

Date: Monday, July 21, 2003  
Time: 3.00 p.m.  
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall and Council Chamber

---

**PRESENT:****Board**

F. Scobie Director of Development Services (Chair)  
L. Beasley Co-Director of Planning  
J. Forbes-Roberts General Manager of Community Services  
D. Rudberg General Manager of Engineering Services

**Advisory Panel**

S. Lyon Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)  
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions  
E. Mah Representative of Development Industry  
T. Durning Representative of General Public  
C. Henschel Representative of General Public

**Regrets**

D. Chung Representative of General Public  
P. Kavanagh Representative of Development Industry  
J. Leduc Representative of General Public

**ALSO PRESENT:**

M.B. Rondeau Development Planner  
V. Potter Project Facilitator  
A. Molaro Development Planner  
D. Robinson Project Facilitator  
M. Thomson City Surveyor  
J. Brooks Director, Social Planning  
S. Harvey Sr. Social and Cultural Planner  
D. Anderson Child & Youth Social Planner  
J. Davidson Sr. Housing Planner

**351 East 11th Avenue**

K. Hemphill Rositch Hemphill & Associates

**1210 Seymour Street**

J. Lehto UD&D Ltd.  
T. Nicholas Executive Director, Family Services of Greater Vancouver  
D. Franks Associate Executive Director, Family Services of Greater Vancouver  
J. Davidson Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

---

**1. MINUTES**

The minutes of the July 7, 2003 were unavailable for adoption.

**2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

None.

**3. 351 EAST 11TH AVENUE - DE407567 - ZONE C-3A  
(PRELIMINARY APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Rositch Hemphill & Associates

Request: To construct a multiple dwelling consisting of 81 residential units over two levels of underground parking accessed from the north lane.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

The Development Planner, Mary Beth Rondeau, presented this preliminary application and briefly described the project. The proposal seeks the maximum permitted density of 3.00 FSR and the maximum 70 ft. height suggested in the Guidelines. Referring to the Staff Committee Report dated June 25, 2003, Ms. Rondeau briefly reviewed the recommended prior-to conditions. In summary, staff recommend approval in principle, subject to improvements to the massing, streetscape, public realm and semi-private open space, and believe the proposal will earn the relaxations being sought. Ms. Rondeau tabled an amendment to condition 1.2.

**Questions/Discussion**

With respect to condition 1.6 regarding the provision of adequate storm sewer service for this site, Mr. Rudberg noted that, given this is a preliminary application, there may be the opportunity to consider alternative uses for storm water other than the storage/detention tank solution.

**Applicant's Comments**

Keith Hemphill, Architect, said they are very pleased with the application process and review which has resulted in a more workable solution for this site. He confirmed his agreement with the conditions, with the exception of a suggested minor wording change in condition 1.1 to make it less prescriptive. With respect to condition 1.6, Mr. Hemphill said they are very open to the idea of making more sustainable use of the storm water and would be pleased to investigate this.

**Comments from Other Speakers**

None.

**Panel Opinion**

Mr. Lyon advised the Urban Design Panel strongly supported this application, and he confirmed that the Panel's comments are adequately addressed in the recommended prior-to conditions. He concurred with the Development Planner's suggested amendment to condition 1.2 with respect to the townhouse expression. He noted that the architectural expression of the building generated most of the Panel's comments. In general, the Panel supported the massing, density and use, and liked the robust quality of the architecture, with recommendations for design refinement on the number of different elements on the building. Mr. Lyon concurred with condition 1.5 which seeks some simplification of design elements.

Mr. Hancock said the proposal is very approvable as a preliminary, with the recommended conditions.

Mr. Mah also recommended approval, with the conditions and amendments, noting the applicant has addressed all the issues.

Mr. Durning supported the application.

Mr. Henschel suggested that condition 1.5 should be a consideration item, preferring to leave the architectural resolution up to the designer. He recommended approval of the application.

#### Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley said the proposal is a good response to what is currently a fairly vague context, although he noted that the direction the context will take in the future is known. He agreed that some simplification of the design could make the project more elegant, but stressed that the appropriate architectural response should be left to the architect. He moved approval in principle, with amendments to the conditions.

Mr. Rudberg seconded the motion, suggesting an amendment to 1.3 to which Mr. Beasley concurred. Ms. Forbes-Roberts agreed it is a good project. She strongly supported pursuing a sustainable solution to the storm water arrangements for this site.

Mr. Scobie said he was pleased with the calibre of this project which should help to create a good precedent for this area in the future.

#### Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE IN PRINCIPLE Development Application No. 407567, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated May 28, 2003, with the following amendments:

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in 1.1 to replace 35 ft. with 3 storeys, and 8 ft. with 10 ft.;

Amend 1.2 to read:  
design development to improve the townhouse response through:

- (i) adding 2-storey townhouse units along both Prince Edward Street (one additional for a total of three townhouses) and East 11th Avenue (four townhouses) which should include a small step in the building massing; and
- (ii) relocating the garbage now shown at the corner of Prince Edward Street and the lane;

Amend 1.3 to add, after "public realm treatment": ", to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services,";

Amend the **Note to Applicant** in 1.6, to add, after "Sewer upgrading may be required":  
Consideration should be given to storm water storage including possible reuse of storm water on site as an alternative to sewer upgrading.

*The meeting briefly adjourned and was reconvened in Council Chamber at 3.55 p.m.*

**4. 1210 SEYMOUR STREET - DE407602 - ZONE DD  
(PRELIMINARY APPLICATION)**

Applicant: UD & D Ltd.

Request: To construct a 3-storey mixed-use building consisting of a Social Service Centre (main and second floors) and Residential Dwelling Units (third floor) with one level of underground parking.

**Development Planner's Opening Comments**

The Development Planner, Anita Molaro, presented this application. Referring to the model, she briefly described the site context. The proposed use is for a social service centre on the first and second floor, and five small dwelling units on the third floor. The zoning permits a maximum density of 3.0 FSR and 70 ft. height. The proposal requests 1.6 FSR and 40.7 ft. The proposed institutional use is to accommodate existing social services into an Integrated Youth Centre. The intent is that the Street Youth Services currently operating at 1065 Seymour, and the Dusk to Dawn program currently operating within St. Paul's Hospital, will be relocated to this facility.

The three principal issues relate to the use, its location, and the public realm interface. Staff recommend improvements to the Seymour Street facade, and expansion of the entry area to ensure adequate queuing space within the building area. The merit of this location for the facility is its proximity to Granville Mall which attracts homeless youth and is where young people congregate. A major concern expressed by the neighbours is the number of social service facilities within the immediate area. However, staff have concluded it is not excessive and note the central concern of the residents is that this proposed use will increase existing negative activity on the street. Staff believe these concerns can be addressed and managed in the provision of a Facility Management Plan and dispute resolution process, as requested in condition 1.1.

Staff recommend approval in principle, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report dated June 25, 2003.

**Social Planning Comments**

Jeff Brooks, Director of Social Planning, described the proposed services and their benefits, noting there will be greater hours of supervision and monitoring and more resources to manage the site than in the two current facilities. There will be a permanent on-site contact person in the facility. Mr. Brooks briefly described the services offered by the Family Services of Greater Vancouver (FSGV) who will be operating this facility. He noted that FSGV and the City's Real Estate Department conducted a search for a property in this area and no other suitable site was identified. With respect to the distribution of social services in the area, Mr. Brooks said it is similar to the West End, Fairview Slopes and Grandview-Woodlands. He noted that staff believe homelessness has generally increased in recent years and he concurred that the street youth issues are serious. However, staff believe they can be managed with a management plan that includes neighbourhood consultation. The proposed Community Advisory Committee will be chaired by FSGV, and any unresolved issues can be referred to the FSGV Board of Directors for resolution and, if still unresolved, to the Funding Committee. In conclusion, Mr. Brooks said the new facility will improve the current street issues as well as the lives of the young people it will serve.

**Questions/Discussion**

Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding alternative sites that were evaluated and the exhaustiveness of the site search. Jill Davidson, Sr. Housing Planner, explained that Real Estate Services reviewed sites on Davie Street west of Burrard but were unable to locate anything suitable, noting that cost as well as location is an important factor for FSVG. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley as to whether Granville Street was considered, Mr. Brooks said it was not considered to be a good location for this facility given it includes affordable rental housing for youths in transition. He briefly described the location of existing social service facilities in the immediate area. Questioned by Mr. Beasley regarding the make-up of the proposed Community Advisory Committee, Mr. Brooks said he saw no problem with the inclusion of a third party mediator, with the consent of the applicant.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, Sue Harvey, Sr. Social and Cultural Planner, advised that a time limited approval was considered but staff concluded that the proposed management plan provided the best mechanism for dispute resolution.

*In light of technical assistance required from City Clerk's staff who would soon be leaving, the Chair sought clarification from the Board as to whether it would permit a Powerpoint presentation from a registered delegation, and whether or not the Board wished to impose a time limit on speakers. In discussion, the Board agreed to allow speakers 5 minutes each, and up to 20 minutes (including Powerpoint) for individuals also representing groups of people.*

Ms. Forbes-Roberts requested clarification regarding the residential units on the third floor. Ms. Molaro explained that these five units are intended for youth who are prepared to live independently. They are small units for low-income renters. She noted there is a condition requiring a covenant on title that these units will not be strata titled. With respect to the private outdoor spaces for these units, the two rear units have balconies and the three units facing Seymour Street have french balconies only.

Some discussion ensued concerning the proposed "hub" approach which provides improved access for youth and greater efficiency for the service providers. Debbie Anderson, Child & Youth Social Planner, explained that the hub model now operates in Mount Pleasant on East Broadway and it has resulted in removing many "at risk" young people off the street.

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

Teri Nicholas, Executive Director, Family Services of Greater Vancouver, briefly described the history of FSGV and the services it provides, noting they have developed a strong organizational capacity. She explained that this proposal is an opportunity to combine two existing services (Dusk to Dawn and Street Youth Services) in one location and provide improved access to youth and enhanced services, including contracted security monitoring. There will also be a receptionist on duty 22.5 hours/day. She stressed that FSGV will continue to be part of the solution and is always open to suggestions for improvement. She explained, they have been looking for a suitable site for over two years, noting it needs to be accessible for the young people on the street. She noted they have time constraints on this particular site and are required to vacate the St. Paul's Hospital location in 2004. With respect to the five third floor units, Ms. Nicholas said they would ultimately like to provide more transitional housing but this would require a rezoning and the necessary funds are not available at present.

Deena Franks, Associate Executive Director, FSGV, described in greater detail the services they currently provide.

Jim Lehto, UD&D Ltd., distributed copies of diagrams indicating the areas included in the search for a suitable location for this facility, and indicating the patterns of movement of youth in the Downtown South. He stressed there is an urgent need for the facility in this area and this site met the requirements for location and site density. With respect to the condition calling for the prohibition of strata titling, Mr. Lehto noted the five small, affordable units were offered as a gesture by the applicant. He requested deletion of the condition.

John Davidson, Architect, said the conditions outlined in the Staff Committee Report can be accommodated. He agreed they can find ways to make the building even more attractive and he described their intent for addressing the conditions relating to the entry area and the Seymour Street facade. Mr. Davidson recommended amending condition A.1.11 relating to treatment of the lane area.

**Questions/Discussion**

Questioned by Ms. Forbes-Roberts regarding the third floor residential units, Ms. Nicholas said they currently only have funding for five units. If funding can be secured at a later date, they would like to provide transitional housing for youth, serving 10 - 12 people.

Mr. Beasley sought clarification as to what assurance the community will have that the loitering problems occurring at the current SYS location will not happen here. Ms. Nicholas said she understood the concern but questioned whether any one organization could handle it. She noted the proposed front gate is intended to discourage people from assembling outside. She added, the current SYS facility is frequently closed which provides the opportunity for people to loiter. She stressed that FSGV wants to address the issue. In response to a question from Mr. Beasley, she confirmed they would be open to a neighbouring resident as chair of the advisory committee.

In response to a further question from Mr. Beasley, Ms. Nicholas said their concern about operating as a tenant as opposed to ownership relates to the long term stability. Mr. Davidson responded to Mr. Beasley's questions about potential design revisions to the entry area.

In further discussion about the five residential units, Ms. Davidson said the request to prohibit strata titling formalizes the applicant's stated intention for the units, noting a relaxation of the minimum unit size standard is being sought for these units. She agreed that small rental units such as these can work and they serve a public purpose.

*The meeting was briefly adjourned at approximately 7.35 pm and reconvened at 8.05 pm.*

**Comments from Other Speakers**

The following delegations spoke in opposition to the application:

Sharon Promislow  
Barrow Promislow  
John Murphy  
Kathy Thompson, Downtown BIA  
Danica and Rhonda Jimenez  
Etienne Rubin (South Central Community Task Force)  
Adrien Amadeo  
Gary Amadeo  
Wes Reith  
James Patillo, Cressey Development  
Peter White  
Kevin Perissinotti  
Mildred Schutte  
Shaun Webb  
Cindy Meachern  
Patrician Raye  
Steve Lockhart  
John Janower  
Roman Skotnicki  
Steve Pelman  
Mitch Kenvon

Comments and reasons for opposition included:

- to deliberately create a centre for youth at risk is a bad idea;
- concern about the notification process;
- this is not an institutional site, it is surrounded by high rise apartments with families;
- if this application is approved, residents of Space and other neighbouring buildings may seek an injunction to prevent it proceeding;
- if this facility proceeds there will be no way for Space residents to enter their building without confronting disconnected youth;

- serious concerns about the concentration of social services in this area;
- why do City staff recommend approval when 93 percent of the response to notification is in opposition?
- safety concerns of resident children in the area;
- no confidence in the suggested facilities management plan;
- the "gap" between Space and this site is a children's playground for Space residents;
- a suitable alternative property on Richards Street remains vacant;
- social services are just an industry for creating jobs for social workers;
- this facility is a social time bomb;
- Space is a building under siege;
- police resources are being reduced so it is extremely unlikely they will be able to regularly patrol the area;
- Space residents have the right to quiet enjoyment of their property;
- the youth on the street are threatening and dangerous.

The following delegations spoke in favour of the proposal:

Gerry Adams, Executive Director, Urban Native Youths Association;  
Dr. Penny Parry  
Jim Sands, Regional Steering Committee on Homelessness  
Jim McLaughlin, Children's Foundation  
Randy Anderson, Ministry of Children and Family Development  
Catherine Morgan, Vancouver Women in Travel and Volunteer at Dusk to Dawn  
Cheryl Nixon  
Ian Doddington, FSGV Board Member  
Don Syroischki, Street Youth Job Action  
David Corrin, FSGV Board Member  
Craig Lindsay  
Heather Hay, Vancouver Coastal Health Authority

Comments and reasons for support included:

- the program is critical to enhancing the ability of the region to address issues of homelessness for youth;
- consider what would happen if there were no services in this area;
- FSGV is accountable and will respond to needs as they arise;
- the facility is much needed;
- if these services do not exist the problems will worsen;
- this location is appropriate because it is where the demand is located;
- the FSGV Board is committed to ensuring there is as much communication as possible with the local residents and businesses to deal with any concerns;
- this facility will provide extensive services to youth;
- Vancouver Coast Health Authority will actively participate in the Advisory Committee.

**Questions/Discussion Arising from Delegations' Comments**

- With respect to notification of future purchasers, it was noted the City intends to implement a new, Council-approved procedure whereby development companies will be requested to notify pre-purchasers of their development projects.
- FSGV advised there will be no needle exchange in this facility;
- Immigrant Services of BC on Drake Street is not a source of problem for residents;
- The Downtown BIA has offered to help FSGV locate a suitable alternative location for the facility.

**Panel Opinion**

Mr. Lyon advised the Urban Design Panel unanimously supported this application when it was reviewed on June 11, 2003. The Panel strongly supported the use in this location where the services are needed. With regard to the design, the Panel found this proposal a refreshing change after reviewing many tower/podium schemes in Downtown South. Some improvements were suggested, primarily with regard to the Seymour Street edge and the streetscape. The Panel found the entrance as designed too congested. Mr. Lyon said the Panel's concerns are adequately addressed in the recommended prior-to conditions.

Mr. Hancock acknowledged there is a need for these services in the area and he was confident that FSGV could successfully administer the facility. However, he had serious concerns about the concentration of social services in this block and the potential impact on residents who purchased their property in good faith. He said he was therefore not able to recommend approval for the use in this location.

Mr. Mah thanked the members of the public for their helpful comments, noting this application has been particularly difficult to review. He agreed there is a need for this type of facility in this area and he was confident that FSGV would do a competent and diligent job of operating it. He agreed it is very difficult to find reasonably priced sites in the Downtown. Mr. Mah said he also had some concerns about the proposal, noting the siting is particularly onerous on Space residents. As well, there will be a significant number of potential new residents in the immediate area who have been unable to comment on the proposal. On this basis, Mr. Mah said he was unable to recommend approval. He recommended allowing time for potential alternative sites to be reviewed and for new residents to move in and provide their comments.

Mr. Durning said there is an extreme need for these services in this area and it is a very modest project. He said he shared the sincere concerns of the neighbourhood, however, the community needs the services. Mr. Durning urged FSGV to put a lot of effort into assuaging the fears of the community. He supported the application.

Mr. Henschel said that without this facility more young people will end up permanently on drugs. He supported the proposal. However, he would like the proponent to indicate in the final application that it has done due diligence in looking for alternative sites, and to show there are no other sites available. Mr. Henschel also supported a time limited development permit as a strong inducement for the applicant to be a good neighbour. He also recommended making the building adaptable for future change of use, believing it to be inappropriate to make undesirable social circumstances permanent with the creation of a permanent, purpose-built, specialized structure.

#### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Rudberg commented that the split opinion of the Advisory Panel is reflective of the problems associated with this application. The City is trying to create livable neighbourhoods that support families in the Downtown, but there is also a need to address issues concerning street youth and to provide them with guidance and opportunities for improvement. There is no doubt these services are required and it is unfortunate that FSGV have not found another location where there is not a concentration of social services. Mr. Rudberg also acknowledged that putting Space residents between two facilities creates a real potential for problems. Nevertheless, he said he accepted that this is the best site for FSGV in terms of its budget and the location, although he wished he could share the applicant's confidence that it will work. Given the location, particularly sandwiching Space between two facilities, it has to work. A time limited permit will put the onus on all parties to make it work and is the only basis upon which it should be approved. The neighbours should not be burdened with the combined problems created by Covenant House and this facility. If FSGV had chosen some other location, perhaps in a commercial or retail area where there is not the same potential for conflicts, Mr. Rudberg said he would be more inclined to approve without any time restriction.

Mr. Beasley said he strongly admires the work of FSGV which is doing an almost impossible job on a daily basis. He commented that we also have to be careful not to demonize young people who are experiencing serious difficulties and who may have come to the streets from a variety of difficult circumstances. Mr. Beasley said he could not support the proposal at this time, even on a time limited basis. From a land use point of view, this activity needs to be in a location that is designed to accommodate a lot of activity on the sidewalk, namely a commercial area. If there was a commercial area adjacent to this site, Mr. Beasley said he would feel compelled to support it for that reason. This site, however, was envisioned as a residential place. In this respect, Mr. Beasley said he had no concerns with the residential component of the proposal in this location. However, he said he believes it is fair to say there is too much concentration of social services on this block. There is no question these services are needed in the neighbourhood, and many of the neighbours agree, but not concentrated on one block. Even with the best efforts, there will be a very real impact. Mr. Beasley said he did not feel confident about the security for monitoring the interface. As well, the dispute mechanism proposed by staff is very one sided, noting there is no reasonable way for FSGV to independently respond when its Board and funders have said the facility is urgently needed. It needs independent mediation that is binding and secure. Mr. Beasley said he did not believe there has been very much community consultation in deciding where the facility should be located.



Mr. Beasley agreed that, if Mr. Rudberg's motion is seconded, the approval should be time limited. As well, there needs to be a facility management plan, including a community advisory committee chaired by a resident member of the community. There needs to be staffing at the facility 24 hours/day, 7 days/week to deal with issues when they occur. The front of the building needs to be completely redesigned to provide a spacious place for respite and sanctuary - a place for youth to get off the sidewalk and wait for services. The rear façade also needs to be redesigned. If the preliminary application is approved, the complete must come back to the Board where citizens can see whether the conditions are being satisfied. Mr. Beasley urged the applicant to negotiate with Providence for an extension of the tenure at St. Paul's Hospital. An appropriate way to proceed would be to come forward with a proposal that has a good degree of support from the community. Mr. Beasley stressed that, in order to make a high density neighbourhood work and co-exist, careful attention must be given to how the interfaces happen. We have to find solutions that are balanced and which work for everyone.

Ms. Forbes-Roberts acknowledged the challenges of this application. She said she shared many of the concerns expressed and would not support an approval unless it was time limited. She noted the problem of youth on the streets and homelessness in general is in all neighbourhoods, and is on the increase. She commended the service workers and the neighbourhood for dealing with it. She agreed there is a concentration of social services within two blocks of this site. She said she was not impressed with the current situation at the Street Youth Services facility and had serious concerns about their long term commitment and accountability to the community, which she did not believe is adequately addressed by the proposed dispute resolution process. She suggested that staff explore an operating agreement (tied to a business license) to be worked out with the community so that there is some agreement and shared expectations. The dispute resolution process as proposed does not work because it is biased towards the facility. It must be more neutral. She noted that the stringent conditions that may be imposed may not be workable for FSGV and must be worked through in the complete application. Ms. Forbes-Roberts urged FSGV to continue searching for an alternative site. She agreed with Mr. Beasley that 24-hour coverage at the facility is essential.

Some discussion took place regarding the specifics of the proposed operating agreement. Mr. Rudberg said that while he had no objection to the details suggested by Mr. Beasley, he would prefer to keep the resolution general at this time. For this reason, he did not support Mr. Beasley's amending motion.

Mr. Scobie wished FSGV success but cautioned that the challenges facing FSGV with this facility might be impossible to achieve, noting that FSGV cannot be responsible for the actions of street youth outside of the services to be provided within the proposed facility, creating a situation that all levels of the community and government have yet to find a solution for.

#### Motion

It was moved by Mr. Rudberg and seconded by Ms. Forbes-Roberts, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE IN PRINCIPLE, *for a one year period upon issuance of an occupancy permit*, Development Application No. 407602, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated July 9, 2003, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1 to read:

*provision of a third party dispute resolution mechanism, developed in consultation with the neighbours, that includes a greater role for the neighbourhood in the identification and resolution of any issues, and the exploration of mechanisms such as an operating agreement tied to the business license, or a Good Neighbour Pledge;*

Amend 1.4:

*design development to increase the entry area, providing a spacious loggia to allow for additional queuing space to ensure that the youth entering the centre can be accommodated within the building area;*

Add 1.5:

*design development to the rear façade to provide an architectural treatment as a primary façade, acknowledging the entry circumstances of the building across the lane;*

Add 1.6:

*staff and the applicant to provide clear confirmation that another site is not available for this facility;*

Amend A.1.11:

*design development of the lane area of the project to provide an aesthetically acceptable security screen to contain the loading area and a secure exterior amenity area; with hardy planting within the amenity area and outside the screen consistent with the Downtown South lane guidelines.*

CARRIED (Mr. Beasley opposed)

It was moved by Mr. Beasley and seconded by Ms. Forbes-Roberts, and was the decision of the Board:

Add a Note to Applicant in 1.1:

***Arrangements should include:***

- (a) that any Community Advisory Committee is chaired by a neutral person;
- (b) that the operators provide 24-hour/day, 7 days a week staffing at the door of the facility.

CARRIED (Mr. Rudberg opposed)

## 5. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11.30 pm.

C. Hubbard  
Clerk to the Board

/ch

F. Scobie  
Chair