future convention centre site (VCEC). The application requests the relocation of the floats and for an office facility located on a barge. The policies on which the application is being considered include the Coal Harbour Official Development Plan (CHODP), the major objective of which is to encourage redevelopment of the Coal Harbour waterfront and to maintain and encourage the diversity of water uses, including a marine terminal facility for float planes. The CHODP also acknowledges that the development of the Coal Harbour waterfront will occur over many years and that interim uses such as this are appropriate to consider. The float plane operation falls within the Burrard Landing Precinct which is identified as a commercial and public use precinct focusing on an active, pedestrian-oriented waterfront where a float plane operation should be located. The applicable Guidelines include the Burrard Landing CD-1 Guidelines and the VCEC CD-1 Guidelines which both speak to providing a diverse urban waterfront with working marine uses.

The principal issue identified in this application relates to the location of the floats. The applicant considered a number of alternative locations and concluded that the proposed location is the most desirable option. Several agencies were consulted, including Department of Fisheries & Oceans (DFO), Burrard Environmental Review Committee (BERC), Vancouver Port

Authority (VPA), the Harbour Master and the convention centre proponents. Notwithstanding the applicant's conclusions, staff are concerned about the location of the floats and the impact on Harbour Green Park, its walkway and water play area. Staff therefore recommend that water coverage and interface of the facility with the park be reduced. Ms. Molaro briefly reviewed the recommended conditions of approval outlined in the report, to address this and other concerns that have been identified. Subject to satisfactory resolution of the conditions, the recommendation is for approval of the application.

#### Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg as to what assurance there is that the floats do not remain beyond the temporary three year period, Ms. Molaro advised condition 1.4 seeks legal arrangements which include a registered charge on title to secure the removal of the floats upon expiry of the permit.

Mr. Haden sought clarification regarding the silt curtain. Ms. Molaro explained the silt curtain is part of the environmental measures associated with the convention centre and is intended to protect fish from construction impacts. Activity beyond the harbour headline is controlled by the Harbour Master.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley about adjacent buildings that would be impacted by the proposal, Ms. Molaro explained that 1233 West Cordova Street and the two buildings west of it are currently occupied. 1169 West Cordova Street is under construction, with occupancy expected in about two years. There are no current development applications for 1139 and 1105 West Cordova and these sites are therefore unlikely to be occupied within the three year permit period. The Shaw Tower (298 Thurlow Street) is the closest to both the existing and proposed terminal and is expected to be occupied next year. The CD-1 zoning for 201 Burrard Street has been approved but there is currently no development application in process. The distance between 1233 West Cordova Street and the proposed floats is about 180 m.

Nick Losito, Director of Environmental Health, Vancouver Coastal Health Authority, advised the noise impact of the proposed new location on 1233 West Cordova Street would be three decibels more than at the existing location. With respect to noise impacts on the water play area in Harbour Green Park, Mr. Losito said there would be a 7 - 7.78 db increase in sound levels from the proposed new location; however, the resultant sound level is approximately the same as that generated by the water park itself. Mr. Losito advised the noisiest part of the float planes is on take-off, followed closely by landing and breaking. There are also some noises associated with activity at the docks during maintenance. He said he believes the noise associated with planes arriving can be addressed through the recommended Facility Management Plan. In response to a further question from Mr. Beasley, Mr. Losito said the noise impact from take-off and landing will be no different in the proposed location than exists now.

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor concerning fish habitat, Ms. Molaro advised the proposal does not increase water coverage; the existing docks will be relocated. She confirmed the proposed new location is about 260 m from the existing facilities. The final permanent location has not yet been determined and is dependent upon the design development and RFP process associated with the convention centre, although it is anticipated to be along the north face of the convention centre site.

Noting the recommended temporary location for the float plane offices is at the northerly edge of Parcel D, which is the western portion of the convention centre site, Mr. MacGregor questioned whether further temporary relocation of the offices at some time during construction of the convention centre could be addressed in this application. Ms. Molaro

agreed the offices may have to be moved again at some time during construction of the convention centre but the floats will remain in the same location. Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, noted the Board can only consider the application which is before it; however, the Board may wish to provide some direction for the Director of Planning to deal with a temporary further relocation to the "transition zone" by a Minor Amendment. Mr. MacGregor noted the convention centre proponents have indicated a completion date of 2008, which is beyond the three year period of the subject application. Ms. Molaro advised the CD-1 zoning limits interim development permits to three years.

In response to a question from Mr. Henschel, Ms. Molaro confirmed the take-off and landing area will remain unchanged and is all to occur within the Area Alpha. In response to a further question from Mr. Henschel regarding the float plane offices, Ms. Molaro briefly described the rationale for staff's recommendation to relocate them on land.

Mr. Rudberg sought clarification as to where the parking for this facility is expected to occur. Mr. Thomson advised the applicant is required to secure a minimum of 65 off site parking spaces. There are currently about 700 parking stalls available within about a five minute walk of the proposed location, and locations include the Shaw Tower and the currently vacant lot at 201 Burrard Street. Condition A.2.3 will require the spaces to be identified and secured, and condition 1.3 calls for float plane patrons to be regularly advised of off-site parking arrangements in order to minimize impact on neighbouring streets.

Mr. Beasley asked staff to confirm the City's policy with respect to float planes in this vicinity. Ms. Molaro advised that in 1976, the Central Waterfront District identified that float plane operation should continue to exist in the Coal Harbour area, and subsequently the Coal Harbour ODP identified that the float plane operation should be located in the Burrard Landing Precinct of Coal Harbour. As well, the Guidelines for Burrard Landing and the convention centre both identify a float plane operation to be provided in this area. She confirmed there has been no City policy since 1976 that does not indicate that the float planes will be included in this area.

#### **Applicant's Comments**

Laurie Schmidt, Brook Development Planning, introduced the applicant team. He confirmed they have reviewed the Staff Committee Report and accept all the recommended conditions except B.2.2 which they request be worded similar to the Note to Applicant in 1.3, namely "maintenance activities generating significant noise (rev ups) will be restricted to the following hours: Monday thru Friday - 7.30 a.m. to 8 p.m.; Saturday - 10 a.m. to 8 p.m.; and Sunday - 10 a.m. to 6 p.m.", and also to note that these maintenance activities do not include emergency situations which will be outlined in the required Facilities Management Plan. Mr. Schmidt submitted to the Board copies of reports commissioned by the float plane operations in Victoria. With respect to condition 1.1, Mr. Schmidt said they would encourage the Board to allow for the flexibility of possible relocation of the land based facility in the park transition area, as noted earlier by Mr. MacGregor.

Rick Baxter, West Coast Air, referred to a number of open houses held with the neighbouring residents. He noted there have been many discussions around the specifics of approach paths and the take-off and landing area and, in response to a request from a neighbour, the operators have moved the approach path slightly northward, further away from the residential towers. He said they are confident the residents will see some improvements. Mr. Baxter said they have also made available the noise and air quality studies that have been done, both in Vancouver and Victoria. With respect to parking, Mr. Baxter advised they are currently in negotiations to secure the required spaces. He said that in addition to their shuttle bus

services they plan to increase their valet services to reduce the amount of vehicles in the area. They already have a plan in place for communicating parking information to their passengers.

Chuck Brook, Brook Development Planning, submitted copies of approximately 60 e-mails and letters in support of their application.

The Chair circulated correspondence addressed to the Board since completion of the report and up to 2.30 p.m. today.

#### Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley questioned the applicant about alternative locations that were considered for the proposed temporary relocation. Greg McDougal, Harbour Air, said areas to the east of Canada Place were explored and an air and sea traffic evaluation carried out at the request of the Vancouver Port Authority (VPA). During the course of this investigation, the VPA determined it was not appropriate to have a mix of aircraft and vessels, nor did it fit in with their future plans for the area. The VPA have confirmed that anything to the east of Canada Place is unsuitable. Mr. McDougal said they considered locations extending from Second Narrows Bridge to Dead Man's Island but found that any location that provided water access did not provide access for passengers.

Mr. Beasley noted the Staff Committee Report indicates there has been inconsistent use of Area Alpha. To address this inconsistency, Mr. McDougal advised a buoy has been located on the corner as a visual reference for pilots. He added, Area Alpha is a recommended take-off and landing area but is not regulated; air traffic controllers may advise pilots if they are not landing in Area Alpha. However, given its sensitivity, Harbour Air has a policy that pilots are required to restrict landings to Alpha. Mr. McDougal confirmed they have no concerns with the condition calling for designation of a community liaison person and said a similar arrangement is in place in Victoria. He also confirmed he would have no concerns with working with a committee of local residents in this regard.

Mr. McDougal advised they are in discussions with the harbour authority with regard to the floats extending beyond the harbour headline and the VPA has deferred somewhat to Transport Canada on this issue. However, they understand the VPA has the ultimate authority.

In response to a question from Mr. MacGregor regarding condition 1.3, Mr. McDougal confirmed they have no concerns about safety in addressing the requirements. Transport Canada has no jurisdiction with respect to issues such as maintenance times. He explained, when an aircraft is in the water it is considered to be a vessel. When it is in the air, Transport Canada has jurisdiction.

Mr. Rudberg raised a question about the protocols for fuelling the float planes. Mr. Baxter explained the new design they are proposing will be superior to the existing system and it exceeds all local, provincial and national fire code requirements. The new configuration will also allow for improved safety and containment if a fuel spill does occur.

In discussion with regard to the request for operation protocols on staff training on safety, take-offs and landings, Mr. Thomson confirmed that staff would not object to deletion of 1.3 (c), noting the Staff Committee did not have the information provided today when the condition was included in the report. He confirmed the City is not a regulatory authority in this respect.

Mr. Henschel questioned whether there had been any analysis of the potential change in noise impacts as a result of moving the offices off the barge. Mr. Losito said while there has been no analysis, he believes any contribution of the barge to blocking sound would be minimal.

Mr. Timm sought clarification regarding the potential designation of the harbour as an airport. Mr. McDougal confirmed that if this designation occurs, Transport Canada and the port authority would be involved in regulating the landing area. Mr. Baxter explained there is a draft standard currently in place which is expected to be finalized within the next six months. Victoria is currently operating under this draft standard and when it is finalized will become Canada's first certified water aerodrome. Mr. Losito commented that passenger safety consideration takes precedence and will override any restrictions in place with respect to landing. In response to a question from Mr. Timm regarding Area Alpha, Mr. Baxter said he did not believe that moving it north would be an option.

#### Comments from other Speakers

37 delegations addressed the Board. The following Coal Harbour residents were opposed to the application:

Laurie Maine  
Mike Hartner, Coal Harbour Residents' Association  
John Singleton, Solicitor speaking on behalf of the Coal Harbour Residents' Association  
Al Waisman  
Gerry Sieben  
Faye Mankowske  
Yan Chen  
Betty Rumpel  
Glen Patterson  
Jerzy Motyka  
Dimas Craveiro  
Roy Rauser  
Derek Cook  
Doug McLelland  
Anke Provost

Most of the speakers stressed they were not opposed to the float plane operations in the harbour, only with the requested relocation of the facilities. Concerns included noise and pollution impacts on their residences and Coal Harbour Green, specifically the water park, and increased traffic congestion in the area. Concerns were also expressed about the health and safety impacts of the fuelling operations, particularly on the many children in the area. Several speakers suggested the facilities would be better located to the east of Canada Place and thought the application should be deferred until a formal application is made for a temporary location east of Canada Place. It was suggested it is unsafe to allow the seaplane operations to continue in this location given Coal Harbour is now a densely populated residential neighbourhood. Other points raised included:

- the proposed land based facilities will need to be moved again when construction on the convention centre begins; discussions should be held now with the Park Board regarding impact on Harbour Green Park;
- Burrard Environmental Review Committee deals only with the non-human environment;
- the noise report does not include tests and repair;
- unless there is a financial penalty attached, the three year term can be easily extended;
- the existing wharfs accommodate 12 aircraft; the proposal indicates 25, which will double the noise and pollution;

- there is no plan in place to ensure the operations' viability if it has to relocate in spring 2005;
- enough issues have been raised to warrant deferral of the application and further investigation.

Mr. Baxter said there needs to be better definition of maintenance because there are various levels of maintenance. Regular maintenance is performed at the docks which does not necessarily create noise. The noise which is of concern to the residents relates to the "power runs", which may occur at start-up of the aircraft. A full power rev does not occur very often and is not required on a regular basis. Mr. Baxter said West Coast Air conducts most of its maintenance on the weekends in a hangar facility at YVR. Mr. McDougal confirmed that Harbour Air also conducts most of its maintenance at the Vancouver airport. He said they are attempting to reduce the amount of optional high rev testing in the harbour. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, he confirmed that some periods during the weekend could be identified when high revving would not be done except in an emergency.

In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg regarding concerns expressed about uncontrolled expansion plans, Mr. McDougal noted there will be less space for docking aircraft in the temporary facility than the three carriers currently have, for a combined total of about 25 planes. The planes meet all the required regulations; the engines are rebuilt every five years.

Jim Crandles, Vancouver Port Authority, advised that the Board of the Port Corporation and Vancouver City Council, in February 1994, adopted the Central Waterfront Policy Statement which indicates that seaplane facilities east of Canada Place are not allowed. The policy also talks broadly about trying to create a transportation hub in this area, and supports the existing heliport facilities.

Cheryl Hall, Vancouver Rowing Club, addressed the impacts of the proposal on the rowing club which she said do not appear to have been addressed in the report. She wished to ensure that safety and navigational information is included in the process and that the applicant be required to work with the Harbour Master and all harbour stakeholders.

Bob Ransford, Hyack Air, urged the Board to require that other float plane operators be included in the current scheme, noting that private business arrangements have not been achieved to date.

Mr. Baxter said the three applicants represent well over 95 percent of all float plane traffic in Coal Harbour, which they believe is a good representation of the industry. If there was any additional room, they would make it available to other users. The goal is for the permanent solution to be a common facility, open to all. Mr. Baxter confirmed a larger temporary facility would be required to accommodate other operators. Mr. Beasley noted the Board applied a condition to the convention centre, urging the proponents to conduct an RFP for a general use facility. Ms. Molaro confirmed the City could consider another interim use application elsewhere for another operator.

Don Larson, CRAB Water for Life Society, stressed that policy clearly states that sea planes are not allowed east of Canada Place. While he sympathized with the concerns raised by the residents about noise and pollution, Mr. Larson said the sea plane operations should not be moved east of Canada Place, temporarily or otherwise, where they would have a major impact on CRAB park and the surrounding neighbourhood.

Jim Lehto, UD&D, spoke on behalf of Barbary Coast Marina, Pride of Vancouver and M.V. Antibii. He noted that the convention centre will also be displacing 23 vessels, representing 200,000 passenger trips a year, including harbour cruises and the carol ships. This application does not provide for these commercial passenger vessels. They believe the best solution for any interim move would involve all marine uses, allowing shared use of facilities. Mr. Lehto said they believe there are alternatives to the subject proposal, and he noted his clients intend to file a development application for a small marina. He urged that the Board keep its options open and reserve the right to make further amendments to the subject application, which may include provision for commercial passenger vessels in and around this site. He also urged that the City minimize the negative impacts for the relocation of all the interested parties when the convention centre construction begins.

The following delegations also urged that the relocation plans include provision for the charter boat operations and marina:

Murray McDonald  
James McMillan  
Irwin Krieger

The following information was provided by staff in response to some of the issues raised:

- with respect to air quality, Mr. Losito advised the fuel odour does not present a health risk. Condition A.3.1 recommends installation of an overfill protection and vapour recovery system as part of the fuelling operation;
- the proposed relocation includes a traffic turn-around next to the offices. This will be designed to accommodate all drop-offs including taxis and shuttles. It was noted the future Thurlow Street ramp will be operational before the Burrard Street ramp is demolished during the convention centre construction;
- the City of Vancouver Noise By-law does not apply to aeronautical noise which is a Federal jurisdiction;
- the permanent location for the float plane terminal, as indicated in the ODP and zoning for the convention centre, assumes use of the existing Alpha Area for take-off and landing;
- the Coal Harbour ODP states: "The development of Coal Harbour is expected to occur over many years. Interim uses are appropriate having regard to the planning policies approved by City Council." Staff's interpretation is that interim locations and subsequent interim uses would be accommodated within the CHODP. The CHODP also indicates that interim uses will be regulated by a zoning district schedule which permits uses of short term duration. There are references to interim uses in the CD-1 zoning;
- the City's Legal Department has indicated that staff's interpretation is consistent with the ODP;
- it is expected that the navigational impact assessment will consider all users of the harbour, including the Vancouver Rowing Club.

The following delegations spoke in favour of the application:

Peter Armstrong, Rocky Mountain Railtours  
Roger Swetnam, Coal Harbour resident



Darcy Rezac, Vancouver Board of Trade  
Nancy Stibbard, Capilano Suspension Bridge  
Terry Wright, Vancouver Olympic Organizing Committee  
John Ruttan, Tourism Nanaimo  
Lorne White, Tourism Victoria  
Helen Entwistle, Vancouver Economic Development Commission  
Rick Antonson, Tourism Vancouver  
Mary Mahon-Jones, Council of Tourism Association of BC  
Richard Christie, Vancouver Harbour Air Traffic Control Tower  
Lisa Kujbida, Air Traffic Control Association  
Ian Henley  
Ken McNicolls  
Doug Banner, Pacific Spirit Tours

Comments in support included:

- the sea plane terminal is an essential part of the convention centre expansion and the sea planes are a key component of our tourism industry;
- Coal Harbour is a mixed use area and the float planes are a major part of it; it should not become a semi private marina;
- this is a working harbour and the residents have chosen to live there;
- Coal Harbour is less noisy than other parts of the downtown;
- there is no other choice for the temporary relocation;
- the float planes offer a safe and reliable service between Vancouver and Vancouver Island and a move from Coal Harbour would have a very detrimental effect on the services they provide;
- it is important that there is a permanent location for the float planes in the convention centre proposal, and that both facilities are well integrated into the neighbourhood;
- the air traffic controllers expressed concern about the safety of locating the float planes east of Canada Place;
- air traffic controllers noted that the current Alpha Area provides them with excellent line of sight to the seaplanes and they expressed concern with any changes that would reduce visibility and thus hamper safety.

*The meeting adjourned between 7.30 and 8.00 p.m., during the course of the delegations' presentations*

#### **Panel Opinion**

Mr. Haden noted the application was not reviewed by the Urban Design Panel. He said it is important to recognize that the Board can only review the application that is before it. There are a number of issues that have been raised that are not relevant to the application, including alternative sites, operational issues, take-off and landing noise, issues outside the jurisdiction of the City, such as BERC review and Transport Canada review, and business arrangements between the applicant and other parties. It is also important to recognize that overall development plans are policy frameworks, not contractual relationships. The key issue is whether the temporary relocation 260 m westwards creates any substantive increase in noise and pollution relative to the current location.

Mr. Haden said he was satisfied that the recommended conditions address all the major concerns and tend to reduce pollution impacts relative to the current situation. He commented there seems to be a common misconception that the larger civic interest in the waterfront should not take precedence over the interests of the adjoining residents. Further, there is a broad urban design issue involved in the recent substantial increase in residential population immediately adjacent to the waterfront because it has created issues that may lead

to a reduction in the range of waterfront uses. Residents who chose to purchase property in Coal Harbour did so in full knowledge of the existing conditions. The relocation of the terminal is not a substantive shift in those conditions. Vancouver is not a resort; it is a city with multiple, conflicting urban conditions that need to be brought together and they will not always harmonize perfectly. The trade-offs are difficult and challenging but in choosing to live downtown, residents have fundamentally made a choice that they will take advantage of what it has to offer, and that must include taking responsibility for some of the larger conditions that affect the city. With respect to the conditions, Mr. Haden said there should be some specific reference to the considerations of the Vancouver Rowing Club. While it is outside the specifics of this application, Mr. Haden said it would also be advantageous if the existing carol ship facilities could be accommodated, and perhaps the City could facilitate discussions between VCCEP and the float plane operators to keep the ships on the waterfront. Mr. Haden recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Chung said the sea planes provide an essential service and they have been in the harbour for a long time. He recommended approval of the requested temporary relocation. While the proposed location is not perfect, it is temporary. He requested that the applicant minimize maintenance noise. As well, that the applicant investigate concerns expressed about the close proximity of the flight path to the residences. Mr. Chung supported inclusion of consideration for the rowing club and the carol ships.

Mr. McNaney commented that one of the charms of Coal Harbour is the interaction of different uses. The float plane operators are in a difficult situation because they are being forced to move, and the residents have made it clear they do not want to the operations next to their homes. The convention centre needs to be built and it will be a wonderful addition to the city but it will result in the temporary displacement of some uses. The Coal Harbour community will continue to evolve and develop. Mr. McNaney did not support moving the float planes further east. He said the operators provide an extremely important service to Vancouver and he was convinced this is the only viable location for the temporary facilities until the convention centre is built. He noted the operators have already shown their desire to cooperate and have agreed to work closely with the community to ensure their concerns are brought forward. Mr. McNaney said he believed the noise, air quality and management issues can be resolved in cooperation with the neighbourhood. The residents have moved to the area in recent years and should expect some compromises, just as the existing uses were compromised as they moved in. The float plane use is consistent with the plans and should always remain. Mr. McNaney supported the application for a three year term, with the conditions as proposed. He said he was also sympathetic to the uses of the rowing club.

Mr. Henschel said the float planes define the working harbour. Losing them is not an option. Moving the facilities east of Canada Place is also not an option. This is the only location. He supported the application, adding he would like to see the applicant work with the Vancouver Rowing Club and the Barbary Coast Marina to see if there can be some accommodation of their needs.

#### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Beasley commented that this application has presented a quandary. There are three thousand residents who must be considered, and there are also 300,000 travellers and 300 employees who must be considered. Mr. Beasley noted there are different interests that are not easily reconciled. However, it is not a case of winners and losers because ultimately everyone must co-exist. He stressed the float planes have always been in the vision for Coal Harbour and the area west of the existing trade and convention centre. The plans also indicate that the heliport would be east of the trade and convention centre, that recreational moorage

would be in the vicinity of the Bayshore, and commercial moorage next to the convention centre. The intent is to spread the activities across the whole shoreline. There is clearly a policy and zoning which allows interim uses that do not fit the pattern of the permanent development of the site, and this is contemplated to happen in the 15 - 20 years it takes to develop the site. Mr. Beasley said he was certain the Board is well within its rights and obligations to consider this application and it is clear that it can be considered for up to three years. The float plane service is important and it is urgent to solve the problem. Nevertheless, there are still some caveats, including the other reviews and approvals that are necessary, e.g., BERC, Harbour Master. With respect to alternative locations, Mr. Beasley noted the VPA has indicated that sites east of Canada Place are not available. As well, at the City's request, the applicant explored other sites and concluded this was the only option. Mr. Beasley noted the air traffic controllers have also indicated that other sites are not as safe as the one proposed. He added, there are many residents along the entire shoreline and any proposal to move the facility eastward would likely elicit just as much concern from residents of the easterly community. Mr. Beasley said he was convinced the proposal is the best and only site for a temporary location.

Mr. Beasley said he believed the other harbour users are also very important. We must find a way to assist the rowing club, other airlines and the passenger vessels to continue their activities in the port. It has always been in the City's plan that these boats would be in this part of the harbour. He stressed that what is needed is collaboration, and this also applies to the residents because their interests are just as important as the float planes. He said he believes there are solutions to the concerns raised by the Vancouver Rowing Club, involving some adjustments to their routes and cooperation on timing, etc. There is no short term urgency to accommodate other airlines, given a decision has already been made that, in the long run, it will be an airport open to all airlines and this will be part of the RFP associated with the convention centre. Mr. Beasley noted the passenger vessel operators have indicated they will be making a development application and there may well be a way to accommodate them, noting the float plane operators will be one of the stakeholders.

Mr. Beasley said he supported a delegate's statement that the interests of the people are as important as the interests of the company. Fortunately, the closest residential building is not yet occupied, and the buildings that are occupied are a good distance away from the noise and pollution sources. Nevertheless, the residents' comments need to be seriously considered. Noise during take-off and landing is the same in all the options. The normal taxiing operation is relatively quiet. The most concern relates to high level noises during maintenance. The Medical Health Officer advises there is no fundamental health danger in the odours being experienced. However, it is important to deal with it through technical measures. With respect to traffic, Mr. Beasley said he did not believe it was realistic to think taxi drop-off would occur four blocks away, especially when there will be very direct access onto this site. Proximity of the planes to residential buildings is an ongoing concern and close attention should be given to ensuring the pilots are using the Alpha Area very diligently.

Mr. Beasley said it is clear it is an interim use and the following is being done to ensure it has a defined end: the permit is for only three years; there will be a charge on title to ensure the time limit is adhered to; a condition on the convention centre development application ensures a process is begun on the ultimate, permanent location for the float plane facilities. It is acknowledged that the proposed temporary site is not an optimum location and the principle of an interim and temporary use is not debatable. Commenting on the delegations who spoke in support of the float plane operations and the commercial marina, Mr. Beasley urged that they start working with the City, the convention centre developers and other proponents on a permanent solution because it will take the cooperation and collaboration of all to ensure it is

achieved. This applies in particular to the Coal Harbour residents who will need to take a more active role on an ongoing basis with the other users of the waterfront in order to formulate protocols that will allow them to co-exist.

Mr. Rudberg agreed that situations such as this are never easy. He said he was guided by public policy which reflects the public interest. Clearly, the alternative of moving the float plane facilities to the east of Canada Place is not an option. Policy also indicates that interim uses will be allowed to the west of Canada Place and that the Board may consider uses compatible with and not adversely affecting adjacent development. The Board therefore must judge whether this interim use can be built so that it can co-exist with existing development in the area. He said he was convinced they can co-exist. He said he believed the conditions, as amended, will provide for a noise environment that is better than exists today. As well, the improved fuelling facilities will contribute to improving air pollution. Mr. Rudberg said he was also persuaded by the air traffic controllers' concerns about public safety most particularly if the facilities are located to the east of Canada Place.

Mr. MacGregor concurred with the Board's recommendation. He agreed it has always been intended that the float planes will be located in this area. It is also clear in the zoning that these operations are not permitted east of Canada Place. Mr. MacGregor commented that most of the information in the "fact sheet" published by the Coal Harbour Residents' Association is inaccurate. With respect to the concerns raised, Mr. MacGregor said he believed the approval is a step forward because it puts into place mitigation measures that do not exist currently. The process must begin now to secure a permanent location for the facilities and the float plane operators' response today will go a long way towards securing its approval. Mr. MacGregor noted that correspondence received since publication of the report includes 170 letters of support, 2 expressing some concerns and 6 opposed. He congratulated staff for an excellent report that greatly assisted the Board in its deliberations.

#### Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 408662, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated September 15, 2004, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1 to add:

*or onto the easterly edge of the park lands (commonly called the "transition area" and which is a part of the convention centre construction area), with such a move to be considered as a Minor Amendment to this approval; and further to consider locating noisier maintenance activities in the northeasterly area of the site;*

Amend 1.2 to add:

*and further, the size of the facility as measured by the number of berths will not be enlarged;*

Amend 1.3 to add after "Director of Planning", *in consultation with the General Manager of Parks & Recreation and the General Manager of Engineering Services;*

Delete 1.3 (c) and replace it with:

*convening of a community liaison committee with regular reports by float plane operators on operations, in particular in regard to the use of the Alpha Area and noisy activities at the docks;*

Amend 1.3 (d) to add: *and consideration for quiet periods during times of high park use;*

Amend 1.3 (e) to read:

methods by which patrons will be regularly advised of off-site parking *and taxi* arrangements, to minimize patron parking *and taxi drop-off* on City streets;

Add 1.3 (f):

*liaison with the Vancouver Rowing Club;*

Amend B.1.2 to change the date to *March 21, 2005;*

Amend B.2.2 to read:

Maintenance activities *generating significant noise (such as rev ups)* will be restricted to the following hours: Monday thru Friday - 7.30 a.m. to 8 p.m.; Saturday - 10. a.m. to 8 p.m.; and Sunday - 10 a.m. to 6 p.m.

Add a Note to Applicant after B.2.2:

*This would not include emergency situations, to be specified in the Facilities Management Plan.*

#### 4. OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

---

C. Hubbard  
Clerk to the Board

---

T. Timm  
Chair