

Date: Monday, December 17, 2007  
Time: 3:00 p.m.  
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

---

**PRESENT:****Board**

D. McLellan Deputy General Manager, Community Services Group (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  
N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry  
J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry (excused Item 1)  
M. Braun Representative of the General Public  
C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public (Item 1 & 2)  
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

**Regrets**

D. Chung Representative of the General Public  
H. Hung Representative of the General Public

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

B. Boons Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development  
S. Brodie Civil Engineer  
R. Segal Development Planner  
S. Black Development Planner  
A. Higginson Project Facilitator  
P. Huber Project Facilitator  
M. Zak Director of Social Planning  
N. Edelson Senior Planner, Downtown Eastside Group  
B. Johnson Housing Planner  
W. Memon Parking Policy & Development Engineer (Item 3)

**1499 WEST PENDER STREET - DE411520 - ZONE CD-1**

J. Hancock IBI/HB Architects  
J. Stovell Reliance Holdings

**1255 WEST PENDER STREET - DE411500 - ZONE DD**

W.T. Leung W.T. Leung Architects  
H. Knoetzele W.T. Leung Architects  
B. Krause W.T. Leung Architects

**601 EAST HASTINGS STREET - DE409938 - ZONE DEOD**

R. Littmann Orbis Architecture  
M. McElrae President, Union Gospel Mission  
D. Russell Director of Operations, Union Gospel Mission

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

---

**1. MINUTES**

It was moved by Mr. Ridge, seconded by Mr. Judd and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on December 3, 2007 with the following amendments:

Amend the second paragraph starting Mr. Toderian on page 5 by deleting the wording after LEED™ to the end of the paragraph, to read:

Mr. Toderian asked for clarity on Condition A.1.16 from staff. Mr. Toderian noted that there was no Council Policy in place requiring an applicant to certify for LEED™ *Gold and understood that the applicant's aspirations had always been to achieve LEED™ Silver equivalency or better. He encouraged the applicant to achieve the best sustainability achievement they could. He added that the applicant in order to certify for LEED™ Gold would need to start at the beginning of the project as it can't be added on after the design has been completed.*

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

**3. 1499 WEST PENDER STREET - DE411520 - ZONE CD-1  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: IBI/HB Architects

Request: To develop this site with a mixed-use Retail, Residential, Restaurant and Live-Work project containing a total of 145 units, comprised of a 36-storey west tower; a 10-storey east tower; a 5-storey podium; and seven levels of underground parking.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Ralph Segal, Development Planner, introduced the application for rezoning the site at 1499 West Pender Street. Mr. Segal described the development in the surrounding area using the context and architectural models. He noted that the project attempts to minimize impacts on neighbouring developments. The form of development was approved in principle by Council and staff believe the applicant has achieved what Council approved.

Mr. Segal noted that at the rear of the proposal there seems to be a very tight relationship with the building opposite, and a refinement is requested. Staff are asking that there be as much of a setback as possible. In terms of sustainability, the proposal is seeking LEED™ Silver as its target. Mr. Segal added that the project will be a positive addition to the neighbourhood, and in terms of its architecture, an exemplary scheme.

Mr. Segal reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated November 21, 2007. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

**Questions/Discussion**

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

- There is not a lot of room for a more expansive entry.
- The applicant is looking for other strategies as to how the glazing will be treated on the tilted portion of the façade.
- The applicant is planning to include air conditioning in the building.
- A street car route is planned for West Pender that will terminate at Stanley Park.

**Applicant's Comments**

Jim Hancock, Architect further described the architectural plans for the development. Jon Stovell, Developer, stated that they have tried to be sympathetic to the possibility of heat gain in some of the units. He noted that because of the adjacent tower, the reversed slope façade will be in shadow for a great deal of the day. Mr. Stovell added that they will make sure they have calculated the correct response for the façade.

**Questions/Discussion**

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

- The applicant would consider adding colour to the base of the building.
- The LED lighting system will add colour to the blank wall at night.
- The applicant is confident that they will achieve a high Silver LEED™ rating.
- All the suites are to be corner suites resulting in cross ventilation.

**Comments from other Speakers**

None.

**Panel Opinion**

Mr. Wall stated that the concerns of the Urban Design Panel had been addressed in the prior-to conditions. He added that most of the concerns were just about details such as colour, public realm interface, treatment of the plaza and how the elements will come together. Also there were some concerns with the architectural expression of the entry at the south-west corner.

Mr. Tatomir thought it was an awesome project and commended the applicant and City staff. He noted that it would make sense to have a green roof on the small tower and not spend the money on a green roof at the top of the 36 storey tower. He felt the money could be spent in the public realm. Mr. Tatomir stated that he would like to see something other than small CRUs on the street to give motion and interest to the area. He also suggested adding colour to the sidewalk as well as adding a landscape wall or waterfall.

Mr. Shearing thought it was a well designed project and agreed that staff's comments had captured what needs to be addressed.

Ms. Maust was very impressed with the project and thought the applicant had done a good job in including the heritage density.

Ms. Nystedt also thought it was a well designed project.

Mr. Braun recommended approval of the project. He suggested that the applicant didn't need to add any more colour and thought the building was well articulated and would have some

beautiful angles. He added that he would not like to see the design change as he thought the project was stunning in its design.

#### **Board Discussion**

Although Mr. Toderian supported the consideration of additional colour in the project, he noted there is a danger of doing too much. He thought there was an opportunity to put some well resolved, careful colour into the project. He encouraged the applicant to think about the opportunity and how colour could express itself during the day as well as at night. Mr. Toderian also thought it would add interest that the building will express itself differently on varying facades. Mr. Toderian congratulated the application on trying to achieve a high LEED™ Silver and thought the solar gain solution was insightful.

Mr. Judd thought it was a great project.

Mr. Ridge said the building would bring a lot of pleasure to a lot of people and was looking forward to its completion.

#### **Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE411520, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated November 21, 2007, with the following amendments:

Delete Condition 1.5;

Renumber Condition 1.6 to 1.5 and Condition 1.7 to 1.6;

Amend Condition A.1.17 by changing "level 6" to "level 3".

**4. 1255 WEST PENDER STREET - DE411500 - ZONE DD  
(PRELIMINARY APPLICATION)**

Applicant: W.T. Leung Architects Inc.

Request: To construct a new fourteen storey, mixed use, office and residential development containing 28 dwelling units, including three and a half levels of underground parking.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the application for a 14 storey building with residential and commercial spaces. Mr. Black described the developments in the surrounding area noting that the Evergreen Building had just been declared a heritage site. In terms of the Guidelines for the area, any new building must be neighbourly in character, respect adjacent towers and minimize view impacts. Mr. Black noted that staff believe the building responds well to those Guidelines. Staff are asking for some design development for a better response to the open space at the entry near the Evergreen Building, and are asking the proponent to design something similar with their entry that would pickup the angle of the Evergreen Building. Mr. Black noted the applicant had responded to the unique nature of the site and is offering a variety of glazing solutions. Mr. Black also noted that the Urban Design Panel supported the proposal and commended the applicant on their design. The Panel had some minor concerns regarding the residential entry with the Panel suggesting some additional design development in order to tie the entry into the Evergreen's unique expression. There is a four foot gap between the proposed building and the Evergreen which is part of the Evergreen's property. The UDP made a suggestion that some discussion could take place between the two property owners to address how to treat the space.

Mr. Black reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated November 21, 2007. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

**Questions/Discussion**

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

- The applicant is being asked to bring the main entry of the building relatively close to the sidewalk. Also some additional design development is requested to better reflect what is happening on the other side of the property line on the Evergreen Building.
- This is the only time the Board will see the application as it will go to the Director of Planning as a Complete Application.
- The approach the applicant took with the design was so the views could be shared with the neighbouring sites, as well as being respectful to the Evergreen Building.

**Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Leung, Architect further described the architectural design for the project. He noted that they are in discussion with the owner of the Evergreen Building to find a solution as to how to treat the gap. Mr. Leung said he is hopeful that they can find a solution to meet Condition 1.3. He had no concerns with the remaining conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

**Questions/Discussion**

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

- The site is too small to allow for water retention for the landscaping as the cistern would be too big to put on the site.
- There is less of a chance for energy sharing as the retail tenant is too small.
- The tenant will be the owner who is moving his office into the building.

**Comments from other Speakers**

Frank Bassett was concerned with the small setback of the building and the massing being so close to the Palladio as he felt it would have a negative impact on his sense of privacy and would reduce light into his suite. Mr. Bassett read several emails from other owners in the Palladio.

Michael Goldberg was also concerned with privacy issues. Mr. Goldberg suggested moving the massing back towards West Pender Street and to angle the corners of the building so the views would be less affected. He asked the Board to consider ways to ameliorate the views and privacy impacts.

Bogue Babici asked that the design of the building respect the views from the Palladio. He commended the applicant on the design of the building and suggested that the east wing of the building be pushed towards West Pender Street as a way to share the views.

**Questions/Discussion**

- Above the seventh floor, the separation between the new building and the Palladio will be 73 feet, and around 50 feet below the seventh floor.
- The applicant agreed that it is possible to shift some of the mass towards West Pender Street but he hadn't explored that at this point.
- There won't be any more shadow impacts on the Palladio with the shifting of the tower.
- The applicant would rather see more height and less width to the building.
- The Palladio is 33 feet from its property line.

**Panel Opinion**

Mr. Wall noted that the Urban Design Panel unanimously supported the project. The Panel was impressed with the applicant's sensitivity to the approach and Mr. Wall thought the applicant had addressed the Panel's concerns in a balanced way. Mr. Wall noted that shifting the building towards West Pender Street might increase the shadowing. He added that the Panel was impressed with the architectural expression of the façade and liked the different types of glass the applicant was planning to use. Mr. Wall thought the design would create a neighbourly building as the principle rooms look to the north and south with only secondary rooms looking into the courtyard. Mr. Wall noted that one of the few concerns the Panel had, was with the entry, and how it responds to the entry condition on the Evergreen Building. The other concern was the language of the north and south facades and the Panel asked the applicant to use a language that would be sensitive to the Evergreen Building while being mindful of the sustainability measures that were needed on the south façade. Mr. Wall said he got the sense from the applicant that they were responsive to the commentary. Mr. Wall noted that the Board had approved a number of projects in SEFC with only thirty to thirty-five foot separations and this project greatly exceeds what is being built in SEFC.

Mr. Tatomir fully supported the conditions in the Staff Committee Report. He stated that he would like to see the two owners have some sort of feature designed for the gap between the

two buildings. He also suggested the applicant use reflective glass on the façade facing the Palladio to help address the privacy issue.

Mr. Shearing thought the buildings would be extremely close and hoped that staff and the applicant could better address that issue. He felt the building could be a fabulous example of design on a tight urban site. He added that another layer of design could capture more opportunities to make the building a great piece of architecture. Mr. Shearing also thought the privacy issues could be mitigated and added that he would like to see the application come back to the Board for further review.

Mr. Stovell noted that the Palladio is a short distance from their property line and felt it was a shame that the proposal couldn't use the four foot gap so that the new building could be moved over.

Ms. Maust thought the design complemented the Evergreen Building. She added that some design development still needed to be done to the entry. She noted that the difference in architecture between the two buildings was important.

Ms. Nystedt was impressed by the careful design and the sensitive balance to the Evergreen Building. She thought the privacy was well handled on the difficult site and commended the applicant for being open to continue talking to the neighbours. Ms. Nystedt did express concern regarding the cumulative density in Coal Harbour.

Mr. Braun recommended approval of the application. He did not recommend moving the building closer to West Pender Street as he thought that would cause more problems. Mr. Braun suggested the applicant should add some lushness to the new building, something remarkable with the landscaping to reference the Evergreen Building next door.

#### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Ridge would like to see the application come back to the Board. He acknowledged the architect for trying to mitigate the impact of the new building on the neighbours in the Palladio.

Mr. Toderian was cautious about creating circumstances where the Board sees applications more than once. He said that Preliminary Applications should be dealt with at the Board so they don't have to be brought back and can go to the Director of Planning as a Complete Application. Mr. Toderian added that he thought the changes being asked of the applicant regarding the privacy issues were not sufficient to have the application come back to the Board.

Mr. Toderian commended the applicant for the clever architectural approach on a challenging site and that the applicant had taken a real spirit of communication with the neighbours in the Palladio. Mr. Toderian thought the height was right as it pays respect to the Evergreen and doesn't overshadow the building. He also thought the applicant had done a good job of addressing the unique context of the site. Mr. Toderian thanked the public for attending the meeting. He thought shifting the massing would not be the right move as it would create more problems. Mr. Toderian encouraged the applicant to do their best in providing green performance.

Mr. Judd supported the amendments and said he also agreed that the application did not need to come back to the Board as a Complete Application.

**Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE IN PRINCIPLE Development Application No. DE411500, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated November 21, 2007, with the following amendments:

Add a new condition 1.4:

*further consideration to mitigate privacy in relation to units in the Palladio;*

Add a new condition 1.5:

*further consideration to add landscaping elements similar to those on the Evergreen.*



**5. 601 EAST HASTINGS STREET - DE409937 - ZONE DEOD  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Orbis Architecture

Request: To develop a six-storey mixed-use building, containing Retail, Residential and Special Needs Residential Facility - Group Living uses, over two levels of underground parking.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Sailen Black, Development Planner, described the programming for the building, noting that there will be fifty parking stalls underground; the first floor is to have kitchen facilities and a dining room as well as a community drop-in centre; the second floor will provide overnight accommodation for forty-three people; on the third floor there is to be thirty sleeping rooms and also a outdoor roof deck; the fourth floor is for thirty-six studios apartments for independent living; the fifth floor will be for meeting rooms and volunteer dorms; and the sixth floor will be for administrative functions. Mr. Black noted that the proposal was not supported by the Urban Design Panel at the first review with the Panel making a number of recommendations. They recommended adding more brick on the building and a more simple approach to the façade. The proponent has made significant modifications to the building design based on those recommendations. The UDP supported the proposal at the second review.

Mary Clare Zak, Director of Social Planning, said the use was supported and will offer services to people currently residing in the area.

Nathan Edelson, Senior Planner, Downtown Eastside Group, suggested the UGM speak to the neighbours to see if they can reach an agreement and to get suggestions to improve their relationship with the community. He noted that the main concerns are about the concentration of services and the amount of low cost housing in the neighbourhood. From a policy point of view, the zoning does permit these types of services. Mr. Edelson added that the primary focus needs to be for the residents in the neighbourhood. There has been concerns regarding the line-up at the existing facility and a number of steps have been taken to address this issue. These steps include changing the location of the entrance for the dining room and designing the area to be used as a drop-in centre during the day and a waiting area for the dining room at meal time. This should eliminate the need for line-ups on the sidewalk. Mr. Edelson noted that the dining room will serve a maximum of 250 at meal time on a typical day.

Mr. Black reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated December 5, 2007. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

**Questions/Discussion**

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

- The Operations Management Plan is to be included in the development permit.
- If the conditions in the Operations Management Plan are not met by the UGM, the City can enforce their compliance.
- The waiting area will be open for other purposes and can hold more than 250 people.

**Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Littmann, Architect, had one concern with the conditions. He felt that Condition 1.1 c) would affect all the rooms on the upper floors and proposing to green the corner of the building would cover the brick. Also adding a brick veneer on a brick façade would offer no benefit. Mr. Littmann agreed to comply with all the conditions that have been outlined in the Staff Committee Report and will continue to work with staff to deal with issues that have been identified.

Mr. McElrae, President, Union Gospel Mission, said the project was the result of years of envisioning and hard work by many people including residents of the neighbourhood. He said he was thankful for all the support and noted that the UGM had been in the area since 1940 helping those who are in the most need. The UGM assists many people to find hope and purpose in their lives and they are not limited to one municipality as they operate twelve facilities in the lower mainland. The UGM has an annual operating budget of \$10,000,000.00. They are supported by BC Housing and CMHC. Mr. McElrae said that having back to back facilities in the area is financially prudent and ensures enhanced security. He added that they have reduced the number of queries and believe they have worked hard to alleviate the concerns of the community.

Mr. Russell, Director of Operations, Union Gospel Mission, said they had made the commitment with the new building to not have any line-ups on the sidewalk. The new facility will have a larger area for the dining room and more washroom facilities. There will also be an amenity room and fitness room. Mr. Russell said they were taking steps to serve their guests and respond to the concerns of the neighbours. He added that they were excited to be able to take care of more people in need. Mr. Russell noted that there is to be a Community Advisory Committee, more security, the addition of a school patrol along Princess Street, and retail space on the ground floor. Mr. Russell added that the police say there are fewer instances of crime in their block than in the surrounding blocks.

**Questions/Discussion**

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

- Stantec has been hired as consultants regarding sustainability measures for the project.
- The project will achieve 33 points on the LEED™ Scorecard with room for an increase to almost Gold.
- There has been a change in the design resulting in 38 parking spaces for volunteers, staff and residents.
- The retail tenant has not been identified at this time.
- Mr. McElrae agreed that the restraints in the Operations Management Plan and corresponding Agreement can be met by the UGM.

**Comments from other Speakers**

The following delegations spoke in opposition to the application:

Kate Brunton  
Claudine Michaud  
Kieren Beattie  
Rick Archambault  
Patricia Canning  
Mathew Brown  
Dawn Ineson  
Wesley Kenzie

Judy Kenzie  
Danny Wong  
Peter Fry  
June Seto

Comments in opposition included:

- Not opposed to treatment programs and independent living but are opposed to food programs that will destabilize the neighbourhood.
- The facility will attract drug dealers.
- Concerned about the number of people who will come into the neighbourhood.
- More people will be hanging out on the street or in the park.
- The scope of the project and the number of programs is too large to be run well.
- The facility won't revitalize the street.
- The UGM has not been a good neighbour.
- There is no enforcement or contingency plan for problems.
- The service model is flawed. Sooner or later there will be line-ups on the street.
- Good neighbour agreements don't have any teeth and there is no legal remedy.
- Opposed to 200 square foot rooms.
- The facility will draw people from other neighbourhoods.
- Not the right area to add more facilities.
- Will create the biggest "drug mall" in North America.
- Impact on neighbour's house as the building will block the sun and daylight.
- Would like to see more businesses in the neighbourhood.
- Concentrating these kinds of services makes it harder for people to escape their conditions.
- What do they intend to do with non-qualifying individuals who show up to the drop-in centre when they turn them away.

Questions/Discussion

- The capacity of the cafeteria is 500 people. The operating plan states that there would be up to 250 people at any meal.
- The existing facility will be serving the residents and not the public.
- The existing facility is currently feeding 200 people at each meal and requires a line up outside on the sidewalk to do that. The new facility will eliminate the line up outside.
- The vast majority of people using the cafeteria live in a ten block radius.

The following delegations spoke in support of the application:

Audrey Laferriere  
Thierry Dumoulin  
Jamie Hellewell  
Martin Baker  
Gerry McBeth  
Jeremy Fry  
Sister Elizabeth Kelleher  
Alicia Walker  
Irene Vandas  
Bill Chu  
Mike Jovan  
Kathy Walker  
Rev. Bruce Curtis  
Jennifer Crolow  
Arnold Mulesa

**Comments in support included:**

- The UGM has been a good neighbour and their stretch of Cordova Street is always the cleanest.
- The UGM have their own security team which helps provide a safety element on the street.
- The UGM is a positive element in the neighbourhood.
- The UGM transforms lives with help always available and helps keep the neighbourhood clean.
- The UGM has grown in the DTES because they have responded to the needs of the community.
- The UGM is not bringing people to the DTES but is a reflection of the need in the area.
- The daycare centres in the area are in support of the project and the UGM has received forty letters of support from local businesses and have 1,000 names on a petition of support from the neighbours.
- The Franciscan Sisters Benevolent Society has been providing hospitality in the area for over 80 years.
- There are 2,000 homeless living on the streets of Vancouver and the best part of the project is that some of them will get housing.
- We have a responsibility to help the poor and homeless.
- The UGM have a number of programs for children including homework programs and sending children to summer camp.
- The UGM will help make a safer environment for the women in the DTES.
- The UGM is an important resource for St. Paul's Hospital as they send patients with addiction problems from the DTES to them and they would have a harder job caring for these people without the UGM.
- Not every homeless person is a criminal.
- The DTES is a worthy community with worthy people. The UGM gives people a chance by helping them set goals they can achieve.
- There is a dramatic and desperate need for these services.
- The UGM staff not only clean their block but other blocks around the facility as well.
- We need to have compassion for the people who will use this facility.
- The UGM is an opportunity for people and they are facing the problem, not bringing the problem.
- A life is worth more than a building.

**Questions/Discussion**

- The facility will offer 35 sleeping rooms and 37 self-contained units.
- The Salvation Army on Cordova Street has a similar facility.
- The UGM will report regularly on the number of people they are serving. If the number approaches more than 250, then the UGM will find an alternative solution or other facilities to handle those people.
- The vast majority of SROs do not have cooking facilities.
- The UGM is trying to get well designed facilities for shelter and food to better meet the existing needs of the community.

**Panel Opinion**

Mr. Wall said the Urban Design Panel supported the project in terms of its design as well as the changes from the first review. Staff have clearly gone into the changes that the applicant provided to meet the commentary. Mr. Wall stated that the conditions accurately reflect the wishes of the Panel. Mr. Wall noted that the Panel had comments regarding the public realm interface, retail exposure, a streetscape that is typical of most city streetscapes to make for a better neighbour in the community, and how the building will meet the ground was more important than the bulk of the building. The Panel felt the interior open space was very

important and needed some landscape treatment and trees as well as a covered area which will provide a place for people all year around. The Panel also suggested providing additional exterior space on the fifth floor. The Panel thought these improvements would help the building fit better into the community. Mr. Wall said he appreciated the comments from the public and that it was challenging to see through the comments and find a common ground. He noted that the residents on the north side of East Hastings Street thought the UGM was a good neighbour but the people on the south side thought they were not. Mr. Wall thought the discussion regarding safety in the park was outside the influence of the UGM. He acknowledged that the building has been designed for local needs and was not meant to increase the overall amount of services in the neighbourhood. Mr. Wall said the building is appropriate and supportable although there seems to be some contention regarding the size of the cafeteria. He thought it would be beneficial to have all the services in one building noting that the UGM thought the food component was an important part of their out-reach program. Mr. Wall questioned the size of the food serving area suggesting some of the area could be given over to the drop-in centre or to increase the size of the retail.

Mr. Tatomir thanked the public for speaking to the Board. He noted that a better design makes for a better environment and a better community. He said he would like to have seen the Provincial or Federal Government provide funding for the project. Mr. Tatomir was in support of the project and supported the relaxation being asked for by the applicant.

Mr. Shearing also thanked the public for attending the Board meeting. He noted that there has been some moves to cut back the corner to get some light into the house next door. Mr. Shearing suggested scaling back the food services to give some comfort to the neighbours.

Mr. Stovell noted that most of the applications in the DTES had been market applications as the need is real and that need must be addressed. He added that there are strategies that can be used to mitigate the impact noting that line-ups can be brutal. Mr. Stovell was concerned that changing the size of the food services area would result in having line-ups on the sidewalk. He added that the physical space had been designed to have the line-up inside the building. Mr. Stovell suggested the Board consider adding a review to future social service applications.

Ms. Maust recommended support of the application. She felt that staff had gone a long way to assure the neighbourhood that the facility will work, and she added that it fits well within the ODP and the heritage buildings in the neighbourhood. Mr. Maust suggested changing the base of the building from brick to scored concrete to reduce potential graffiti.

Mr. Braun recommended approval of the application. He disagreed that the physical size of the kitchen/dining room meant the UGM would be serving more people. He added that under-designing the building would reduce the buildings usable life time.

#### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Toderian thanked the public for their comments adding that they were very much appreciated. Mr. Toderian was particularly pleased to hear a young person's perspective as well as all the people who shared their personal hardships with the Board. He added that he felt they were all brave to come and share their personal stories with the Board.

Mr. Toderian noted that the Board does not make social policy but merely interprets Council Policy. He added that the Board usually deals with building design issues and rarely deals with conditional use concerns. Mr. Toderian thought the negatives had been mitigated through the design and the issues of the UDP had been addressed. He added that all the issues haven't been solved but noted that an agreement plan will address the outstanding issues. Mr. Toderian

hoped the community could trust the UGM to do their best and that it is not the role of the Board to pass judgement on the past operation. Mr. Toderian reminded the UGM that they are not just providing a service, but that they also need to be a good neighbour. He felt they had come a long way and hoped they would continue their dialogue with the community. Mr. Toderian also noted, in response to the comment that the matter should be move to Council for consideration rather than having a Board decision, that it is not the role of the Board to bump challenging projects to Council.

Mr. Toderian thought the facility was necessary to support the existing population and that there was a need to provide the services to support the people who have great need.

Mr. Toderian thought the scale was appropriate and that the applicant and staff have done a good job in mitigating the problems especially getting the line-up off the sidewalk and into the building. The physical design on a day to day basis will handle 250 people except for three days a year when they will have more people. Mr. Toderian thought it would be easy to monitor the number of people using the facility.

Regarding sustainability, Mr. Toderian thought the applicant would be achieving LEED™ Gold. He noted that healing the community was also a sustainable measure. Mr. Toderian asked the applicant to rethink the amount of parking and to consider reducing the parking. Mr. Toderian said he felt the site was not a powerful corner and didn't need a powerful building. Mr. Toderian added that he supported the existing conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Judd thanked everyone for speaking to the Board stating that their input was heard. Mr. Judd thought there were some significant changes in the building and questioned how the Operations Management Plan would be enforced. He added that he took it at face value that the applicant will live up to the spirit of the agreement.

Mr. Ridge supported the motion. He noted that the relaxations were extremely flexible. Mr. Ridge felt that there was a need to feed and house the homeless as not doing so would not move us forward as a society.

**Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE409938, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated December 5, 2007.

**6. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:20 PM.

---

L. Harvey  
Assistant to the Board

---

D. McLellan  
Chair