

**Meeting:** No. 475  
**Date:** Monday, February 21, 2000  
**Time:** 3.00 p.m.  
**Place:** COUNCIL CHAMBER, City Hall

**PRESENT:****Board**

F.A. Scobie	Director of Development Services (Chair)
L. B. Beasley	Director of Current Planning
B. MacGregor	Deputy City Manager
T. Timm	Deputy City Engineer

**Advisory Panel**

J. Hruda	Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
J. Hancock	Representative of the Design Professions (excused from Item 3)
A. Gjernes	Representative of Development Industry
P. Kavanagh	Representative of Development Industry
J. Leduc	Representative of General Public
R. Mingay	Representative of General Public
M. Mortenson	Representative of General Public
R. Roodenburg	Representative of General Public

**Absent****ALSO PRESENT:**

R. Segal	Development Planner (Item 5)
M. Kemble	Development Planner (Item 3 & 4)
B. Adair	Development Planner (Item 5)
A. Milaro	Development Planner (Item 5)
N. Edelson	Planner (Item 5)
D. MacPherson	Planner, Social Planning (Item 5)
N. Peters	City Surveyor

**Item 3 - 699 Cardero Street - DE404701 - Zone CD-1**

Martin Brückner	Hancock Brückner Eng + Wright
Jim Hancock	Hancock Brückner Eng + Wright
Hannah Brus	Hancock Bruckner Eng + Wright
Michael Geller	Geller and Associates
Andrew Abramowich	Austerville Properties
Geoff Glottman	Austerville Properties

**Item 4 - 1529 West Pender Street - DE404754 - Zone CD-1**

Peter Busby	Busby and Associates
Peter Webb	Fineline International Developments Inc.

**Item 5 - 571, 573 & 575 Powell Street - DE404609 - Zone CD-1**

David Levi	Chair, Vancouver Richmond Health Board
Heather Hay	Community Network Director

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 7, 2000 be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. **699 Cardero Street - DE404701 - Zone CD-1  
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Hancock Brückner Eng + Wright, Architects

Request: To construct a 26-storey multiple dwelling development (rental incentive units) containing 165 units with three levels of underground parking.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Mr. Mike Kemble, outlined the background of the Bayshore site including the Georgia Precinct, which included four towers between Denman and Cardero Streets. This application pertained to Tower D at Cardero and Georgia Streets, which is to provide market rental housing. The major issue raised by this application was tower height. When the first westerly Towers A and B were approved 5-6 years ago, tower height was measured from the Georgia Street grade because Bayshore Drive was not yet built and no building grades were available for it. Also, the first two towers were approved at 53 m and 65 m in height and did not challenge the maximum allowable under the zoning. However, construction of new streets since that time, in particular Bayshore Drive, have resulted in new building grades. The Georgia Street building grade as it exists and the building grade of the new Bayshore Drive defines a base surface. The zoning allowed for a height of 74 m and Tower D exceeded that height by approximately 10 ft., measured from the base surface, and there was no flexibility to alter that definition. Staff have been very pleased to see the design improvement of this building and suggested that a reduction in the floor-to-ceiling height would bring it in line with the maximum height allowable, as required in Condition 1.1.

Mr. Kemble also made reference to the tower base; guidelines state that the base (podium) should be essentially fully glazed space in order to maximize the views from Georgia Street. This is addressed in Condition 1.3.

Staff support a text amendment to amend the height calculation as the extra height, if measured from the Georgia Street property line creates little blockage of neighbourhood views. Should Council disallow the text amendment, the tower design will have to be modified to meet existing by-law height requirements.

Mr. Kemble further commented on the lack of pedestrian access from Cardero to the Tower D lobby - resulting in shared pedestrian/vehicle use of the driveway which was a serious safety concern. Also, staff recommend full access for the disabled along the diagonal route through the site from Georgia Street. These are addressed in Conditions 1.2 and 1.4.

---

**Discussion**

Mr. Kavanagh enquired if the ceiling height of 8 ft. 6 in. was to accommodate air conditioning mechanisms, etc., and if the ceiling height of the podium would be approximately 22 ft. Mr. Kemble confirmed both queries.

Mr. Gjernes noted that he would prefer that the transparency be more thorough and have the storage area reallocated to a less conspicuous area and asked that the Applicant address this in his comments.

Mr. MacGregor obtained confirmation that if the height were measured from Georgia Street, through a text amendment, the height of the building as proposed would not be a problem.

The Chair thanked Mr. Kemble for his opening remarks.

**Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Jim Hancock noted his concurrence with the conditions of approval and looks forward to the successful acceptance of this application. He then addressed the proposed condition regarding transparency and as raised by Mr. Gjernes, commenting that the caretaker's suite could be moved to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and confirmed there would be no storage on the mezzanine level, which would further enhance transparency.

Mr. Beasley spoke to Condition A.2.6 with reference to the subdivision condition and stressed that this was a requirement. Mr. Hancock confirmed that the market housing would be separated via subdivision prior to the issuance of the Development Permit. Mr. Kavanagh referred to item 1.1 of the DPSC report requesting that the Applicant address the requirement so as to be acceptable to everyone.

The Chair noted that clarification of the property line would be sought.

Mr. Gjernes enquired as to what percentage of the 165 proposed units would be family-oriented along the Georgia Precinct. The Chair noted that there is no prescriptive limitation on family occupancy in this building and Mr. Hancock advised that a non-discrimination covenant re: families with children has been registered to that effect.

**Comments from Other Speakers**

None.

**Panel Opinion**

Mr. Hruda noted that the Panel supported this application and that the podium height was not an urban design issue, but is hopeful the building height concern would be resolved to allow the height as proposed. He concurred with the installation of a more disabled-friendly design for the pedestrian connection through the site from Georgia Street and the added base transparency.

Mr. Gjernes noted his approval of the development, stating that the Applicant had done a good job for rental housing. He hoped the text amendment could proceed quickly to address the building height issue but if timing were to delay permit issuance he would recommend issuance of an excavation permit pending resolution.

Mr. Kavanagh did not support the text amendment; the Applicant should meet the current height requirement.

Mr. Roodenberg approved the 8 ft.+ floor-to-ceiling height; also felt the podium height should be lowered to attain the allowable building height.

Ms. Mingay supported this project if the developer makes the podium height adjustment - as per Mr. Roodenberg's comments.

Mr. Mortenson concurred as well with Mr. Roodenberg, provided the public access is improved [staying away from stairs].

Ms. Leduc stated that transparency is extremely important and if this aspect was satisfactorily addressed, this development had her support.

**Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE404701, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated January 26, 2000, the plans and information forming a part thereof, thereby approving the construction of a 26-storey multiple dwelling development (rental incentive units) containing 165 units with three levels of underground parking, accessed from the parking garage on Bayshore Drive, with the following amendments:

THAT the Note to Applicant be deleted and Condition A.2.6 be amended as follows:

A.2.6           clarify notation "property line" at the northeast corner of the site; *and obtain registration of the subdivision.*

**4. 1529 West Pender Street - DE404754 - Zone CD-1**

(COMPLETE)

Applicant: Busby and Associates Architects

Request: To construct a 28-storey residential/commercial building with a two-storey and mezzanine podium for retail and office uses, 11 strata townhouses (six units with office use on the ground level), 225 rental dwelling units and three levels of underground parking.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

Prior to Mr. Kemble's opening remarks, he distributed a memo dated February 21, 2000 addressed to the Development Permit Board, adding the following recommended conditions to those in the staff report:

"A.1.23 An irrigation system shall be specified in all common areas, including the entry and upper terrace areas. Hose bib's should be provided in private areas such as patios and courtyards. Notations to this affect should be added to the drawing.

(**Note to Applicant:** The irrigation system design and installation shall be in accordance with the irrigation industry of B.C. Standards and Guidelines.)

A.4 Standard Housing Centre Conditions:

A.4.1 Confirmation that a housing agreement is to be registered against the property which secures the rental tenure (except for the Hastings Street townhouses) of this building in perpetuity."

The Board also received copies of Mr. Busby's letter, same date, covering the applicant's requested revisions of Conditions 1.1 and 1.2. [Letter on file.]

Mr. Kemble noted that the site was part of the Marina Neighbourhood and was situated on the northwest corner of Pender and Nicola Streets. Two years ago a Text Amendment, for this CD-1 zoned site, was approved in order to make it more attractive for rental housing. As well, parking requirements, including underground parking, had been decreased. A general form of development at that time provided vehicular access to the building only from Nicola Street. The major issue addressed in this report was the Nicola Street edge treatment. There is a request to increase the podium height by 1 m in order to better accommodate the relationship between the townhouse units and the adjoining commercial podium. Regarding the change in loading provisions - originally this application had one loading bay in the building, the proposal now incorporates three in a configuration resulting in a 40 ft. blank wall adjacent to Nicola Street. Guidelines state the building must interface well with the public realm - requiring a maximum of glazing and providing animation along the area. Condition 1.1 recommends further design development to provide an active use in place of the blank wall area, with loading located further towards the interior of the site. Staff would also support a reduction of loading spaces from 3 to 2. Also vertical columns on the north face of the tower north encroaches into the 2 m guideline setback; the townhouses are setback 2 m. Staff do not support the tower column encroachment but are prepared to support the balcony encroachment.

Mr. Kemble also noted the blank portion of the northwesterly wall which would be visible for some time from Cardero Street. This wall should be treated with some horizontal reveal pattern as the guidelines call for a masonry character throughout the street base of this neighbourhood.

With regard to the podium landscape treatment, a condition at the time of rezoning was that the townhouses along Hastings Street be able to be occupied by families with children; Staff suggest that a small, children's play area be provided on the podium rooftop. The issue of grade level office space in the townhouses also needs some clarification. Were it to be rented out to someone other than the townhouse owners, a number of Building By-law requirements would emerge. Therefore, a covenant restricting to the townhouse occupant may be required.

Staff believed this was a very attractively designed building but felt that more amenity space and a better interface with the street needed to be provided along Nicola Street.

### **Discussion:**

Mr. MacGregor noted that there was no disabled access and therefore the townhouses would not allow for office use. Mr. Timm enquired as to where a setback was a required, and Mr. Kemble informed him that site-specific guidelines seek a setback to provided a transition from the street to the townhouse space. Mr. Timm asked and received confirmation that the loading bay space required 11 ft. clearance throughout. Mr. MacGregor stated if the balconies were the only thing extending into the setback area, then he didn't see a problem with it.

The Chair referred to Condition A.1.16 being ambiguous, following A.1.15 and should be deleted.

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

Mr. Webb stated that at the outset the City agreed to a relaxation of the unit cap for this cap. Their application adhered to the rental proforma with the intent that the City would accommodate this application. In the development planning stage they had come to the City, presented their tower; the Design Panel approved to move the loading bay underground - reducing the height of that wall by 10 ft. There had to have been some confusion on the stenographer's part as to how the Design Panel members had voted on this project.

The Chair noted that this was not an issue of fault. On the matter of columns on the front of the building Mr. Busby noted the required setbacks are guideline setbacks - had the columns issue been raised at the Panel, he is confident the proposal would have been approved by the Panel.

Mr. Busby stated that 99.9% of this project had previously been approved as part of the rezoning process; he stressed this is a privately-initiated rental project and the added conditions now being raised by staff were not fair. The Chair replied he did not think fair is the issue.

Mr. Busby commented that after meeting with Mike Kemble that morning, further adjustment had been discussed including adding a 4 ft. planter; moving the loading bay into the building; [at this time Mr. Busby presented a number of charts/drawings (4) to the Board and Panel, providing a visual presentation of how their project would appear showing some of the required amendments - no one had viewed these renditions prior to this time and place]. He felt that they had presented their project to the Design Panel for approval - yet had not heard about this issue until that morning's meeting with Mike Kemble. Moving the columns inside the unit floorplate would impact the livability of some living rooms. These columns did not compromise the public realm. He asked that Alternative 1.1 of their letter be shared with the Board and Panel.

Mr. Beasley requested clarity on the 40 ft. blank east wall. He also asked Mr. Busby if he did not know the guidelines called for a 2 m setback during the period he was working on this project. Mr. Busby's response was that he thought the guidelines were flexible on this issue.

Mr. Busby replied that they had worked closely with Planning staff and could not accept these required alterations/amendments to the project - that it was a "late hit".

Mr. MacGregor stated that the minimum 2 m setback represented a minor contribution from the site to the public realm. Mr. Busby responded that the column elements ran to the top of the building and are a significant piece of the architecture and the structure. Mr. MacGregor also referred to Condition B.1.4 and confirmed that this must be adhered to. Mr. Beasley indicated his concern with the applicant's attitude in responding to design concerns with the East building wall; a planter is not an object you just stick on the building; as well as concern for the main, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors. He also stated that the Board would not adjudicate this condition that evening - if it meant abandoning further examination of locating loading further towards the interior of the site.

Mr. Webb confirmed they would add suitable childrens play equipment on the podium roof.

### **Comments from Other Speakers**

None.

### **Panel Opinion**

Mr. Hruda first referred to the blank wall, noting the applicant had presented a design study at the Panel meeting. A number of comments and suggestions were made by Panel members regarding Nicola Street. The question was how to deal with these. The applicant acknowledged that this was a problem. The Panel's recommendation was that Condition 1.1 regarding the base level be strongly pursued. Regarding the structure elements along Hastings Street impinging on that public realm, Planning staff had not highlighted that this was an issue and Panel Members had relied on Staff. However, Mr. Hruda recommends that the condition must be adhered to.

Mr. Busby replied that a review of possible solutions to respond to the specific direction detailed in Condition 1.1 showed that none were very attractive. With reference to the design development of the blank wall facing Cardero Street, he indicated they would "look at it again".

In summation Mr. Hruda stated this project was very well handled, specifically in the character and massing, and would support this project.

Mr. Hancock commented on Conditions 1.1 and 1.3 and that the East wall needs to be addressed. Condition 1.1 should read "further work needs to be done on that facade". He noted that the applicant had indicated he would adhere to Condition 1.3. He also stated that he liked the columns and did not have a problem with the encroachment, and concurred with Condition 1.4 and felt that Condition 1.5 was a legal matter concerning restrictions of that use.

Mr. Gjernes recommended approval of Condition 1.1 and agreed with Mr. Hancock's suggested wording for Condition 1.1 re: the Nicola Street facade and the relocation of the loading bays was not required. He believed this could be resolved with the applicant. Suggested Condition 1.2 be deleted; Condition 1.3 - a resolution seemed to be forthcoming between staff and the applicant; Condition 1.4 - provision of a small play area for children seems to be appropriate and agreed to by the applicant; Condition 1.5 was a legal issue concerning the covenant for office use. He felt the project looked good and that the applicant had done a good job, and the referenced requirements/solutions could be resolved.

Mr. Kavanagh felt prior-to Condition 1.1 should include ". . . to provide animation with glazing along Nicola Street". Condition 1.2 would generate a hardship for the applicant; if this was not necessary on Georgia Street, why was it necessary on Hastings Street? Condition 1.3 - glazing is needed to the extent permitted by the maximum allowable in the Development and Zoning By-law.

Mr. Roodenberg recommended approval. Concerning Conditions 1.1 and 1.3; he felt the applicant was well aware that some work needed to be done. He concurred with Mr. Hancock's comments regarding columns noted in 1.2. Condition 1.4 - this was a small provision that should be made in the event that this project will house

children. He concurred with 1.5.

**Minutes**

**Development Permit Board  
and Advisory Panel  
City of Vancouver  
February 21, 2000**

Ms. Mingay stated it was a lovely building - recommended approval of Condition 1.1 and respected the amount of work necessary for this job. She concurred that Condition 1.2 should be deleted and agreed with Condition 1.3.

Ms. Leduc indicated her amazement that it had taken Staff 1.5 years to get to this stage and indicated we should get on with it. Her main concern was the North side wall, which should have some light and interest on the side. She agreed with Condition 1.4.

The Chair commented on project timing noting that the permit application had been received December 23, 1999.

Mr. Mortenson supported Condition 1.1, seeking re-evaluation of the Nicola Street facade. He would leave columns (i.e., delete Condition 1.2) and concurred with the requirements for a childrens' play area.

**Comments of the Board:**

Mr. Beasley sought clarity of the balcony rail trim and was advised it would be clear glazing. He also felt it was good to see rental projects being built. He thought that in terms of Condition 1.1 the loading bays should be relocated, Condition 1.2 should be deleted and Condition 1.3 should be followed through with. He was prepared to approve the application on this basis, and incorporating the further conditions as per Mike Kemble's memo; Mr. MacGregor seconded the motion with the exception of Condition 1.2 which he thought should be retained.

Mr. Timm supported Mr. Beasley's views regarding the columns and deletion of Condition 1.2. He felt this was a fine architectural structure.

**Motion**

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE404754, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 9, 2000, with the following amendments:

Condition 1.1 add “. . . to provide animation with glazing along Nicola Street”;

Delete Condition 1.2

Delete Condition A.1.16

Addition of the following conditions (per Mr. Kemble's memo):

“A.1.23 An irrigation system shall be specified in all common areas, including the entry and upper terrace areas. Hose bib's should be provided in private areas such as patios and courtyards. Notations to this affect should be added to the drawing.

(**Note to Applicant:** The irrigation system design and installation shall be in accordance with the irrigation industry of B.C. Standards and Guidelines.)

A.4 Standard Housing Centre Conditions:

A.4.1 Confirmation that a housing agreement is to be registered against the property which secures the rental tenure (except for the Hastings Street townhouses) of this



**5. 571, 573 & 575 Powell Street - DE404609 - Zone CD-1**

(COMPLETE)

Applicant: Vancouver/Richmond Health Board [VRHB]

Request: To permit interior and exterior alterations and the change the use of a portion of this existing warehouse building to a Health Care Office (approximately 2,920 sq. ft.) and a Social Service (Resource) Centre (approximately 5,840 sq. ft.) to develop a resource centre with associated health services for people addicted to drugs.

**Introductory Comments**

Chair of the Development Permit Board, Rick Scobie, introduced the Board, stating that Messrs. MacGregor, Timm and Beasley are voting Members of the Board; and that he, as Chair, was not a voting Member of this Board. The others are appointed by Council and are the Development Permit Board Advisory Panel - its members representing a variety of interests: two from the design profession, two from the development industry and four from the general public. He then described this Development Application and introduced the first staff member to speak to the Development Permit Staff Committee report.

**Development Planners' Opening Comments**

Mr. Bob Adair, Planner, referred to a posted map indicating the exact location of this proposed specialized facility and its surrounding community. The proposed Centre will be located on the main floor. Staff recommend approval for a one-year trial period; i.e., to July 1, 2001, with careful monitoring to ensure that its objectives are adhered to. If the Centre proves to be a success after the one year trial period, the permit could be renewed.

Mr. Donald MacPherson, Social Housing, detailed the operation of this Centre and spoke to its proposed objectives and its future role in assisting disease control and its impact on those persons who are drug addicted - a response to an ever-increasing epidemic.

Mr. Nathan Edelson, Central Area Planner, stressed the difficulty in reviewing this application, as it is the first of its kind. Staff have met with the community and an Advisory Committee was formed in the Spring of 1998 to review this proposal. A total of 21 sites were looked at in detail before selecting the Powell Street location. Notification letters were sent. Staff attended meetings with property owners, community organizations, and the business community. Additional groups were identified in order to review this proposal with the Health Board. Although the response wasn't always favourable, there was a unanimous concern about the existing health condition in their community. The City too is aware that this is not an ideal situation but also believe that the facility is necessary. Due to location of this facility, any problems that surface will be addressed quickly rather than waiting until the expiry of the one year trial period.

**Discussion**

Mr. Timm referenced the goals of the DEOD ODP, and questioned whether the proposed Centre was primarily for the residents of the area. Bob Adair said that several studies had shown that the drug using population of the Downtown Eastside was between 1,000 and 4,700 persons and that the Centre would clearly be serving the immediate needs of the neighbourhood population.

The Chair questioned the cost of building improvements and investment to establish this facility with only the

assurance of a one-year approval. Mr. Beasley also pondered the City's position in this endeavour if the applicant did not follow through with its proposal. The applicant indicated that the VRHB owned the building and would find another use for the building if the application was refused.

**Minutes**

**Development Permit Board  
and Advisory Panel  
City of Vancouver  
February 21, 2000**

Mr. MacGregor expressed concern about the hours and days of operation [9:00 to 1:00 p.m.]; Mr. Levy explained this time span was the most viable for the Centre's clients. Mr. Kavanagh queried the Centre's 16 hr., 5 days per week operation rather than 24-hr. day, 7 days a week.

The VRHB advised that although their original plans of operation were to be on a 24-hr. basis; however, due to budgetary concerns they can only afford this 16-hour time period.

In response to a question as to why residents living in this area wouldn't have showers and laundry facilities in their own dwellings, Mr. Donald MacPherson commented that many people in the downtown neighbourhood do not have easy access to shower and launder even if they live in SROs in the area, and this facility will provide a place for people to clean up, do laundry, etc.

Mr. MacGregor made reference to Conditions 1.0 and 1.2 stating that if these conditions are complied with, then Condition B.2.2 is redundant; the Chair concurred. The Chair made reference to the 1 year trial period, questioning whether it should be amended to read "a 12-month period", rather than July 1, 2001. The applicant confirmed they were entering into a one-year lease and that if the Board approves this application, the VRHB would prefer a year coincidental with the timing of the lease. Ms. Mingay obtained confirmation that the standards of operation of this Centre will be reviewed yearly and that the permit renewal will be up to the Board. Mr. Mortenson queried how the City would be monitoring this facility; the Chair confirmed that City staff, including Central Area and Social Planning staff, are working on this area's issues and will be well aware of the facility's performance. Mr. Gjernes wanted assurance that the applicant would come before the Board for review after the end of one year; the Chair advised that this was the case unless, during the year's operation, there are no community concerns with the operation of the facility.

Mr. Edelson noted that those opposed have given detailed reasons (e.g., it will increase drug addition in this community; crime rate will increase, with particular concern for the seniors and children in the area). Also concern with the hours of operation - however, the hours specified are not to reinforce the drug trade, but rather to lessen it. Level of funding provides staffing with assistance of the VPD to handle this.

**Applicant's Comments**

Mr. David Levy, Chair of the VRHB and Ms. Heather Hay, Community Network Director, both addressed the Board. Mr. Levy noted that in 1997 they commenced their HIV Action Plan to reduce the epidemic of drug users and are prepared to work with a \$4 Million per year budget in order to decrease the drug use and reduce overdoses. The Health Board and the City both concur that a change of life style is required to effect this Action Plan. Two years ago the VRHB commenced reviewing similar methods applied in other countries and consulted local drug users as to how they would react to such a facility.

The VRHB presented an overhead display, providing information on communicable disease control, vaccinations, primary care, etc. They also summarized Alcohol and Drug Services and how they are intertwined, starting with the point of contact, to treatment, and on to recovery.

The VRHB will be monitoring this facility closely and will be in encouraging other regional Health Boards to provide similar facilities for their drug-related problem areas. The applicant reassured the Board that there will be a 24-hour contact person who will be able to assess any problems affecting the neighbourhood and find solutions; this individual will be accountable to the Health Board. The applicant stressed the formation of a community Liaison Committee, working closely with the Vancouver Police Department. This Committee will participate in managing continuous cleanup in the area. Their goal is to guarantee safety in the neighbourhood,

diminish drug use and maintain suitable funding for this Resource Centre.

**Discussion**

Ms. Leduc indicated the need for school principals, parents, home owners, along with the Strathcona Business Merchants to participate in this project, and wanted to know if the Centre will be able to accommodate everyone who shows up. The applicant advised that they will coordinate their services with other facilities - St. Paul's Emergency, immunization programs, etc. Mr. Kavanagh questioned the availability of funding to expand hours of operation and asked for clarification as to what authority the 24-hour contact person have to immediately address concerns. The VRHB advised that at present their resources cover only the aforementioned hours and days, and that the contact person is empowered to handle all situations and is responsible to contact whoever will be able to problem-solve.

Mr. Timm confirmed that the Building By-law will deal with this as a change of use, with various up-grading requirements being triggered; VRHB confirmed that they own the building and upgrades will be required regardless of who uses the building.

The applicant made reference to a similar sized centre in Frankfurt that had resulted in greater community safety, less drug use, and less Hepatitis.

**Comments from Other Speakers**

Of the 58 speakers who had registered and 7 additional persons from the gallery, 12 were against this Centre being in their community.

Those speakers opposed to the approval of this application were: Messrs. Rick Archambault and Paul Ardoff, representing the Strathcona School Parents Advisory Committee; Messrs. Harry Jung, Wayne Nelson, Bob Harris, Guy Campbell, Mitz Kazuta and Ms. Yvonne DeValone, members of the Strathcona Area Merchant's Society; Ms. Brigitte Snyder and Mr. John Wortcher, are owners of rooming houses; and Mr. Ted Fromson and Ms. Kim Little are residents in the area. Their concerns were:

- concern for the children's safety in schools, play grounds, and being exposed to the drug trade
- it will decrease property values
- renters are moving out of the Strathcona community
- it will keep shoppers away from their businesses; corner grocery stores will be a thing of the past
- it will attract drug users from other neighbourhoods, compounding the existing problems
- there are enough social services facilities in their area and this proposed facility should be located elsewhere
- this facility will not improve the existing drug user problems

[A petition of signatures against this project was handed to the Chair. (This petition had previously been submitted to Staff.)]

The following delegations encouraged the Board to approve this facility. Of note were: Mr. Al Mitchell, Manager of the Lookout Shelter; Ms. Elaine Scott, representing Health Canada; Mr. Jeff Anderson, Board Member of the BC Persons with Aids Society; Inspector Chris Beach, on behalf of the Vancouver Police Department, stressing VPD's dedication to this Resource Centre and commitment to its success; Dr. Larry Campbell, Chief Coroner, Mr. Ralph Buckley, Director of the Strathcona Mental Health Team; Mr. Mark Smith [letter], Executive Director of Triage; Mr. Ken Paquette, Member of the Kettle Friendship Society; Ms. Susan Craige, Unity Housing Society; Mr. Ian Macrae, representing DERA; Ms. Maura Drake, representing Seniors/Buddhist Society/Vandu; Sister Elizabeth Kelliher, Franciscan Sisters of Atonement [Sister Kelliher was unable to stay due to the lateness of the hour, but handed her letter to the Chair; on file]; Ms. Janet Woo reading a letter from Ms. Libby Davies, MLA, Vancouver East, who was unable to attend due to ill health [letter on file].

Also in favour were: Messrs. Robin Woodward, Roger Bailey, David Diewert, Bud Osborn, Ms. Gillian Maxwell, Ms. Muggs Sigurson, Messrs. Andrew Johnson, Am Johal, Robert Miller, Donald Baker, Ms. Thea Walter, Ms. Susan Kurbis, Ms. Liz Evans, Ms. Kerstin Stuerzbecher, Dr. James Pau, Messrs. Bryan Alleyne, Dan Small, John Cameron, Tom Laviolette, Ms. Ann Livingston, Ms. Margaret Green, Ms. Sara Evans, Messrs. Richard Cunningham, and Bob Sarti. Their reasons for approval were:

- the Centre should be in the area where its services are needed the most
- will assist in disease control and drug rehabilitation
- bring dignity back to the many afflicted residents in the area
- facilities like Carnegie, [where seniors are not allowed] are over-flowing, with people having no where to go
- including the drug afflicted and past users in the various community support groups
- give them back their dignity
- create a framework for the revitalization of the Strathcona area - residential and commercial

### **Panel Opinion**

Mr. Kavanagh is not in favour of this application due to the lack of involvement of those individuals who are most concerned about this project.

Mr. Gjernes stated that this meeting had raised more questions than answers and that it was a win-lose situation. He was impressed with the representatives from the various agencies. However he felt the area is a terrible site for this type of facility and wondered why this Centre couldn't be closer to Main Street, (e.g., why not at 100 East Hastings Street); he felt it should be out of the Strathcona community entirely and felt if the City approves this application, they would also have to become more deeply involved in the relevant health and safety issues, thus taking on a huge responsibility. On balance, he was 60% in favour, 40% opposed to the application.

Mr. Hancock commented on the good arguments heard on both sides. There is no debate that this is a good facility, it's the location that is problematic. We could spend more time looking for another location - the same discussion would ensue as at this meeting. The problem is in this neighbourhood, and this is where this facility must be situated. This project should be supported.

Mr. Hruda was impressed by the overwhelming need for this facility. The neighbourhood's concerns were very valid, but there would be problems with any site; however, there is a dire need for this Centre. He concurred with Mr. Hancock's comments noted above.

Ms. Leduc recognized the need for the drug users and the need for this Centre. There is a need for a series of these facilities, but funds are restricted to the operation of only 5 days per week and detox will be needed as well. The neighbourhood has been over taxed with social services and felt that forcing yet another service will lead to polarizing the residents. She therefore did not support this application.

Ms. Mingay felt very moved by the speakers and supported. She also agrees with the conditions.

Mr. Mortenson felt that to do nothing would be to turn a blind eye to the condition and need in the area. He believed in the concept of a multi-layer approach. As a pilot project it will require a lot of attention, and sensitivity to the concerns of the neighbourhood, but felt that the need could not be ignored. He wondered whether in the future a study should be made of services in this area.

Mr. Roodenberg supported the application. He concurred with the conditions of approval recommended by the Staff Committee except for Condition B.2.2 which is redundant and should be deleted.

After thanking the public delegations and Members of the Panel, the Chair summarized what he saw as the two principal issues, and his assessment. The first is whether this use satisfies the terms of the DEOD ODP. He explained why he was satisfied it did. The second was the issue of location. Mr. Scobie suggested there probably was a better location for this facility in theory, but the applicant had assessed numerous alternatives he was satisfied the site proposed was the best site available. Given the seriousness of the crisis this facility is attempting to address, he believed that no one had the luxury of time to await the uncertain possibility of a better site becoming available. The Chair encouraged approval of the application, noting the onus rests with the applicant to proceed with the comprehensive facilities outlined in The Vancouver Agreement.

### **Board Discussion**

Mr. MacGregor thanked every one who showed up. Comments from both sides had been heartfelt. There are too many social services concentrated in the area, but there are also many drug addicts in the area. He agreed that we must do more, and do it differently as the present situation is not working. He viewed this as a step forward. Will this help the community? Yes. This may not be a perfect location, but will we ever find a perfect location? He would encourage the Health Board to look at this as a 7-day operation. The Good Neighbour Agreement (GNA) is important to be in place as it talks about a partnership made up by the residents, businesses and the community in place with three levels of government. He moved approval with amendments to: Condition 1.0 (i), (ii) and (x) as well as Condition 1.2. The Chair referred to Condition B.2.3 and stated that these are typed on the permits when issued. The Chair also referred to Condition 1.2 and suggested that in the 1<sup>st</sup> line the “ six week ” period be amended to read “three months ”.

Mr. Beasley expressed his appreciation for the profound comments from the neighbourhood, in particular regarding the existing drug problem. He felt a step must be made towards a solution and seconded Mr. MacGregor’s motion. He stressed that the temporary permit, as well as the GNA, must outline what the neighbourhood should expect; that Staff would work closely with this Centre recognizing that the community’s concerns are real and that much cooperation would be needed. He is also concerned with the continuum of proposed services as this was just the 1<sup>st</sup> step in this undertaking.

Mr. Timm supported the application based on it complying with the intent of the ODP and that the problems would be in the DTES. He also felt that this application is in accordance with the spirit of the City. The impact on the neighbourhood could be negative, but this service needs to be provided where the problem is, and that comfort could be obtained from the GNA. Board and Panel members concurred that if this facility is problematic, it would be back before the Board in one year’s time.

**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. DE404609, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 9, 2000, with the following amendments:

The Development Permit Staff Committee's RECOMMENDATION, be amended in the 4<sup>th</sup> line, to read "for a limited period of time expiring *12 months from the date of issue of the occupancy permit*" rather than expiring July 1, 2001.

Condition 1.1

- (i) add the word *City staff* after . . . . , Police, local residents, businesses, schools, . . .
- (ii) add the words , *7 days a week* after . . . 24 hour . . .
- (x) delete "Note to Applicant"

Condition 1.2

Replace the words "six weeks" in the first line to read "three months".

**Standard Conditions:**

- A.1.1            add the words "*and design development to the security fence at the rear of the property to be more neighbourly with respect to the the housing across the lane;*"

**Standard Notes to Applicant:**

- B.1.2            in the 1<sup>st</sup> line, change the date to read July 1, rather than April 1, 2000.

Delete Conditions B.2.2 and B.2.3.

**6. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:30 a.m.

---

M. Penner  
Acting Clerk to the Board

---

F.A. Scobie  
Chair