

FEBRUARY 19, FEBRUARY 21 AND FEBRUARY 27, 2001

Dates: Monday, February 19, 2001; Wednesday, February 21, 2001; Tuesday, February 27, 2001
 Time: 3.00 p.m.
 Place: The Ballroom, Plaza 500 Hotel, 500 West 12th Avenue

PRESENT:**Board**

F. Scobie	Director of Development Services (Chair)
L. Beasley	Co-Director of Planning
B. MacGregor	Deputy City Manager
D. Rudberg	City Engineer

Advisory Panel

J. Ross	Representative of Development Industry (absent February 27)
D. Chung	Representative of General Public
M. Mortenson	Representative of General Public (absent February 27)(excused Item 3.)
R. Bruce Scott	Representative of General Public

Absent

P. Grant	Representative of the Design Professions [Urban Design Panel]
J. Hancock	Representative of the Design Professions
P. Kavanagh	Representative of Development Industry
J. Leduc	Representative of General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

R. Michaels	Manager, Enquiry Centre, Development Services
M. Thomson	City Surveyor
J. Brooks	Director, Social Planning
D. Macpherson	Drug Policy Coordinator
Ins. K. Doern	Vancouver Police Department
M. Gordon	Central Area Planning
N. Edelson	Central Area Planning
A. Mak	Translator

Item 3 - 401 Main Street - DE405520 - Zone HA-1

J. Burton	Birmingham & Wood Architects & Planners
M. Clague	Director, Carnegie Centre

Item 4 - 166 East Hastings Street - DE405516 - Zone DEOD**Item 5 - 569 Powell Street- DE405517 - Zone DEOD****Item 6 - 412 East Cordova Street - DE405518 - Zone DEOD****Item 7 - 59 West Pender Street - DE405519 - Zone DD**

G. Sportack	Omicron
R. Woodward	Vancouver/Richmond Health Board
H. Hay	Vancouver/Richmond Health Board

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

The Chairperson introduced members of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel and briefly described the Board's procedures. Mr. Scobie's comments were translated into Cantonese by Andrew Mak.

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of February 5, 2001 be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 401 MAIN STREET - DE405520 - ZONE HA-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Birmingham & Wood Architects and Planners

Request: Exterior alterations to the terrace adjoining the Main Street frontage of the existing Carnegie Centre; provide new covered seating and tables and ramps, including the retention of the existing trees; replacement of an onsite raised sidewalk adjoining the lane; replacement of new doors and grilles at the southwest corner of the building ; and repairs to existing light fixtures.

Advisory Panel member, Michael Mortenson, declared a conflict of interest on this Item. He will refrain from participation in deliberations on this application.

4. 166 EAST HASTINGS STREET - DE405516 - ZONE DEOD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Omicron

Request: Alterations to the 1st storey and portions of the basement and mezzanine levels of this existing building together with a change of use to provide a social service centre having an approximate floor area of 3385 sq.ft.

5. 569 POWELL STREET - DE405517 - ZONE DEOD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Omicron

Request: Interior and exterior alterations to facilitate the change of use of the existing one- storey building from wholesale use to a medical health office.

6. 412 EAST CORDOVA STREET (formerly 410 E Cordova St) - DE405518 - ZONE DEOD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Omicron

Request: Interior alterations and a change of use of the first storey of the existing building from a medical health office to an education and life-skills training centre.

7. 59 WEST PENDER STREET - DE405519 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Omicron

Request: Interior alterations to the first storey of the existing building to provide for a change of use to a health care office. The second storey is to continue as a vacant space.

Development Services Staff Introduction

Rick Michaels, Manager, Enquiry Centre, Development Services, first reviewed the process undertaken for the five development applications, noting they are related with respect to use, location and key issues. The applications are being processed concurrently and included property owner notification that identified the linkages between them. For the most part, the community response has been in respect to the five applications as a single package. Mr. Michaels briefly described the development permit process and the notification process. Information sent to property owners included the Vancouver/Richmond Health Board (VRHB) Overview and Detailed Description of Use, and an overview of the Vancouver Agreement. These documents are also included as Appendices D and E, respectively, in each of the five Development Permit Staff Committee Reports dated February 12, 2001. The VRHB's community consultation process is described in Appendix F.

More than 3,000 responses to the notification were received as of February 16, 2001. Approximately 900 letters of opposition have been received, of which approximately 100 are within the notification areas. There are also approximately 2,500 letters of support, of which about 400 are from addresses within the notification areas. The majority of the submissions are form letters. The key reasons for support or opposition to the applications are contained in the Staff Committee Reports. All the responses acknowledge there is a serious problem with drug addiction in the neighbourhood that needs to be addressed. Mr. Michaels stressed the notification is not a referendum. The number of responses indicates the extent of public interest but the content of the responses is the most critical, especially in how it relates to the Council-adopted policies, guidelines and by-laws against which Staff review the development applications. Staff concur with the community's concerns about the potential impact of these applications; however, staff believe that under the auspices of a Good Neighbour Agreement and time-limited approvals, any negative impacts arising from any of the applications can be dealt with quickly.

Mr. Michaels explained the criteria for reviewing each of these applications comes from Council-adopted by-laws, guidelines and policies. These together comprise the measuring stick which is applied to all development applications in deciding an outcome. The relevant references to Council-adopted guidelines and by-laws are also indicated for each site in its respective report and are the basis for the staff recommendations of approval to the Development Permit Board.

Mr. Michaels then reviewed each application separately in terms of the applicable by-laws and guidelines, referring also to the Staff Committee Reports. The time-limited approvals for the four change-of-use applications are based on a one year period of operation.

401 Main Street (Carnegie Centre) (identified as Site A)

This is not a change of use application but seeks only exterior alterations to better relate the space to functions within the Carnegie Centre, and to improve security, circulation and monitoring. The major condition of approval is the requirement for a Good Neighbour Agreement. Staff are also seeking improvements to the lane, as outlined in the report. Relevant regulations are the Heritage Conservation Act and the HA-1 District Schedule.

The Development Permit Staff Committee recommendation is for approval, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

166 East Hastings Street (The Roosevelt Hotel) (identified as Site B)

This application involves a change of use to the main floor and portions of the basement and mezzanine to create a contact centre. The remainder of the building will remain unchanged as a lodging house. The main issue is suitability of use and the major condition of approval is a Good Neighbour Agreement. Staff seek proper interface between the contact centre and lodging house uses. Pedestrian weather protection is also being sought. The relevant regulation is the Downtown Eastside/Oppenheimer Official Development Plan (DEOD).

A time-limited approval is recommended by the Staff Committee, subject also to the conditions outlined in the report.

59 West Pender Street (identified as Site C)

This change of use application is in the Downtown District and seeks to convert the first floor to a health clinic. It is primarily a relocation of an existing clinic in Gastown (Blood Alley). The second floor would remain vacant.

A Good Neighbour Agreement is being sought, together with a time-limited approval, as outlined in the Staff Committee Report.

569 Powell Street (identified as Site D)

This change of use application is in the Downtown Eastside/Oppenheimer District. The proposal is to re-house the existing clinics at 412 East Cordova Street and 501 West Hastings Street. Staff recommend relaxation of the parking requirement, noting the proposed change of use does not increase parking or loading demands for the building, nor alter the level of nonconformity that currently exists.

A Good Neighbour Agreement is being sought, together with a time-limited approval, as outlined in the Staff Committee Report.

412 East Cordova Street (identified as Site E)

This site currently contains a health clinic on the main floor, with housing above. Parking requirements were relaxed at the time of approval. The change of use application is to convert the existing building to a life-skills training centre and this use improves upon the existing parking nonconformity.

A Good Neighbour Agreement is being sought, together with a time-limited approval, as outlined in the Staff Committee Report.

Comments from Social Planning

Jeff Brooks, Director of Social Planning, began his comments by stating that the last ten years or more has seen an epidemic of heroin and cocaine use in the Downtown Eastside, along with ten years of neighbourhood frustration. In July 1999, the City, the Province of B.C. and the Federal Government signed the Vancouver Agreement which committed all these governments to work together as partners to improve conditions in the

Downtown Eastside. To prevent drug use and provide treatment for addicts, and to improve public safety, in September 2000 the Vancouver Agreement partners announced a series of health initiatives. These initiatives will be supported by the coordination of Police, City staff, treatment agencies and the Vancouver/Richmond Health Board. The five development sites now being considered represent the start of a comprehensive system of treatment services that are linked and respond to the goals of the local population, linking addicts from other communities to services within their home communities and reducing the open drug market at the corner of Main and Hastings Streets. Mr. Brooks noted the Province and the Federal Government have just announced agreement in principle to developing a new drug treatment court in Vancouver.

Mr. Brooks briefly commented on each of the applications, describing the services that will be provided. In response to neighbourhood concerns that the contact centre at **166 East Hastings Street** might attract drug users from other areas, Social Planning recommends the VRHB demonstrate that procedures are in place to determine where individuals using the centre are coming from, with plans to link those from outside the area to facilities in their home communities. Community concerns continue to exist that this facility will become an illegal safe injection site. The VRHB has stated that a safe injection site is not part of the programming of the contact centre and drug use will not be tolerated. Social Planning recommends that if this facility becomes an illegal safe injection site, the facility be closed.

In summary, Social Planning views these five applications as a first step in building a comprehensive system of drug and alcohol services for the Downtown Eastside community that is also linked to a city-wide strategy. Each application is strengthened by having a monitoring and evaluation component that includes residents, businesses, community organizations and Police. Benefits to the community will be improved access to health services, increased health among the marginalised population of drug users, an increase in referrals to services in other areas of the city and region, a reduction of the open drug scene within the neighbourhood and a reduction in crime. Social Planning acknowledges that while these facilities are an important first step, significantly more prevention and education programs as well as alcohol and drug treatment services including drug treatment courts, must immediately and in the long term be developed throughout the city and the region to complement attempts to deal with addiction issues in the Downtown Eastside.

Comments from Vancouver Police Department

Inspector Ken Doern stated the Vancouver Police Department supports all five development applications. The Police Department believes this partnership with Health will improve the safety of those who live, visit and work in the Downtown Eastside. Without the Carnegie Centre redesign and the health contact centre in place, Police believe enforcement alone cannot improve the existing conditions on the street. Both initiatives are critical to improving public order. Police will continue to work with the Health Board and City staff to develop a comprehensive health and safety strategy for the area, based on the four pillar approach. The Police will be participating in neighbourhood liaison committees. Inspector Doern briefly reviewed the proposed services at each location and noted the improvements the Police believe will occur.

Mr. Mak provided a brief translation of the foregoing staff presentations.

Questions

In response to a question from the Board, Mr. Michaels advised the application for 401 Main Street was reviewed by the Chinatown Historic Area Planning Committee and the Committee supports the proposed changes.

With respect to the commentary from Permits & Licenses in the Staff Committee Reports, Mr. Michaels confirmed this is provided for information only since it applies to the Building Permit application which is being processed concurrently with the development applications. Mr. Michaels also confirmed that the reference to "The Applicant" in the Good Neighbour Agreement means the Vancouver/Richmond Health Board.

Responding to a question from the Advisory Panel, Inspector Doern said the Police see the proposed facilities at Carnegie Centre as an improvement that will provide an opportunity to link those seeking treatment to the facilities at the Roosevelt Hotel. This will allow Police more time to focus on the drug traffickers at the Main/Hastings corner, ultimately reducing the need for addicts to congregate there. The expectation is that there will be a reduction in crime in the area and it will be a safer and more livable community for residents, businesses and visitors.

Applicant's Comments

401 MAIN STREET - DE405520 - ZONE HA-1

James Burton, Architect, briefly reviewed the proposed changes to the Carnegie Centre, noting the redesign of the corner also includes areas on the sidewalks and the lanes around the building. In response to the property's heritage status, the proposed changes will affect the existing building fabric as little as possible and the additions will not be easily confused with the original.

Michael Clague, Director, Carnegie Centre, confirmed the Good Neighbour Agreement will involve those whose businesses and residences are most immediately affected by the change of the Main and Hastings corner.

166 EAST HASTINGS STREET - DE405516 - ZONE DEOD

412 EAST CORDOVA STREET (formerly 410 E Cordova St) - DE405518 - ZONE DEOD

59 WEST PENDER STREET - DE405519 - ZONE DD

569 POWELL STREET - DE405517 - ZONE DEOD

Using a slide presentation, Gerry Sportack, Omicron, reviewed the proposals for the above four sites.

Robyn Woodward, Vice Chair, Vancouver/Richmond Health Board, noted they held or participated in close to 100 community meetings during the past year, consulting with this community on their health and safety needs.

During this process, they were repeatedly asked to provide a wider range of supports and health services for families, seniors and for those suffering with mental health problems. They were also asked to provide expanded sobering, detox and counselling aimed at not only harm reduction but also services that would lead to abstinence and recovery. The public also wanted accountability for the programs being offered. Last summer, the responsibility for adult alcohol and drug services was transferred from the Ministry of Children and Families to the VRHB. The VRHB decided a city-wide alcohol and drug strategy must be developed and implemented so that the serious nature of addictions throughout the city can begin to be addressed. The VRHB is committed to provide a wide range of addiction services in every neighbourhood of the city as well as the Downtown Eastside and these will be provided in the community health centres. Some are already in place and in use in many areas of the city. However, since the majority of addicts live in the Downtown Eastside the existing downtown clinic space cannot begin to provide the level of service needed. These are critical and urgent health and safety needs which need to be addressed in this neighbourhood. The services proposed for

these four sites represent the minimum level of support that needs to be implemented if we are to address the health and safety needs of the area population. Ms. Woodward confirmed the VRHB agrees with the conditions in the Good Neighbour Agreement.

Heather Hay, Network Director and Regional Director for Adult Alcohol and Drug Services, first described the client population in the Main and Hastings area. She stressed the majority of these people do not want to be there. They want access to health care and immediate access to treatment services. They also want jobs and to return to their families and to society. These applications are a beginning towards finding a solution. They can build a bridge to identify commonalities and to resolve differences. Ms. Hay then reviewed the services to be provided at each of the sites. In summary, she urged the Board to approve the applications to help heal the addicts in the Downtown Eastside, to heal a fractured community, and to establish a foundation to move towards a solution together for the community, families and individuals who have been bearing the burden of poverty, illness and isolation.

Mr. Mak provided a summary translation of the foregoing applicant presentations.

Comments from Other Speakers

The Chair noted that speakers will be called in the order in which they were registered. If a person is absent when their name is called there will be no further opportunity to speak. People who wish to be added to the list may do so until the end of this day's meeting, after which the speakers list will be closed.

The following citizens addressed the Board in support of the applications:

Libby Davies, M.P. for Vancouver East
Dr. John Blatherwick, Medical Health Officer
Nicola Hall
Frances Kenny
Lesley Kemp
John Van Luven
Terry Blythe, Chief of Police
Am Johal
Perry Kendall
Keith Draper
Pat Gilchrist
Bert Massiah
Haedy Mason
Kathleen Cummings
Anita Hutchings

Suze Kilgour and Wallace Robinson, Edge Community Liaison Committee
Mark McLean
Margaret Prevost
Dve Diewert
Gillian Maxwell
Sister Elizabeth Kelliher
Denise Bradshaw
Dr. Susan Burgess
Don Baker
Curtis Locke
Carl Bognar
Louise Perron
Muggs Sigurgeirson

The following citizens spoke against the applications:

Winnie Wong, representing merchants and property owners, societies and employees in the Strathcona area
Angela Giannoulis
Guy Campbell
Rick Hui
Brigit Snider (Ms Snider also spoke on behalf of tenants of 610 Alexander, and read a letter of opposition from Cindy Chan Piper)
George Chow, Chinese Benevolent Association

Harry Jung
Mits Kazuta

Leanore Sali, Gastown Business Improvement Society
Sang Lee (translation provided by Mr. Mak)
Charles Lee on behalf of the Chair of Chinatown Property Owners
Association

Charles Lee on behalf of Sam's Pharmacy
T. Wing Wai
Barbara Lee

No response was received from 268 additional names that were called from the speakers list.

There was a half hour recess at 6.55 pm and the meeting was adjourned for the evening at 10.05 pm.

The meeting reconvened at 3pm on Wednesday, February 21, 2001.

Chairman's Opening Comments (translation was provided by Andrew Mak)

Mr. Scobie referred to his earlier statements during the February 19 meeting in which he indicated that the speakers list would be closed at the end of that meeting, and that if people were not present when their name was called, they would not be entitled to address the Board later. Clearly, many individuals listed to speak were not present when their names were called.

The Board members have reflected on the above and have agreed to the following.

Motion

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

1. Public delegations will resume today at that point on the speakers list where the Board concluded on Monday.
2. Those who registered during Monday's meeting will be added to the end of the original speakers list.
3. As indicated throughout Monday's meeting, the speakers list is now closed. No new names will be added to the list.
4. Once the remaining list of 377 registered speakers has been concluded, those who were registered to speak and appeared on the list prior to speaker number 320 but were not present when their name was called on February 19 and therefore did not speak, will be provided with a second opportunity to provide comments to the Board.

However, in order to be provided with this second chance, those speakers who missed their turn on Monday will have to confirm their intent to speak. This can be done only during today's meeting, by visiting staff at the table by the door at the back of the room.

5. Throughout today's meeting, and hereafter should today's meeting need to be reconvened, individuals registered to speak to the Board must be present and provide their comments when their name is called. Those not present to speak when their name is called will forfeit their opportunity to comment on the applications before the Board.

- CARRIED

In seconding Mr. Rudberg's motion, Mr. MacGregor noted this goes well beyond the Board's normal procedures. Mr. Beasley also concurred with the motion.

Comments from Other Speakers (Continued)

The following people were heard in support of the applications:

Herman Hui	Ann Sherman	Jim Nagy
Paul McGillicuddy	Rick Taylor	Thia Walter
Susan Craigie	Richard Kay	Linda Antelenos
Leith Harris (for A. Whittaker)	Dale Ratcliff	Cindy Martin
Penny McLoud	Dean Dubick	Lani Russwurm
Shane Simpson	Andrew Johnson	Sarah Levine
Donna Vogel	Jeff Summers	Leo Cooper
M.L. Burke	Tom Laviolette	Gail Khoo
Randy Puder	Anton Pillita	Sarah Forssmann
Jane Graham	Jeff Anderson	Corey Audet
Barry Ferguson	Neil Monckton	Ed McCurdy
Catherine Smart	Patti Masionet	Cory Gagnes
Steve Mathias	Chan Bamcharan	Allison Russell
Jim Layden	Nathaniel Geary	Corinna Beasley-Hammond
Mary Gail Barabana	Vanessa Savage	Tracy Vernelli
Dr. Bob Korth	Chandra Murdoch	Linda Watt
Verl Brown	Chris O'Rourke	Amanda Honeysett
Steven Wright	Nicole Davies	John Cameron
Roger Bayley	Jil Pleskatch	Sonja Kaemer
Pam Fairfield	Brian Goble	Tanya Fader
Sarah Evans	Cora Seppala	Paul Miller
Barry Conroy (did not support 166 East Hastings)	Dan Small	David Paterson
Hart Molthagen	Liz Evans	John Jones
Lisa Skerritt	Kirsten Schurzercher	Andy Bond
Susan Kurbis	Vaerya Edelman	Leif Ericksen
Patrick O'Rourke	Mark Townsend	Lauren Howes
	Brian Rees	W.E. Sandquist

The following were heard in opposition to the applications:

Fred Mah	Charles Lee (also presented a petition)
Roz Davidson-Hoffer	Tony Lee (also represented Stephen Chong and John Bal)
George Chow on behalf of Sammy Kam	Lynn Bryson
Bryce Rositch	Mark Budgen
Sue Bennett	

No response was received from 146 additional names that were called.

There was a half hour recess at about 6.30 pm and the meeting was adjourned for the evening at approx. 10.00 pm.

The meeting reconvened at 3pm on Tuesday, February 27, 2001

Comments from Other Speakers (Continued)

The following people were heard in support of the applications:

Andrew Larcombe	Richard Cunningham
Warren O'Brien	Liz Bloomfield
Carol Romanow (did not support 401 Main Street)	D. Wilson
Paul Kerston	Suzanne Richter read a letter from Ivana Brennan and
Berge Tashdjian	Susan Giles
H. Hamilton	Vance Dezembra

Ann Livingstone
Thia Walter on behalf of Brian Lane
Vanessa Savage on behalf of Justin Evans
Sid Tan
Paul Lang
Judy Langdon
Ken Frail

Ruth Wright
Larry Campbell
Staff Sergeant Chuck Doucette (S.S. Doucette also read a letter
of support from the Head of Drug Enforcement Branch, RCMP)
John Hulley

The following spoke against the applications:

Linda Ruiz
Alvin Leung

No response was received from 113 additional names that were called.

General Closing Comments from Development Services Staff

Rick Michaels noted that responses to notification as well as petitions are still being received. This may be in part because some people believe the total numbers will affect the outcome of these applications. Mr. Michaels reiterated that the notification process within the development permit application process is not a referendum. While the number of responses indicates the magnitude of public interest, it is the content of the response which is most critical, especially as it relates to Council-adopted by-laws, guidelines and policies. Mr. Michaels added that, at the time the Staff Committee made its recommendations to the Board on these applications, the number of responses in opposition far exceeded those in favour.

Mr. Michaels briefly explained how staff review applications within the zoning regulations, noting the Zoning and Development By-law is intended to, amongst other things, promote health, safety and general welfare. As well, the District Schedules and the Official Development Plan are clear with respect to health and safety considerations, and the provision of preventative health care and treatment services within the DEOD is a primary goal and objective.

With reference to the Staff Committee Reports, Mr. Michaels tabled an amendment to note that Mr. Macpherson is a member of the Community Services Group and not Social Planning as indicated.

Each of the applications was then addressed separately, as follows:

401 MAIN STREET - DE405520

Closing Comments from Staff:

Mr. Michaels tabled a number of suggested amendments to the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 12, 2001. These were reviewed and discussed by the Board. With respect to condition A.1.1, to obtain a Provincial heritage alteration permit, Mr. Michaels noted the permit has now been received and the condition can be deleted.

Nathan Edelson, Central Area Planner, explained the purpose of the proposed Good Neighbour Agreement is to ensure the facility is managed in a reasonable and neighbourly way. With respect to timing, the signing of the agreement would be a condition of permit issuance. The Liaison Committee would be struck later and performance of the committee would be sought based on the date of occupancy. The expectation is there would likely be one neighbourhood liaison committee that may service several of the facilities. In discussion, Ms. Woodward confirmed the independent evaluator referred to in the Good Neighbour Agreement would evaluate each site, including the redesign of the Carnegie Centre, as one complete package.

Jeff Brooks said, having heard all the presentations, Social Planning supports all five development applications and believes they represent an important and immediate first step to addressing the urgent situation in the Downtown Eastside. These services, along with expansion of services in other areas of the city, will and can make a difference. The applications are also consistent with the basic principles of effective treatments, namely, no single treatment is appropriate for all individuals. Treatment needs to be readily available. Medications such as methadone are an important element of treatment for many patients, especially when combined with counselling and other therapies. Addicted individuals with co-existing mental health issues should be treated in an integrated way. Treatment programs should provide assessment for HIV and AIDs, Hepatitis B and C, Tuberculosis and other infectious diseases. Finally, recovery from drug addiction can be a long term process and treatment may require multiple episodes of treatment. Social Planning believes all the applications are consistent with these principles. The services will provide very real benefits to the community: improved access to health and increased health among the drug-using population. They should also result in a reduction in the militant drug scene and associated crime.

On behalf of the Vancouver Police Department and the Police Board, Inspector Doern said there is an absolute need for the Carnegie Centre redesign to proceed. There is an urgent need to reduce the amount of space available on the street for illegal activity at the corner of Main and Hastings Streets. The redesign will help to improve sight lines so Police can monitor the behaviour on the street. This will allow Police, along with the health contact centre, to link addicts to professional help. The Vancouver Police will be very frequent visitors to the health contact centre to ensure there is no drug use and to enforce the Criminal Code of Canada. The linkage of addicts to the health contact centre will reduce the number of persons in the public spaces, therefore allowing police enforcement to focus on the drug dealers. This will reduce the amount of drugs in the area, resulting in fewer addicts frequenting the area. Police will also be frequent visitors to the other health sites proposed and to the immediate surrounding areas to deal quickly with any street disorder issues at those sites. A clear message will be given to the addicts to not use the lanes, alleyways or public spaces for criminal activity. This message will be augmented with a reminder of the availability of the health contact centre for connection with health care professionals and a respite from the street scene. Sufficient police resources will be deployed to ensure that the tone is established relative to unacceptable behaviour in public spaces, not only at the corner of Hastings and Main, but in Vancouver. Police will continue to work cooperatively with the Carnegie street program staff to ensure this happens at the corner and adjacent to the health contact centre.

With respect to a concern expressed by one of the speakers that other police agencies in surrounding municipalities would be bringing persons to the Downtown Eastside to access the services to be provided, Inspector Doern noted the Vancouver Police meet regularly with police managers from all the various police agencies in the Lower Mainland. The VPD will clearly articulate the scope and purpose of the Downtown Eastside Health and Safety Initiatives and the five sites to serve the Downtown Eastside neighbourhoods. It will be made very clear to the surrounding police agencies that the Downtown Eastside is not a destination for other police agencies to deliver persons in need of the enhanced services in the package proposed by the Vancouver/Richmond Health Board.

The goal of the VPD is to work towards the restoration of public order across Vancouver by reducing the open drug scene at Main and Hastings. Police will serve on the neighbourhood liaison committees and support community policing strategies and community action plans developed in partnership with the residents, business people and the community policing centres in the four neighbourhoods that comprise the Downtown Eastside. To address crime and disorder matters and to do their part to improve the quality of life in the Downtown Eastside, the VPD has assigned 31 uniformed police officers with specific geographical responsibilities in the Downtown Eastside neighbourhoods. The VPD and the Police Board take the position that addicts require treatment and drug dealers require substantive gaol sentences. The VPD will not allow the drug scene to re-establish in another neighbourhood.

The VPD supports all five development applications. The expanded treatment facilities with additional services for people addicted to drugs and alcohol are all essential. All five applications together will make the streets safer for those who live, work and visit in the Downtown Eastside and surrounding communities. These initiatives incorporate a comprehensive approach to enforcement and treatment that will be more effectively address Vancouver's drug problems. The VPD is committed to implementing these first changes to improve the Downtown Eastside.

The Board took a 5 minute recess and reconvened at 6.05 pm

Panel Opinion

Mr. Scott supported the application. He said anything that can be done to increase safety, reduce addiction and the problems that exist at Main and Hastings, should be done.

Mr. Chung concurred with Mr. Scott. The proposed improvements to the corner of Main and Hastings will help Police to monitor the area. He supported the application.

Board Discussion

Mr. Rudberg stressed the Board's role is not to evolve new policy or to make new by-laws. The Board's role is to look at existing Council policies as set out in its regulations and guidelines and to ensure the applications are consistent with those policies. In reviewing this application and its applicable regulations, Mr. Rudberg said he finds it is consistent with Council policies. The work that is being proposed, in both the private and public realm, is consistent with the Police objective to create a much improved environment at this corner, leading to improved physical conditions and enforcement priorities. He moved approval of the applications, outlining a number of amendments to the conditions.

Mr. MacGregor agreed with Mr. Rudberg's introductory comments. He said he was impressed also by the comments of all the delegations, noting they helped determine his decision on the applications. While many of the speakers expressed differing views, there is much more common ground than the two sides may realise. Part of the solution to the polarization is for the parties to get together to work things out, and the Good Neighbour Agreement will help to facilitate that. Mr. MacGregor noted some speakers felt these initiatives should be postponed until the four pillars report is complete. The Board also heard that something should be done and done now; and that this is only a small start with much more to be done. The Board also heard that health care support is needed in the communities in which the problems exist. The VRHB has advised that services are spread throughout the city and not just concentrated in one area. The Board also heard that addiction is everyone's issue, affecting our children, parents, seniors, and neighbours, and it is not just in one area of the community but is widespread. Reflecting on the advice the Board has received, both now and when the Board considered the resource centre a year ago, Mr. MacGregor said he has concluded that something must be done. These applications are a step forward and the Good Neighbour Agreement involves a process of constant review to determine how well things are progressing. He seconded Mr. Rudberg's motion, suggesting some further minor amendments to the conditions, to which Mr. Rudberg concurred.

Mr. Beasley noted the application for 401 Main Street is basically a form of development question. Therefore his consideration of the delegations' comments has been from the point of view of functionality and any impact on the heritage status of the Carnegie Centre and on the streetscape. It is clear that this application does include a dimension of enforcement. The Police have indicated that in order for them to deal with the criminality issues relating to the drug dealers, there needs to be more organization on the Main/Hastings corner. Mr. Beasley added, if the proposed alterations facilitate expanding the programming by Carnegie Centre and establish some clear territoriality for that programming, this will be a major benefit, noting the

programming of the Carnegie Centre and the work of the Carnegie Centre Association is quite fundamental to the general livability and quality of life in this community. The proposal appears to be very sensitive to the heritage resources and the Provincial heritage authority has concurred. With respect to streetscape, Mr. Beasley said he had some concern about the loss of weather protection for the washrooms. He said he hoped Engineering Services would give this further consideration as the project proceeds. He supported the motion of approval and the amendments made.

Mr. Scobie noted this application is quite straightforward compared to the other applications before the Board. It is in a District Schedule which has no accompanying Official Development Plan with additional provisions. It involves no change of use, only alterations to the existing building, for which Provincial heritage alteration approval has been received for the work proposed. Most of the proposed work occurs on city streets and lanes, which are not zoned and therefore beyond the purview of the Development Permit Board. Mr. Scobie concurred with Mr. Beasley's suggestion that the City Engineer give further attention to the entrance to the washrooms in terms of weather protection, provided it does not compromise the interests of the Police in improving security and surveillance.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 405520, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 12, 2001, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1:

the applicant *City of Vancouver* is to enter into a Good Neighbour Agreement, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, Director of Legal Services and the Chief Licenses Inspector, in consultation with the Director of Social Planning, that incorporates , but is not limited to, the following:

Delete 1.1 (i);

Amend 1.1 (ii):

~~establishing~~ **requiring establishment of** one Neighbourhood Liaison Committee for all sites including representation by the Vancouver/Richmond Health Board, Carnegie Centre staff, ~~life skills centre staff,~~ **other City staff**, client groups, Police, local residents, businesses, schools, and other organizations;

Amend 1.1 (iii) to add *Vancouver/Richmond Health Board* before "independent evaluator";

Delete 1.1 (iv);

Amend 1.1 (v) to add *Vancouver/Richmond Health Board* before "independent evaluator";

Delete 1.1 (x);

Delete 1.1 (xi);

Delete 1.1 (xii);

Delete 1.1 (xiii);

Amend 1.1 (xiv):

requiring the ~~VRHB~~ *Carnegie Centre* to be responsible for maintaining the adjoining street boulevards and lane in a neat and tidy condition;

Delete the **Note to Applicant** after 1.1 (xiv);

Delete A.1.1;

Add new A.1.1:

fully detailed landscape plan indicating all planting materials, sizes, numbers and locations including details of proposed tree retention measures during and after construction.

Amend B.1.2 to change the date to *July 1, 2001*;

Delete B.2.1 and replace with the following:

The Good Neighbour Agreement is to be operational during the use and occupancy covered by this development permit.

- CARRIED

166 EAST HASTINGS STREET - DE405516

Closing Comments from Staff:

Mr. Michaels said the zoning issues on this application are fairly straight forward. The proposed use is conditional. It fulfills the goals and objectives within the DEOD Official Development Plan and policies. A minor issue relates to the retail continuity requirement. Staff believe the proposed use would be somewhat similar to retail use in terms of its animation of the street. Further, the requirement for full retail use at this location relates to new development. For existing development, such as this proposal, the regulations talk to reinforcing retail continuity. In this instance, it is a vacant space within the building and there is very little street frontage for the proposed tenant space. The frontage will likely continue as a vacant space. In summary, staff are very supportive of the proposed change of use, without strictly requiring retail continuity which is believed would cause unnecessary hardship.

Mr. Michaels tabled a number of suggested amendments to the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 12, 2001. These were reviewed and discussed by the Board.

Jeff Brooks noted his earlier comments apply to this application, namely, that Social Planning supports all five development applications and believes they represent an important and immediate first step to addressing the urgent situation in the Downtown Eastside. These services, along with expansion of services in other areas of the city, will and can make a difference. The applications are also consistent with the basic principles of effective treatments, namely, no single treatment is appropriate for all individuals. Treatment needs to be readily available. Medications such as methadone are an important element of treatment for many patients, especially when combined with counselling and other therapies. Addicted individuals with co-existing mental health issues should be treated in an integrated way. Treatment programs should provide assessment for HIV and AIDs, Hepatitis B and C, Tuberculosis and other infectious diseases. Finally, recovery from drug addiction can be a long term process and treatment may require multiple episodes of treatment. Social Planning

believes all the applications are consistent with these principles. The services will provide very real benefits to the community: improved access to health and increased health among the drug-using population. They should also result in a reduction in the militant drug scene and associated crime.

Inspector Doern noted the Vancouver Police Department's earlier general comments also apply to this application. The VPD supports all five development applications. The expanded treatment facilities with additional services for people addicted to drugs and alcohol are all essential. All five applications together will make the streets safer for those who live, work and visit in the Downtown Eastside and surrounding communities. These initiatives incorporate a comprehensive approach to enforcement and treatment that will more effectively address Vancouver's drug problems. The VPD is committed to implementing these first changes to improve the Downtown Eastside.

Inspector Doern emphasized that the Vancouver Police Department believes there is an urgent need for a very low threshold facility near the existing centre of the illegal drug trade, as a place Police can take or refer people addicted to drugs or those with mental illness or others who need assistance. The lack of such a facility contributes to the size and visibility of the open drug market at Main and Hastings. The Vancouver Police believe that without the health contact centre in place at 166 East Hastings Street, enforcement alone cannot improve the existing conditions on the street in the Downtown Eastside. The health contact centre is critical to improving public order in the Downtown Eastside.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Scott said he had little to add to what the Board and Panel had already heard from members of the public, both for and against the applications. He strongly urged the Board to heed the requests of the Chief Constable, the Chief Health Officers of the City, the District and the Province, to approve the applications.

Mr. Chung noted his comments apply to all four VRHB applications. He noted enforcement in the area has been increased and it has not worked. The Police Department cannot do it all: the problem must be addressed in another way. Mr. Chung noted it is not very often that the three levels of government agree and work together. We should therefore take this opportunity to approve the applications. Decentralizing services would not be appropriate because the Downtown Eastside is where the addicts live and they are not very mobile. He said he hoped the Police would act quickly to protect drug addicts from the dealers, and particularly those who are trying to get help. He also hoped the Police would act swiftly when problems occur, especially at the health contact centre given its 24-hour operation. Mr. Chung said he hoped the VRHB would be successful in this initiative, but not at the expense of the community of Strathcona. He said he sympathized with the business owners and residents of Strathcona but stressed it is essential to do something to reduce the problems that are occurring. He also hoped the independent evaluator would accurately analyse the situation so the VRHB can respond accordingly.

The Chair noted an e-mail dated February 26, 2001 was received from Advisory Panel member, Michael Mortenson. Mr. Mortenson was unable to attend Day 3 of this meeting and had written to recommend that the Board approve the application.

Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor said that, in addition to his comments on the previous application, he wanted to emphasize that the Development Permit Board must look to City policy to determine whether an application complies with that policy. In this case, staff have advised that it does and he concurred with that view. This is a small step forward, but there is no "quick fix" to the problems in the area. He therefore had some concern about the time period suggested for the development permit and recommended it be extended. Mr. MacGregor moved approval of the application, with a number of amendments to the conditions.

Mr. Beasley first made some general comments about the four VRHB applications. It is clear the Board members are not experts on alcohol and drug treatment. He therefore looked to some independent commentary on the VRHB proposal and this was forthcoming from the Medical Health Officer and other senior medical officials. It has become evident that a fundamental principle is that addiction is not an issue of criminality but a health issue and this must be acknowledged. There has been a good health analysis by the VRHB about these proposals and that they do represent a coherent package. The initiatives in principle also seem quite consistent with the four pillar approach which is being generally discussed, both in terms of expanding services and rationalizing services. Commenting on concerns that these facilities will attract addicts from outside the community, Mr. Beasley said he did not believe there was any convincing evidence that this would occur. It is evident there are presently not enough facilities to service the people in the neighbourhood. As well, it has been stated the VRHB consider these facilities provide a triage function, to connect people back to their home facilities if they are from outside the community.

It is clear that something needs to be done. Mr. Beasley emphasized the strength of the testimony about how addiction impacts families as well as those addicted. It is also clear there needs to be a solution in terms of a return to civility on the streets for all people in this community. He was also impressed by the evidence from the Chief Constable but also from police officers on the beat that this would lead to an increase in general civility in the neighbourhood. Mr. Beasley added, it is important we make our approach to this initiative a model for other cities to emulate.

With respect to the basis on which the Board has to consider applications, Mr. Beasley said he did not believe there was anything inconsistent in these proposals with the existing zoning or the Official Development Plans and policies. He also saw no evidence that these proposals would create significant negative impacts on the community. There is a lot of fear, but no convincing proof that these facilities or their clients would cause major negative impacts. With respect to the Board's procedures, he noted there has been extremely full discussion and input. It has been very open, extremely civil, and very long. It is therefore difficult to understand the commentary from those who said people were afraid to come here and speak. Mr. Beasley said he shared the concerns expressed about the possibility of negative impacts and noted that making a discretionary decision requires confidence that unpredictable events will not occur and lead to a worse situation than currently exists. The Good Neighbour Agreement does give a great deal of security that issues, if they emerge, will be dealt with. He agreed with the temporary approval and also concurred with Mr. MacGregor's motion to provide a longer time frame. The Good Neighbour Agreement also acknowledges that this is a new and evolving way to deliver services, with ways built into it to make changes happen.

Mr. Rudberg noted the Board has heard from a wide variety of people from which two main messages have emerged: (1) that there is a fundamental need to improve the health and safety of the community, and (2) that these are not just isolated facilities and we need to be concerned about the impacts on the adjoining neighbourhoods. Mr. Rudberg said he was convinced the Good Neighbour Agreements will go a long way to address the concerns of the neighbours and he looked to the periodic reviews to ensure this occurs. Mr. Rudberg also stressed that the Board is required to reflect on Council's policies. The Board does not make new policies or address issues that are more appropriately dealt with by Council. The Board has to be guided by the existing zoning and guidelines. Mr. Rudberg said he believed what is being proposed at 166 East Hastings Street is entirely consistent with the zoning and guidelines previously approved by Council. Finally, Mr. Rudberg said he agreed with some of the statements made by members of the public: that enough is enough and we need to move forward. He concurred with the motion of approval.

Mr. Scobie noted the Board has heard from many victims, not only the drug users and their families but the health care professionals, providers, and volunteers who are themselves feeling victimized as a result of being unable to adequately serve those in need. Law enforcement personnel as well feel frustration in their ability to deal with the situation. The other victims are the residents and business people in the area who are very concerned about the situation and feel that they are being victimized by the first group of victims. Mr. Scobie said he is hopeful that these initiatives will reduce the first group of victims, which in turn will provide the second group of victims with some relief. He added, however, that he was not convinced that the concerned residents and business people are, through the conditions, being given enough attention. However, he said he was hopeful that these people, through their participation in the Good Neighbour Agreement, will feel their needs are being heard and addressed, noting that if their concerns had been more successfully addressed in the past, the extent of opposition may have been less significant.

Commenting on concerns expressed by some speakers that these applications should not be dealt with until decisions arise from Framework for Action discussions, Mr. Scobie said he understood the concerns but stressed that the Development Permit Board cannot look to what may emerge from those discussions as future policy. The Board must deal with the by-laws and regulations in place today, and the Framework for Action process imposes no restraints on the Board in terms of a delay or moratorium on considering any development applications before it.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 405516, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 12, 2001, with the following amendments:

Amend the approval preamble to delete "September 1st, 2002, and replace with: *two years after occupancy approval or March 1, 2004, whichever first occurs*;

Amend 1.1 to replace "applicant" with *Vancouver/Richmond Health Board*;

Amend 1.1 (ii):
~~establishing~~ *requiring establishment of* one Neighbourhood Liaison Committee for all sites including representation by the Vancouver/Richmond Health Board, Carnegie Centre staff, ~~the Lifeskills Centre staff,~~ *other City staff, Health Contact Centre staff*, client groups, Police, local residents, businesses, schools, and other organizations;

Amend 1.1 (v) to add *Vancouver/Richmond Health Board* before "independent evaluator";

Amend 1.1 (vi) to add *with formal review each six months by the committee established under the Good Neighbour Agreement*;

Delete 1.1 (xii) and replace with the following:
agreement with the Vancouver/Richmond Health Board to develop and implement policies and procedures in consultation with the Police Department and the program advisory committee to ensure that no illicit drug use is permitted or tolerated on this site;

Delete 1.1 (xv);

Amend the **Note to Applicant** after 1.1 (xvi):
A separate agreement to the satisfaction of the *General* Manager of Engineering Services and *the* Director of Legal Services may be required to authorize work on City streets and lanes.

Delete the **Note to Applicant** after A.1.1 and replace with the following:
A canopy/awning application is required to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services. Canopies, if proposed, must be fully demountable and drain to the building's internal drainage system;

Amend B.1.2 to change the date to *July 1, 2001*;

Delete B.2.1 and replace with the following:
The Good Neighbour Agreement is to be operational during the use and occupancy covered by this development permit.

- CARRIED

59 WEST PENDER STREET - DE405519

Closing Comments from Staff:

Rick Michaels reiterated that this proposed health clinic is a relocation and expansion of an existing clinic in Gastown. It will occupy a first floor which has been vacant for some time. The second floor

would remain vacant. The proposed change of use is very consistent with the expectations in the applicable by-laws and guidelines. Mr. Michaels noted this proposal is located in an area which requires pedestrian weather protection and this is called for in the conditions.

Mr. Michaels tabled a number of suggested amendments to the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 12, 2001. These were reviewed and discussed by the Board.

Responding to a question from the Board concerning the proposed clientele at this facility, the VRHB representative explained the normal practice at all VRHB community health clinics is that clients are seen by appointment but walk-in clients are also accepted. Part of the treatment modality, particularly for clients on methadone, is that they keep their appointments. Ms. Woodward confirmed the operation of the clinic will not involve clients lining up outside, noting there will be two large waiting areas in the facility. Large numbers of clients waiting outside has not been the experience at the existing Gastown clinic.

Jeff Brooks noted his earlier general comments also apply to this application, and the reasons for Social Planning's support are outlined in the Staff Committee Report. He emphasized that this is an important first step towards a comprehensive treatment system in the Downtown Eastside. These services are long overdue and badly needed. They will improve public health and public order and have strong elements of public accountability through Good Neighbour Agreements, independent evaluations and other measures.

Inspector Doern noted the Vancouver Police comments made earlier also apply to this application. It is important to note that the existing facility in Gastown has not resulted in a significant number of calls for police service and the VPD does not believe the facility at 59 West Pender will cause any increase at all. This expanded facility with additional services for people addicted to drugs can be used as a place to refer local addicts who require primary health care as well as specialized drug treatment. This is a critical step for the VPD in resolving crime and disorder issues in the Downtown Eastside.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Chung said his previous comments regarding 166 Hastings Street also apply to this application. He recommended approval.

Mr. Scott referred to the opposition to this application from residents of International Village and local business owners. With respect to safety, Mr. Scott said he believed that redeveloping this property will do nothing but improve the immediate area. He encouraged the local merchants to join forces and support it. Mr. Scott noted we entertain people from all over the world and boast about being one of the world's most beautiful cities. It would be really nice if we could also boast to being leaders in recovery from addiction and public health and safety. This can only occur if everyone gets together and becomes part of the solution.

The Chair noted an e-mail dated February 26, 2001 was received from Advisory Panel member, Michael Mortenson. Mr. Mortenson was unable to attend Day 3 of this meeting and had written to recommend that the Board approve the application.

Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor said he believes this application does meet Council policy. It is a relocation of existing facilities. He noted his earlier general comments also apply to this application.

Mr. Beasley said it should be emphasized that this is a very important expansion of service and the package of services would be very incomplete without it. He commented that the Good Neighbour Agreement is probably more important for this facility than the others, noting there were a number of delegations worried about its impacts on their neighbourhood. The fear of those impacts is as powerful as the reality of those impacts, and the Good Neighbour Agreement is important to give people some security that there will be an honourable response if problems arise. Mr. Beasley added, the facility will assist not just drug users but the community as a whole by raising the level of civility. He concurred with Mr. MacGregor's time extension, noting that expanding an operation takes some time and energy to achieve. Overall, he said the facility will be a positive contribution. He added, his comments on the previous application also apply to this proposal.

Mr. Rudberg noted his comments on the previous application apply also to this proposal. Unlike the others, this application is in the Downtown District which has different regulations to guide the Board's decision making. He said the application is consistent with the DD ODP and he was pleased to support it.

Mr. Scobie noted staff's conclusion as outlined in the Staff Committee Report, is that the application is within the scope of the applicable policies, regulations and guidelines.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 405519, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 12, 2001, with the following amendments:

Amend the approval preamble to delete "September 1st, 2002, and replace with: *two years after occupancy approval or March 1, 2004, whichever first occurs*;

Amend 1.1 to replace "applicant" with *Vancouver/Richmond Health Board*;

Amend 1.1 (ii):
~~establishing~~ *requiring establishment of* one Neighbourhood Liaison Committee for all sites including representation by the Vancouver/Richmond Health Board, ~~the Lifeskills Centre staff,~~ *Carnegie Centre staff, other City staff,* client groups, Police, local residents, businesses, schools, and other organizations;

Amend 1.1 (v) to add *Vancouver/Richmond Health Board* before "independent evaluator";

Amend 1.1 (vi) to add *with formal review each six months by the committee established under the Good Neighbour Agreement*;

Amend the Note to Applicant under 1.1 (xiii):

A separate agreement to the satisfaction of the *General* Manager of Engineering Services and *the* Director of Legal Services may be required to authorize work on City streets and lanes.

Amend 1.1 (xiv):

agreement to complete a health policy plan for the Downtown Eastside area in consultation with the community, Police and City staff, by September 2002;

Add 1.1 (xv):

agreement that the VRHB will develop and implement policies and procedures, in consultation with the Police Department and the program advisory committee, to ensure that no illicit drug use is permitted or tolerated on this site.

Amend B.1.2 to change the date to *July 1, 2001;*

Delete B.2.1 and replace with the following:

The Good Neighbour Agreement is to be operational during the use and occupancy covered by this development permit.

- CARRIED

569 POWELL STREET - DE405517

Closing Comments from Staff:

Mr. Michaels noted this application is for the Downtown Community Clinic at Powell and Princess and is primarily the relocation and expansion of existing facilities at 412 East Cordova Street and 501 East Hastings Street. The DEOD clearly provides for the proposed use, as described in the Staff Committee Report. Mr. Michaels explained the change of use involves a parking relaxation. Staff support the requested relaxation given the nature of the facility and absence of problems at the existing facilities that will relocate to this site.

Mr. Michaels tabled a number of suggested amendments to the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 12, 2001. These were reviewed and discussed by the Board. Mr. Michaels also noted a correction to p.10 of the report under Engineering Services comments, to correct typographical errors in the third line of the second paragraph.

Mr. Brooks noted his comments on the previous applications also apply to this proposal, and the reasons for Social Planning's support are outlined in the Staff Committee Report. He again emphasized this is an important first step of a comprehensive treatment system. The services are badly needed and are long overdue. They will improve public health and public order and have strong elements of public accountability through Good Neighbour Agreements, independent evaluations and other measures.

Inspector Doern noted the Vancouver Police comments made earlier also apply to this application. The VPD strongly supports this relocation for the reasons outlined in the Staff Committee Report.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Scott supported the relocation and expansion of the clinic. The community needs the services. He also supported the requested parking relaxation. He encouraged those who are opposed, to work with the Good Neighbour Agreement to identify any problems that do occur.

Mr. Chung recommended approval and he supported the parking relaxation. He noted his previous comments also apply to this application.

The Chair noted an e-mail dated February 26, 2001 was received from Advisory Panel member, Michael Mortenson. Mr. Mortenson was unable to attend Day 3 of this meeting and had written to recommend that the Board approve the application.

Board Discussion

Mr. MacGregor noted his earlier comments also apply to this application. He said he believes the application meets the policies for the area. He also noted it involves the consolidation and moderate expansion of two facilities already in the area. He supported the application and moved approval with amendments to the conditions.

Mr. Beasley noted his earlier comments also apply to this application. This application represents a prudent relocation and a moderate increase in services that complements the other applications. He noted that, by virtue of approval of this application, the previous resource centre concept on this site is now obsolete and will not proceed. This should be of some interest to those who expressed concerns about some elements of that facility when it was reviewed by the Board last year.

Mr. Rudberg supported the application and noted his earlier comments apply also to this proposal. He noted there is an apparent by-law parking deficiency but staff's review of the existing sites indicates that once the facilities are consolidated the parking as proposed should be adequate.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 405517, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 12, 2001, with the following amendments:

Amend the approval preamble to delete "September 1st, 2002, and replace with: *two years after occupancy approval or March 1, 2004, whichever first occurs*;

Amend 1.1 to replace "applicant" with *Vancouver/Richmond Health Board*;

Amend 1.1 (ii):
~~establishing~~ *requiring establishment of* one Neighbourhood Liaison Committee for all sites including representation by the Vancouver/Richmond Health Board, Carnegie Centre staff, *other City staff*, ~~the Lifeskills Centre staff~~, client groups, Police, local residents, businesses, schools, and other organizations;

Amend 1.1 (v) to add *Vancouver/Richmond Health Board* before "independent evaluator";

Amend 1.1 (vi) to add *with formal review each six months by the committee established under the Good Neighbour Agreement*;

Amend the 1.1 (xiii):
agreement to complete a health policy plan for the Downtown Eastside area in consultation with the community, Police and City staff, by September 2002;

Amend the **Note to Applicant** 1.1 (xiv):
A separate agreement to the satisfaction of the *General* Manager of Engineering *Services and the* Director of Legal Services may be required to authorize work on City streets and lanes.

Add 1.1 (xv):
agreement that the VRHB will develop and implement policies and procedures, in consultation with the Police Department and the program advisory committee, to ensure that no illicit drug use is permitted or tolerated on this site.

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in A.1.3:
Any such work must require the approval of the General Manager of Engineering Services and must meet Engineering *Services* standards. *The new fence at the lane appears to be built into the adjacent site; please clarify.*

Add A.2.3:
two class A bicycle spaces are to be provided on site;

Amend B.1.2 to change the date to *July 1, 2001*;

Delete B.2.2 and replace with the following:
The Good Neighbour Agreement is to be operational during the use and occupancy covered by this development permit.

- CARRIED

412 EAST CORDOVA STREET - DE405518

Closing Comments from Staff:

Mr. Michaels noted this application is to replace an existing health clinic with a life skills centre. The DEOD zoning does provide for this use, as outlined in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Michaels tabled a number of suggested amendments to the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 12, 2001. These were reviewed and discussed by the Board. Mr. Michaels also noted a correction to p.9 of the report under Engineering Services comments, to correct typographical errors in the third line of the second paragraph, and to delete items 4. to 10. under the Permits and Licenses comments on p.10.

Mr. Brooks noted his comments on the previous applications also apply to this proposal, and the reasons for Social Planning's support are outlined in the Staff Committee Report. He again emphasized this is an important first step of a comprehensive treatment system. The services are badly needed and are

long overdue. They will improve public health and public order and have strong elements of public accountability through Good Neighbour Agreements, independent evaluations and other measures.

Inspector Doern noted the Vancouver Police comments made earlier also apply to this application, noting the reasons for support are included in the Staff Committee Report.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Chung said the life skills centre will be a welcome addition to the community. He noted his previous comments also apply to this application.

Mr. Scott also supported this application. He noted that opposition to this proposal came mainly from the local business community. He urged the VRHB to seek out their neighbours and encourage them to take an active part in the Good Neighbour Agreement.

The Chair noted an e-mail dated February 26, 2001 was received from Advisory Panel member, Michael Mortenson. Mr. Mortenson was unable to attend Day 3 of this meeting and had written to recommend that the Board approve the application.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley said his previous comments also apply to this application. This proposal is modelling the kind of approach that is talked out in the four pillars strategy in the sense of providing something beyond just immediate treatment to some effective reintegration efforts. It is an important part of the package.

Mr. Rudberg supported the application and noted his earlier comments apply also to this proposal.

Mr. MacGregor also noted his previous comments apply to this application as well.

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. 405518, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 12, 2001, with the following amendments:

Amend the approval preamble to delete "December 31, 2002, and replace with: *two years after occupancy approval or March 1, 2004, whichever first occurs;*

Amend 1.1 to replace "applicant" with *Vancouver/Richmond Health Board;*

Amend 1.1 (ii):
~~establishing~~ *requiring establishment of* one Neighbourhood Liaison Committee for all sites including representation by the Vancouver/Richmond Health Board, Carnegie Centre staff, *other City staff,* the Lifeskills Centre staff *for matters related to the Lifeskills Centre,* client groups, Police, local residents, businesses, schools, and other organizations;

Amend 1.1 (iii) to correct the spelling of "Liaison";

Amend 1.1 (v): to add *Vancouver/Richmond Health Board* before "independent evaluator";

Amend 1.1 (vi) to add *with formal review each six months by the committee established under the Good Neighbour Agreement*;

Amend 1.1 (viii) to add "be" between "can" and "reached";

Amend 1.1 (xiii):
agreement to complete a health policy plan for the Downtown Eastside area in consultation with the community, Police and City staff, by September 2002;

Amend the **Note to Applicant 1.1 (xv)**:
A separate agreement to the satisfaction of the *General* Manager of Engineering Services and *the* Director of Legal Services may be required to authorize work on City streets and lanes.

Add 1.1 (xvi):
agreement that the VRHB will develop and implement policies and procedures, in consultation with the Police Department and the program advisory committee, to ensure that no illicit drug use is permitted or tolerated on this site.

Amend A.3.1 to change "he" to *the*;

Amend B.1.2 to change the date to *July 1, 2001*;

Delete B.2.3 and replace with the following:
The Good Neighbour Agreement is to be operational during the use and occupancy covered by this development permit.

- CARRIED

8. **OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8.20 pm.

C. Hubbard
Clerk to the Board

F. Scobie
Chair

/ch