

Date: Monday, August 25, 2008
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:

Board

D. McLellan General Manager of CSG (Chair)
B. Toderian Director of Planning
J. Ridge Deputy City Manager
P. Judd Deputy City Engineer

Advisory Panel

J. Wall Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
S. Tatomir Representative of the Design Professions
J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry
M. Braun Representative of the General Public
D. Chung Representative of the General Public
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public

Regrets

N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry
H. Hung Representative of the General Public
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

ALSO PRESENT:

City Staff:

A. Molaro Development Planner
R. Whitlock Senior Housing Officer
J. Greer Processing Centre - Manager

1050 EXPO BOULEVARD - DE412190 - ZONE CD-1

D. Jansen DYS Architecture
R. Gidzinski St. James Community Services Society
H. Gregory The 127 Society for Housing
D. Flanagan BC Housing
A. Amrolia BC Housing

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Toderian seconded by Mr. Ridge and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of July 28, 2008 be approved with the following amendments:

Change all referenced of C3-A to **C-3A**;

Amend Page 6, Questions/Discussion, third bullet:

Add the last sentence before “because” to read:

When a use is an outright use, the Board is not empowered to consider whether the location is a good one for that use. In this case, because all the uses are within the definition of health care office, it is not the purview of the Board to consider whether or not this is a good location for health care uses. ***Council has essentially answered that question by making the use an outright use within the corresponding zoning.*** Because the Board was asked for a discretionary increase in density, the Board can consider the issue of scale and size.

Amend Page 7, Questions/Discussion, first bullet:

Change Class a to **Class B**;

Amend Page 11, Board Discussion, second and third paragraphs beginning Mr. Toderian to read:

Mr. Toderian thanked all the residents for their comments and noted that he ***understood*** their concerns. He said they were facing issues that a lot of communities are facing and he was glad that the speakers gave a human face to the issues ***at this hearing***. He said he ***expected that*** VCH and City staff had been listening ***carefully*** to the concerns ***and that this would inform the City's work in many areas***. Mr. Toderian noted that ***the addressing of many of the issues raised*** were not within the purview of the Board as ***the Board does not pass social policy; Council does make social policy***. He added that if it were the Board's purview he would have had some ***additional*** questions regarding the difference between needle exchange and needle distribution. Mr. Toderian also noted that it was not the Board's purview to question the consolidation of VCH's services.

Mr. Toderian made a motion to approve the application with a number of amendments. Mr. Toderian said he strongly supported a community Policing Station in the facility but left the condition as a consideration noting that it would be up to the police department to make that decision. Mr. Toderian commented on the architectural expression noting that it was ***“okay”***; it would be a background building and he didn't expect architectural excellence ***in a building of this type, but rather a well-scaled, well resolved background building that would contribute to the street context. This building will do that.***

Amend Page 14, Board Discussion, first paragraph beginning Mr. Toderian to read:

Mr. Toderian made a motion to approve the application with an amendment. He said ***beyond the building's commendable sustainability and well resolved scale and massing***, he wasn't all that sure how he felt about the building's ***architectural language***. He said that for two years he's been saying that he wanted architects to take more risks with their architectural ***expression*** and that our usual architecture hadn't gone far enough. Mr. Toderian said he didn't like the building ***because of its***

mixing of styles but he *pointed out that the Director of Planning doesn't have to like the architectural style choice of a building* and it gave him an opportunity to commend the architect for taking risks. He questioned whether the design met the City's aspirations around *urban relationships* and felt that it would with the design development conditions *proposed by staff*. He said that there was still work to be done but would recommend approval of the application. Mr. Toderian said he was anxious to see it once it was built and to get people's opinions of the design. He thought they would either love or hate the design but that it would *support* an architectural dialogue that was needed in the city.

Amend Page 19, Questions/Discussion, the paragraph beginning Mr. Toderian to read: *Mr. Toderian clarified for the members of the public what it is that is the Board's purview in its consideration of the application. The Board is empowered by Council to make specific decision's and one of those decisions is not to second guess the land use consideration that Council has already made. Council already considered the issue of whether social housing and the community resource centre were appropriate uses on the site. They made that decision already and it is not the purview of the Development Permit Board to reconsider that decision of Council. What the Board is empowered to do is to consider the architecture relative to the Guidelines and Policies that Council has passed for the site or the neighbourhood at large.*

Amend Page 24, Questions/Discussion, fourth bullet:
Remove the second sentence "*Engineering will be reviewing the street lighting in the area*";

Amend Page 26, Board Discussion, second, third and fourth paragraphs beginning Mr. Toderian to read:

Mr. Toderian thanked the Advisory Panel for their comments and thanked the members of the public for taking time to come and speak to the Board. He said the Board appreciated having a human face to the impact and thanked the people who were brave enough to express their own experiences both positive and negative. He noted that many of the Board members work with social policy *and are always educated by the perspectives* even though there *were many issues raised* that are not within the Board's purview. Mr. Toderian said he hoped people had received answers to their questions. Mr. Toderian noted that the Board was not empowered to *develop social policy or second-guess* safety or land use issues that are already decided by Council. Mr. Toderian *noted his belief that* the social services *proposed* are going to make the circumstances in the community *and city* better. He said it was the lack of services and housing that make the situation worse. He thanked BC Housing for their involvement and hoped they would do more, noting that the 12 sites were a good start. Mr. Toderian said he appreciated the Province's commitment to sustainability and achieving a minimum of LEED™ Gold, adding that he was confident that what was shown the Board would be the end product and would survive value engineering.

Mr. Toderian said he agreed with some of the members of the Advisory Panel regarding the *quality of the architecture, noting that many* market projects *lacked the* same quality of architecture that was shown in this *social housing* project. He added *his belief* that the non-market projects have raised the bar for market housing architecture.

Mr. Toderian said he appreciated the architectural corner treatment and supported the height of the building relative to the guidelines. He noted that one of the speakers made the point that rules should be followed, but Mr. Toderian said that the success of Vancouver planning has been the discretionary planning system. On a routine *basis* the City relaxes rules *when the careful contextual consideration of impacts and benefits warrants it*. He added that *in this case* they are only guidelines and not rules and do not require a relaxation by the Board.

Amend Page 27, Board Discussion, fifth paragraph, replace whole paragraph with the following:

Mr. Timm said with the lengthy list of speakers he had thought he was going to hear a lot of concerns regarding the project. He said that what he'd heard from the public was more fulfilling and enlightening than he'd expected and made for a long but interesting night. Mr. Timm believes the elevator overrun issue is a trade off between the view impact on the neighbours and the architectural needs and design and this should be a discussion between the architect and staff. Mr. Timm thought that the windows should be turned to improve view opportunities. Regarding the loading, Mr. Timm said he didn't realise that this was only a 10 foot lane and to provide a turning swath into a loading bay would have been a huge imposition for the building program. He said he realized the current lane configuration wasn't a permanent arrangement and that when the lane was developed the trucks would have better access. Mr. Timm said he was in support of the amendments and the project.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 1050 EXPO BOULEVARD - DE412190 - ZONE CD-1 (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: DYS Architecture

Request: To construct a 9-storey Multiple Dwelling (supportive housing) containing 133 units with associated amenity areas, all over one level of parking.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, introduced the application and described the intent of the CD-1 By-law which is to develop a district with primary residential uses. Ms. Molaro noted that the building responds positively to the Cambie Street Bridge and to the unique site layout. She further described the architectural treatment noting the flat iron corner treatment, metal sun shades and building materials. The building materials consist of brick and metal paneling and both the Urban Design Panel and staff were concerned with the tectonic relationship of the two materials where they interface and feel they need more distinction. Also the north and east façade, which are important elevations and visible from the Cambie Street Bridge, need more visual interest. Ms. Molaro stated that staff are looking for a more refined and simplified industrial expression to the façade. Staff are also asking to increase the landscaping treatment and improve the interface along the boulevard. Ms. Molaro added that the applicant's intent is to pursue LEED™ Gold.

Ms. Molaro reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated July 30, 2008. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Rob Whitlock, Senior Housing Officer, gave the following presentation: There has been a high level of interest in this application. A few people have expressed support for the proposal, based on the need in the community and the need to address those who are less fortunate.

Many more people have expressed concerns. However, the planning for the use of this site as social housing which includes supportive housing, dates back to the early 1990s, and has been reconfirmed by Council on a number of occasions.

In 1990, as part of a number of new policies aimed at increasing the housing supply city-wide, Council established a policy that 20% of units in new communities such as the north side of False Creek should be earmarked for social housing. Concord Pacific identified a number of sites, including the site at 1050 Expo Boulevard. That decision was later confirmed in 1993 when the CD-1 zoning was put into place for the Quayside neighbourhood, setting 2 minimum requirements for affordable housing, 138 units specifically for families, and 150 additional units, which can be for other household types as well as families.

In 2005, Council directed staff to formulate a policy for the development of supportive housing. Staff undertook a broad city-wide consultative process which involved 20 meetings and 800 individuals participated directly or indirectly, towards creating a document entitled the Supportive Housing Strategy, which was approved by Council in June 2007. That document identified all areas zoned for apartments as an appropriate location for supportive housing. This includes the north side of False Creek.

In the fall of 2007, the Province of BC announced funding to develop 12 City-owned sites as supportive housing. The site at 1050 Expo Boulevard was one of those sites. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was prepared, and referred by Council to a special meeting to hear delegations, which happened on December 12, 13 and 19, 2007. 55 delegations appeared before Council with a number of messages; most supported the plan, but do more and do it quickly as homelessness is increasing. A number of neighbours of a couple of the 12 sites did not support the MOU due to neighbourhood concerns. Council unanimously approved signing of the MOU on December 19, 2007.

Subsequent to the approval of the MOU, BC Housing selected 3 architectural firms to begin preparation of designs for the 12 sites, and housing sponsors were selected for each site at the end of January 2008. Plans were finalized for each site, and development applications were submitted. The process for each application has involved notification of registered property owners surrounding each site, erecting notification signs on the site, and holding of an open house. This procedure was followed consistently with each of the sites which involve development applications, including 1050 Expo Boulevard.

Specific points raised by community members include the following issues:

133 units are proposed. The MOU stated that the site would be developed with 100 units or more. The number set in the MOU was a best estimate based on an understanding of the zoning. When the architect was hired and a detailed plan was prepared, it was determined that 133 units was possible under the existing zoning (without the need for a further text amendment as indicated in the MOU). BC Housing and the City have sought to optimize the number of units that are possible on each of the 12 sites, and proceeding with 133 was

consistent with that objective, and the broader objective of the City to provide as many houses for people in need as is possible.

This increase has occurred on at least one other site, at First and Main, which involved a rezoning approved by City Council in July, where the units were increased from the 80 units outlined in the MOU to 129 units.

As to the size of the project, there are presently two buildings in the Downtown, the Marble Arch Hotel, with 145 units and Seymour Place, with 136 units which are very similar in scope. The 127 Society for Housing operates Jubilee House and The Wellspring apartments, which are side by side, with a total of 177 units. The projects at 1321 Richards and 1338 Seymour Street will house almost 200 units.

Many people feel that supportive housing is inconsistent with the family emphasis of Quayside and Yaletown. The City has prided itself in fostering inclusive neighbourhoods everywhere, specifically working not to exclude any group because of income, household size, or health reasons. The facts are that of the 446 units of social housing built to date on the north shore, 287 units or 64% have been for families and 139 units or 31% for seniors. This project for singles on low incomes, including individuals with mental illnesses and addictions will be the first, and it will represent one third of all the social units completed to date, and only 1.3% of all the units in the community. Council has specifically endorsed the concept of geographically balancing the location of supportive housing units, through the Supportive Housing Strategy, and this project is consistent with that objective.

Concerns have been expressed about the tenant population and the staffing levels. When meeting with residents of a number of the condominium projects along Marinaside Crescent just over a week and a half ago, staff from BC Housing, Mr. Whitlock and representatives of the two societies described the tenant selection process and the criteria:

- One third to a half of the tenants will be people with mental illnesses or addiction issues;
- Tenants must be able to live independently, with moderate support;
- The tenant mix will be matched to the level of staffing and this will occur through the coordinated tenant selection process managed by BC Housing in conjunction with the housing sponsors. Final say on tenant selection will be by the housing sponsors for the project, in this case The 127 Society for Housing and St. James Community Service Society;
- Tenants with severe mental illness and addictions issues will not be housed here because support will not be able to serve the needs of such tenants;
- In clearly defining this as an apartment building with moderate support levels, those tenants with mental illnesses or addictions will for the most part already be connected to support services in the community; and
- Finally, priority will be given to individuals living in the Downtown South area.

In terms of monitoring potential impacts in the community, staff recommend preparation of an Operational Management Plan (OMP) along with a Community Advisory Committee (CAC), contained in Condition 1.1. The OMP will establish site contacts, outline protocols for dealing with impacts in the community and stipulate annual reporting to the City. The CAC will provide a direct and ongoing communication link between community representatives, including The 127 Society for Housing and St. James Community Service Society, residents, school Parent

Advisory Committees, and businesses, along with City staff, including the Police and Social Development Department staff.

Regarding the potential negative impacts of the development on property value, there is no evidence this will occur. Numerous studies in both Canada and the US reflect this conclusion.

In terms of safety and crime issues, the story is very similar. The City's own statistics on Police call reports for Special Needs Residential Facilities, a level of support above supportive housing, indicate that calls are incredibly low compared to what are defined as "problem premises" which are properties owned by absentee landowners who pay no attention to the activities of tenants on site. Assessment of calls over 10 years call loads shows less than 2 calls per site per year, on average. It is also the experience that service providers monitor activity in the community and are the source of some of those calls to the police as they work to ensure that the community is safe for their own tenants.

Mr. Whitlock noted that the Board will hear criticism of the process, the project, the housing sponsors, City staff, and Council's process leading to adoption of the MOU; however, the process has been open with broad public consultation from the Supportive Housing Strategy, through the 12 sites MOU to the development permit process for this proposal. The bottom line is that housing needs to be provided for vulnerable populations, and that the City and the Province are determined to ensure that such housing is provided, and that it serves people where they presently live, and doesn't relocate people who are sick away from areas with which they are familiar and which they call home.

Council has earmarked this site for social housing through the zoning. In addition to the requirements of the CD-1, the Official Development Plan calls for a diversity of people to be accommodated in each neighbourhood. Supportive housing is specifically part of that housing continuum as defined by Council policy. The need to provide supportive housing city-wide has been confirmed through the Supportive Housing Strategy, which has been re-affirmed with Council's adoption of the MOU. These last two initiatives have been specifically intended to respond the opposition to supportive housing which is common, and where many fears are unfounded. And last but not least, individuals with mental illnesses and addictions, whether they live on the street, live in a low income housing unit, or a strata unit, are residents of the city and deserve to live wherever they choose. Housing is a basic human right and this proposal is providing much needed housing, with modest support, in an area where it is needed. The alternative is that such individuals live in substandard housing, or on the street, and the cycle of deteriorating mental health and substance abuse just gets worse.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by Ms. Molaro:

- Solar panels on the roof and the extension of the brick frame are included in the proposal.
- A green roof is not proposed for the project however, staff have asked for a patterning of the roof materials.
- The darker element was added to the metal skin in response to the Urban Design Panel's commentary at the first review as the Panel felt this was an important elevation as seen from the Cambie Street Bridge and needed a stronger visual interest.
- The wording in the Condition 1.1 regarding the Operational Management Plan is similar to the wording in the previous application presented to the Board.
- The site was identified for social housing in 1993 as part of the broader rezoning for the area.

- Tenants will be selected from people who are living in shelters and SROs in the downtown who are in need of a moderate support level.
- The use for the site went to council at the MOU stage where the public was able to address their concerns.
- Notification regarding the use for the site was advertised in local newspapers as well as to various groups.
- 1010 Pacific Boulevard is run by the Red Door Housing Society and is for low income families. There are no social programs in the project and it is not supportive housing.

Mr. Toderian noted that it was not the purview of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel to reconsider the political decision to allow for social housing on the site. The Board is bound by the decision of Council and is not able to consider if the site is appropriate for social housing. The Board's job is to review the building program, the nature of the proposed building with the parameter of the site and the architecture.

Applicant's Comments

Hilda Gregory of The 127 Society for Housing stated that the society was started in 1981 by a small group of individuals to meet the needs for decent, safe and affordable housing for low income residents in Vancouver. The Society's vision includes a long term commitment to the tenant's personal and social needs. The Downtown South/Yaletown area was focused on as there wasn't any decent affordable, safe housing in that area. Since 1981 the Society has developed and operates three buildings in the Downtown South/Yaletown area. Jubilee House was completed in 1986, Brooklyn Court, a heritage building retrofitted and completed in 1989 and the Wellspring completed in 1997. Within a three block area these buildings provide bachelor and one bedroom apartment for approximately 272 individuals. Jubilee House and Brooklyn Court are adjacent to each other and together provide housing for 178 tenants. Some of the tenants are capable of living independently even though they may be facing psychological or personality challenges, living with a disability or managing their addiction. The proposed tenants for 1050 Expo Boulevard would house people of a similar mix; that is they will be of moderate means. The applicants are assessed on their risk of homelessness and those most at risk are accepted first. Rent is determined on a sliding scale based on each tenant's level of income. For many moving into one of The 127 Society for Housing's buildings it is the first time they have had secure, clean and affordable housing. The Society believes that providing housing is only the first step in helping the tenants live a healthier life style.

The 127 Society for Housing believes that the key to successful housing is to offer more than housing to remove the pressures associated with isolation, build their self-esteem and foster a sense of community. To that end the Society pioneered a community worker program for each of the three buildings. Under the guidance of the three community workers, tenants create programs that meet their needs and provide opportunities to gain life skills. These programs are designed to help tenants gain a sense of self-worth, take on responsibility and develop healthy relationships with others in the community all in a safe, supervised environment. While some programs are tailored to the needs of tenants in individual buildings, others are offered centrally for the benefit of tenants across all three buildings. Tenants are empowered to make their lives better through the many programs the Society offers. It creates a sense of community; they live healthier lives and improve their interpersonal skills. They develop hobbies, discover or rediscover new skills and thus try to reach the Society's goal of building community, rebuilding lives.

The support services that will be provided for the tenants at 1050 Expo Boulevard by St. James Community Services Society will offer similar services for personal and social development with similar goals. The Society in its work employs seven people for administration, building

maintenance, cleaning and weekend relief, plus the three community workers and trained instructor/carpenter who carry out the community worker programs. The 127 Society for Housing's goal as owner will be to manage the building's operations including maintenance and cleaning and to that end they will be responsible for employing a building manager, maintenance and cleaning staff. St. James Community Services Society will be responsible for the support services.

The Board of The 127 Society for Housing is both a policy and working board. There are eleven members who are all long term members as the Society has a long term commitment to the tenants and staff. Two board members have served since the Society was started in 1981 including Hilda Gregory as president with other Board members having served five years or more and will continue to do so. Directors are actively engaged on many fronts assuming responsibility for governance, financial management, fund raising, personnel, tenant relations, and political action. Directors are recruited as leaders and according to the skills required at any given time and thus the Society has over twenty years experience in the Downtown/Yaletown area.

The Society has worked through those years with government agencies, building management and support services through their regular programs which were established under the Society's own volition. The Society has built a strong network with community agencies such as Coastal Health, mental health teams, St. Paul's Hospital and their social office, the Salvation Army, the City of Vancouver community centre, the Gathering Place and Coast Foundations and many of the hotels and SROs along that corridor. This experience will be invaluable not only in the Society's responsibility to the owners of 1050 Expo Boulevard as they recruit staff and manage the programs, but in working with St. James Community Services Society to help meet the needs of the tenants. The Society has every confidence in their abilities and their staff to operate a successful project at the 1050 Expo Boulevard site. In conclusion, Ms. Gregory said that it has often been stated that the measure of how civil any society is, is dependent upon how well it takes care of the poor and the needy. Ms. Gregory said she believed that moving forward with the proposal and the other eleven social housing sites with BC Housing was going a good way to ensure that the City of Vancouver was able to have a good measure of being a civil society.

Rose Gidzinski of St. James Community Services Society stated that the Society is a grass roots social services organization with nearly fifty years of experience building community and providing support for people who face multiple challenges. They are a large multi-faceted service provider with over three hundred staff that operate both in the downtown east side where the Society originated and throughout the City of Vancouver. At present the Society manages over 240 housing units in seven buildings including sixty-eight units of emergency and transition housing for women and their children, seventy-nine units for adults with chronic mental health issues and ninety-seven units for low income individuals at risk of being homeless. The level of support varies in each of these housing situation from 24 hours a day to assisting in connecting individuals with community services such as home support, nursing, medical clinics, mental health and addiction resources. Residents may also utilize other St. James social services such as home support, financial planning and administration, hospice care and guardianship.

St. James Community Services Society's role for the proposed Expo building is to provide services to ensure that residents have the support they need 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to live healthy and independent lives within the community. This is not a new goal for the society as they have partnered with other non-profit housing providers to provide support services to their residential communities.

St. James Community Services Society and The 127 Society for Housing have three main goals for 1050 Expo Boulevard. First to provide supportive sustainable long term housing with a priority to individuals living in the local neighbourhood who are homeless, at risk of homelessness or those who may be living in substandard housing who are at risk for homelessness. Secondly, to create a setting that assists residents to live independently with the life skills and health care support they will need to become active and integrated members of their community. Finally the Society wants to work collaboratively with their neighbours to ensure their programs provide safe and effective services and any issues or concerns which arise relating to the site for the residents and make sure they are dealt with in a timely and effective manner. To achieve these goals, residents will receive the assistance and support to live independently providing them with life skills such as household management, meal preparation, budget and financial management, training and education as well the support workers will assist residents in assessing and accessing necessary physical and mental concerns and then connect them appropriately to health care resources available in the community.

An important component of healthy living is building and becoming part of the community. The Society's programs will assist in creating a community within 1050 Expo Boulevard and connecting them to the greater neighbourhood. The Society believes that these are some of the tools their residents will require in order for them to become a more effective member of our society at large.

At present BC Housing will be providing funding to support a minimum of two training support workers on site 24/7 during normal working hours. They are anticipating additional support staff including those with social worker backgrounds. In addition to the support staff, The 127 Society for Housing will have a building manager and maintenance staff working on site during the day to manage and maintain the building.

St. James Community Services Society and The 127 Society for Housing will be working in conjunction with BC Housing through their coordinated tenant selection process to choose tenants with mixes of ages, genders and backgrounds. They will seek to select tenants who will be able to benefit from their supportive programs and community based resources. There will be a balancing of the support provided and support needs of the tenants. St. James Community Services Society and The 127 Society for Housing will make the final decision on the tenant selection.

Ms. Gidzinski stated that they wish to work collaboratively with local residents, businesses and other partners of the project and to ensure their programs provide safe and effective services to their residents and they totally accept Condition 1.1 in the Staff Committee Report. She added that they look forward to building a strong and lasting relationship with their neighbours in Yaletown.

At St. James Community Services Society they set aside the 'why' and focus on the 'how'. Many of the people who seek their assistance have fallen between the cracks due to the loss of work, illness or disability, other due to family crisis or abuse and neglect which lead them to seek their assistance. Regardless of their choices or circumstances the Society believes they can make a difference and they too deserve a chance to once again have the basic comforts of life. They are after all human beings who are trying to gain back their own dignity, worth and self respect. The St. James Community Services Society team of over 300 dedicated staff consisting of nurses, care aids, assisted living workers, mental health professionals, community health workers, therapists and support staff continue to provide assistance and support to those who face a variety of challenges in an attempt to assist them to reintegrate back into our community at what ever level possible keeping them safely housed, active, stable and

employed. Ms. Gidzinski said they were confident in their experience and ability to make 1050 Expo Boulevard a template for solution for homelessness going forward.

Dane Jansen, Architect, said they had reviewed the recommendations in the Staff Committee Report and were able to work with the conditions. He noted that the solar panels on all of the other projects were being reviewed but in this case they had looked at the payback period and determined that they will use the solar panels as presented. He said he was pleased to work with the Planning Department regarding the patterning on the roof. Regarding the south elevation, Mr. Jansen noted that they will address and strengthen the brick massing. Also they will be using different colours in the solar panels to create animation on the building to strengthen that expression.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- The 127 Society for Housing made a proposal to BC Housing and was chosen to operate the project.
- The application does not require a text amendment.

Comments from other Speakers

The following delegations spoke in support of the application:

Bill Crocket
Liselot Troller
Hilary Virture

Comments in support included:

- The neighbourhood needs to assume responsibility for accepting social and supportive housing;
- The architect needs to be commended for the environmentally friendly design;
- There is a critical shortage of supportive housing in the city;
- Reducing the number of the units would mean more people would be denied supportive housing;
- Illegal activities will not be tolerated and will result in immediate eviction;
- The project will help clean up the neighbourhood; and
- The people who will live in the facility are already in the neighbourhood and living on the street or under the Cambie Street Bridge.

The following delegations spoke in opposition to the application:

Vince Schiralli
Christine Wilson
Jonathan Jedwab
Biljana Ljubojev
Patricia Byrnes
Dave Roberts
Brian Antenbring
Liz Cu
Linda Harris
Renne Gallioz
Jyson Tyler
Joyce Neil

Judith Fiedler
Alex La for Wendy Kwan
Loretta Wong
Michelle Roberts
Edwin Lee
Christian Abaya
Tracy Lim
Edward Young
Renee Kim
Nancy Jones
Linda Lauritzen
John Arthur
David K. Chen
Jody McManus
Allen Huey
Amin Shahbaz
Fiona Ooi
Donald Currie
Gloria Arnold
Gorki Nikolic
Fred Harris

Comments in opposition included:

- In support of social housing but opposed to the proposal in this neighbourhood;
- The project is too large for the area;
- The project represents a security risk with the possibility of attracting more crime into the neighbourhood;
- The mix of tenants and the level of supervision is a concern (no medical staff on duty);
- The City's notification process was inadequate and incomplete;
- Concerned with housing homeless individuals with mental health problems;
- The height of the building is over the recommendation in the guidelines;
- Need more time to plan for the community;
- Management plan for tenant selection criteria was not provided in a timely manner;
- Concerned that tenants won't be obligated to enrol in any health care or addiction programs;
- Question the rationale of increasing the number of units from 100 to 133;
- Question the density in the project and the number of people that will be housed in the development;
- Concerned with the combination of addiction and low income residents;
- Concerned there will be more drug dealers in the area;
- BC Housing can't guarantee the safety for the surrounding community;
- Not a good location for people with mental health due to the noise and polluted environment;
- Would like to have had the opportunity to speak to Council;
- Have a petition with over 400 signatures requesting for "a meeting between the Yaletown Residents Association and City Council at which all aspects of the proposal will be open for discussion;
- Why isn't there any commercial or residential at grade in the building;
- Concern with liveability and size of the units;
- Would like to have seen more public education on the project and time for the community to learn about the project and have a say on what is planned for the community. The Yaletown community has been excluded in this process;

- Recommendation for a Community Advisory committee to allow the residents to have their say in the process;
- The Operational Management Plan should be in place prior to approval of the application;
- Would like to see residents pass a criminal history check before being accepted to live in the facility; and
- Concern with the potential for reflected light from the solar panels on surrounding buildings.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by staff and the applicant team:

- In the last few years most social housing units have been for single residents.
- Supportive housing projects are located in high density areas and tend to be located in areas with high crime rates.
- The statistics for police calls showed on average, two calls per social housing project per year.
- The largest social housing project for singles is Seymour Place with 135 units.
- The screening for residents will be done by health professionals and their role is to make sure the residents are matched to the appropriate unit with the level of support required.
- Residents will be selected from SROs and will range from people with multiple needs to people with moderate needs and will be matched to the level of support required.
- The 127 Society for Housing and BC Housing will place people in other housing projects or seek recovery means of treatment for the individuals with drug addiction problems.
- The intention is to create a harmonious environment in the building and anyone who jeopardizes the security of the other residents will be removed.
- The Operational Management Plan (OMP) is aimed at dealing with potential impacts in the neighbourhood.
- The operator will not be responsible for active drug use beyond the property limits.
- There will be guidelines for acceptable behaviour and illegal activity will be cause for immediate eviction. If a resident's behaviour is not acceptable there will be a process to address and they will be given an opportunity to change that behaviour.
- Access to the site has gone through a number of reviews and will be explored through design development.
- The unit sizes are typical for those being funded by BC Housing with the common unit size being 320 square feet.
- The galvanized fence surrounds the planters associated with the outdoor seating area and is a security aspect.

Mr. McLellan noted that Council made a decision through the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and the process was made public. The Development Permit Board looks at the technical aspects of the development application. The process is to have some neighbourhood consultation and notification goes out to the surrounding neighbours. The DPB is not able to overturn any Council decision regarding land use in the City. The Board looks at technical issues and that Council Policy is being adhered to.

Dominic Flanagan of BC Housing stated that any of their new developments are there to serve the most vulnerable. How those services are applied is based on experience. The 127 Society for Housing and St. James Community Service Society are best at serving a moderate population and will screen their potential residents. They may have a mental illness or chronic health issues. In the Downtown South area priority will be given to people who live in the

Downtown South area, who live in inadequate housing or SROs. BC Housing looks at the context for each site, the partners on the site, community considerations, and range of population. There is no set number for the amount of support staff BC Housing will provide but is based on their experience with their partners like Vancouver Coastal Health and with the non profit sector. For this size of building BC Housing will have a minimum of two support staff 24/7. This is separate from the Operational Management Plan which is more about community involvement.

Mr. Whitlock noted that regarding Condition 1.1 they would look at the minimum staffing level in conjunction with the Community Advisory Committee at the end of first year. Mr. Whitlock said he committed to the fact if for some reason the building was not managed properly the situation would be reviewed much earlier. He added that in their experience working with BC Housing and society's like St. James Community Service Society who have been in operation for many years, if there are problems it would be dealt with immediately.

Mr. Flanagan noted that the social housing sites range from 30 units to over 130 units. Mr. Whitlock added that the smallest of the new sites is 51 units at the West 16th Avenue and Dunbar Street site, 62 units at West 7th and Fir Street and the remaining projects have all been in the vicinity of 100 to 110 units and East 1st Avenue and Main Street is 129 units.

In answering a question from Mr. Toderian, Mr. Whitlock stated that they had talked to the Vancouver Police Department in preparing the report and they were not able to identify significant issues in respect to any social housing project in the city. Mr. Flanagan added that BC Housing has monthly meetings with the Police Department and the housing providers and the Police have no concern with their management of the SROs.

Ms. Gregory noted that they will be responsible for the operation of the building during the day and St. James Community Services Society will be providing support workers. The mix will be similar to people they are currently housing elsewhere. She stated that they don't have problems with crime or abuse in their projects. She added that they actually have problems with the market housing surrounding them. They already have a waiting list of people who live in the SROs and hotels in Downtown South who will be suitable to move into 1050 Expo Boulevard.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall stated that the application received support from the Urban Design Panel (UDP) at the second review. There were some minor concerns regarding architecture but the Panel felt it was a dynamic and interesting form that related well to the site. They also thought the façade expression was appropriate and related to its prominent site. There was some encouragement from the Panel for the applicant team to push the design a bit further and suggested using punched windows to reduce energy consumption and create good liveability for the residents. The Panel also felt wider windows would give a great deal of view opportunities and create a warm and welcoming room. The application was not supported at the first review and the Panel though solar shades should be added to the south side of the building and at the second review the Panel encouraged the applicant to look for opportunities to introduce colour or variation to add some richness to the façade noting that it would not be a background building. The Panel also encouraged the applicant to address the architectural expression as they had a minor concern regarding how the materials came together. There is still some concern with the brick and metal panels and how they relate to each other. Another issue for the Panel was how the building relates to the ground plane and its public realm interface. Regarding the chain link fence, Mr. Wall suggested the applicant consider looking at something that has more of a landscape quality, more reminiscent of a landscaped fence. Also, Mr. Wall noted that the

parking entrance seemed to separate the north patio from the easterly garden and would be a benefit if those two areas were connected. Mr. Wall also thought the heat recovery unit on the roof could be enclosed in the elevator penthouse to make it less visible.

Mr. Tatomir thanked the public for attending the meeting. He commended the architect for the design noting there was a lot of consideration given to sustainable features. Regarding the height, Mr. Tatomir noted that there are much higher buildings in the surrounding neighbourhood and thought that nine floors was not too high given the floor area. He encouraged the applicant to play with the colours on the building and to make sure the solar panels are not reflecting light to the surrounding buildings. Mr. Tatomir encouraged the public to approach the two societies as well as BC Housing and work together to get the best Operational Management Plan for the community.

Mr. Stovell thought the public had a lot of fear regarding changes in their neighbourhood and thought that fear would disappear once the building was occupied. He added that it was better than having people living on the street where they do more damage to themselves and the neighbours. Although Mr. Stovell thought the façade needed some improvement, he said he supported the conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

Ms. Nystedt noted that the supportive housing site in Dunbar was an example of how to work with the neighbourhood. They started back in 2002 with a public hearing with most of the neighbours not in support of the project. They were concerned about needles in the neighbourhood, property values, crime, etc. When that application came to the Development Permit Board there were very few people who expressed their concerns regarding the project because there had been a lot of dialogue with the various parties involved and as a result the neighbours had come to an understanding and a sense of partnership. Ms. Nystedt said she hoped that message could be communicated to the parties involved in 1050 Expo Boulevard so that they can partner the community in a meaningful way. Ms. Nystedt thought there hadn't been a conspiracy to leave the Yaletown residents out of the process and that the application needed to be looked at as a community exercise. The only solution when dealing with fear is education. Ms. Nystedt added that the Board would make sure the needs of the community were taken into consider through Condition 1.1 regarding the Operational Management Plan.

Mr. Chung noted that the Provincial and Civic Governments were finally in agreement on the problem of homelessness in the city. He added that it had been a long time coming and recommended approval of the application. Mr. Chung recommended changing Condition 1.2 to include the north façade as he felt it also needed some improvement. He liked the shape of the building noting the shape of the site dictated the shape of the building. Mr. Chung added that it was nice to see a social housing project that was not bland. He encouraged the public to get involved with the Community Advisory Committee.

Mr. Braun thanked the public for their comments. He thought the shape of the building was interesting but was disappointed that the south façade would be brick. He thought the metal panels made for a sleek design and encouraged the Board to amend Condition 1.2 and give the architect more leeway with his design as he would like to see the façade have more metal than glass. Mr. Braun thought there should also be a condition added for a green roof or at least an interesting roof with pavers. Regarding the chain link fence, Mr. Braun thought they were hideous and thought the fenced material should be changed.

Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian thanked the many speakers noting that the Board was listening to everyone. He said that the Board may not have the purview to change the decision of Council but that he and

the rest of the Board work with Council every day on social policy. Mr. Toderian asked the public to understand that it is the Board's job to listen to what people say on any given night in the context of everything else they know, everything they hear from the public every day, and the policy they are given by Council. There is a crisis regarding homelessness in the city, and the recent funding by BC Housing for units is a good start. He thanked BC Housing, noting that it is a no win situation as government gets criticized when housing is not provided and criticized when it is provided.

Mr. Toderian noted that it was the basic obligation of the Board to consider the size and scale of the application within the urban fabric adding that he hadn't heard anything to suggest the building scale itself was too big. The Board did hear about the number of units and the size of the units.

Mr. Toderian said he was not inclined to second guess BC Housing regarding the operation of the facility, noting that the relationship with the neighbourhood has to do with creating a proper Operational Management Plan. He said that developing social housing is not going to increase crime, but in fact will have the opposite effect. He believed that it is the lack of social housing that has contributed to the property crime issues in the city.

Mr. Toderian noted that there will be a discussion with the community regarding the Operational Management Plan but thought the operators and BC Housing shouldn't wait for that to be started. The Board suggested that there was a problem with communication and information. Mr. Toderian added that the City's notification process needs some scrutiny and that the Development Permit Board meeting hopefully had been an opportunity to answer questions and inform the community.

Having spoken to the issue of use, Mr. Toderian expressed strong concerns about the weakness of the building architectural expression on what he sees as a special, "landmark" site in the urban pattern. Considerable work is needed to be done.

Mr. Ridge said he was encouraged that the Operational Management Plan would deal with the impacts to the neighbours and that two of his colleges would be reviewing that plan. He thanked everyone for their comments and said he realized how frustrating it can be when there are changes in the community.

Mr. Judd thanked the public for their comments. He noted that it was not the Board's mandate to make changes to Council decisions. Everyone is in support of supportive housing, especially in this neighbourhood. The key to the success of the project will be how the operators develop the requirements in Condition 1.1 in the Staff Committee Report. Mr. Judd added that St. James Community Service Society and The 127 Society for Housing have heard the concerns and he believed they would take that in to account in developing the plan. He urged the public to get involved in developing the plan and being part of the Community Advisory Committee.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Toderian and seconded by Mr. Ridge and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE412190, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated July 30, 2008, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.1 by adding “and the Director of Planning” after Managing Director of Social Development;

Amend Condition 1.2 to read:
design development to strengthen the architectural expression of the south façade by articulating the two primary elements as physically distinct, **and by further breaking up of the brick expression**;

Amend Condition 1.4 to read:
significant design development to north, east and **west** facades to provide more visual **expressiveness and** a more integrated approach to the material treatment;

Note to Applicant: More expressive design elements including colour should be considered. This should be done through inexpensive and sustainable design approaches. This building has a prominent siting and these three elevations will be substantially experienced within the cityscape. All three facades need further significant development.

Add a new Condition 1.9 to read:
Design development to improve the visual interest and appearance of the roof;

Note to Applicant: Opportunities that also facilitate sustainability and liveability are encouraged.

Add a new Condition 1.10 to read:
reconsideration of the galvanized fence material without substantially adding project costs.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:38 PM.

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

D. McLellan
Chair