

Date: Monday, July 28, 2008
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

C. Warren Director of Development Services (Chair)
 B. Toderian Director of Planning
 J. Andrews Deputy City Manager
 T. Timm General Manager of Engineering Services

Advisory Panel

J. Wall Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
 S. Tatomir Representative of the Design Professions (Arrived @3:20 PM)
 N. Shearing Representative of the Development Industry (Excused Item #3)
 J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry
 M. Braun Representative of the General Public
 D. Chung Representative of the General Public (Excused Item #5)
 H. Hung Representative of the General Public
 C. Nystedt Representative of the General Public

Regrets

K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

B. Boons Assistant Director of Development Services
 S. Brodie Civil Engineer
 R. Whitlock Senior Housing Officer
 D. Morgan Development Planner
 R. Segal Senior Architect/Development Planner
 P. Cheng Development Planner
 S. Barker Project Facilitator
 D. Autiero Project Facilitator
 J. Greer Project Facilitator

1669 EAST BROADWAY - DE412066 - ZONE C-3A

J. Conicella WesGroup
 G. Venini WesGroup
 B. Hemstock PWL Landscape Architects
 T. Gill IBI/HB Architects
 R. Eagleton IBI/HB Architects
 L. Howes Vancouver Coastal Health
 L. Buhler Vancouver Coastal Health

1102 HORNBY STREET - DE412079 - ZONE DD

L. Schmidt Brook + Associates
 J. Schouw James Schouw and Associates
 S. Lyon GBL Architects
 A. Woodend Forma Design
 D. Roberts Kane Consulting

1601 WEST 7TH AVENUE - DE412144 - ZONE C-3A

L. Adams Neale Staniskis Doll Adams Architects
 B. Rice Katherine Sanford Housing Society
 K. Calsafferri Vancouver Coastal Health
 D. MacIntyre Motivation, Power & Achievement Society (MPA)

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of July 14, 2008 be approved with the following amendments:

Amend Ms. French's title on page 1 to Assistant Director of Planning;

Amend the 4th bullet on page 4 to read:

The FSR is not maximized on the site. *In the C-2 zoning there is a **separate** cap on how much residential is allowed **on the ground floor**. **The project is not using all that potential but is maximizing the above grade potential**.* The applicant has maximized the residential for the site.

Amend the third paragraph on Page 6 under Board Discussion to read:

Mr. Timm acknowledged the applicant team for their work on a difficult site because of the grade and the competing programs. He noted that a bigger challenge **was** bringing the community along to accept social and supportive housing **and he congratulated the team on their consultation with the community**. He added that he thought the Operations Management Plan would be important.

Amend the first paragraph on Page 10 under Board Discussion to read:

Ms. French made a motion to approve the application with a slight amendment to Condition 1.1. She noted that staff **had felt they had** to work within **some older** Council guidelines. In the context of the UDP's **strong support** of the application and the unanimous feeling of the DPB Advisory Panel, Ms. French noted that directly across the street is a new development that is going to be highly modern. She added that she was pleased that the Board had **the ability to be flexible about the guidelines**. She thought it was a fabulous design and thought the conditions had addressed the subtle changes suggested by the UDP.

Amend the third paragraph on Page 10 under Board Discussion to read:

Mr. Timm supported the motion. He said he appreciated the comments from the architect regarding the design intent as it helped clarify what he was trying to do relative to the guidelines **recognizing that staff are constrained by the design guidelines**. **Mr. Timm agreed with Ms. French that the development of the International Village had progressed to the point that this new context should be taken into consideration in evaluating the design**. He thought the Board had moved on from design guidelines that were written without much in the way of context except for heritage buildings. He said it was not a commentary on staff's interpretation of the guidelines. Mr. Timm added that the building would be a transition between the Sun Tower and Tinseltown and he appreciated what the architect had done.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 1669 EAST BROADWAY - DE412066 - ZONE C-3A
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: WesGroup Income Properties

Request: To develop this site with a four storey mixed use Retail, Health Care Office, General Office project over a 2½ level underground parking garage.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Dale Morgan, Development Planner, introduced the application for a 4-storey mixed-use building containing health care offices and general office with retail at grade and 2 ½ levels of underground parking. The zoning for the application is C-3A. The applicant is seeking an increase in density from 1.0 to 3.0 FSR and a height increase from 30 feet to just under 52 feet. Health care office, general office and retail are outright approval uses for the site. Height and density increases are conditional. Mr. Morgan noted that the Development Permit Board may consider density increases up to 3.0 FSR and height increases; with height having no regulatory maximum.

The intent of the C-3A Guidelines relevant to this application includes the following objectives:

- Continuous street frontage with recommended maximum Guideline height of 60 feet;
- provide an attractive and pedestrian-oriented neighbourhood and a high quality public realm;
- promote employment opportunities, especially in office uses; and
- accommodate retail and services near transportation hubs.

The site is located on the north side of East Broadway, just west of the Broadway/Commercial intersection and the SkyTrain station. The site is bordered by a vacant medium density residential site to the west, medium density residential development to the north across the lane and low rise commercial buildings to the east and south across East Broadway. On the site there is an existing funeral home, now vacant. This older structure has a mission style façade and has some historical interest, however it has no official heritage designation or status and will be not be retained.

The primary tenant for the development will be Vancouver Coastal Health (VCH). Their program needs do not require them to occupy the whole building and they will be renting out some of the space until their future needs change. Commercial retail space will occupy the ground floor with health care office and general office above. The building will be clad in brick, metal panel and painted concrete.

Vancouver Coastal Health (VCH), in accordance with Council approved protocols, had initiated extensive community outreach in advance of submitting the application.

The proposed health care office use with related general office and ground floor retail is considered a good fit within the objectives of the Broadway/Commercial C-3A Guidelines, with respect to its location, nearness to a public transit hub, office-related employment, and encouragement of an active pedestrian-oriented environment. This part of Vancouver has been identified by the Vancouver Police Department (VPD) as a high incidence area for crime and mischief and these issues were identified by some of the respondents to the notification. There were also concerns that the delivery of health care services could add to social problems in the neighbourhood.

Condition 1.1 recommends an Operations Management Plan to be provided prior to occupancy of the building and targets four main areas of concern:

- a) a consideration to establish a community based group to liaise with the neighbourhood and the VPD to address any related issues with respect to the community health centre;
- b) provision of a security plan;
- c) improve the ongoing needle recovery program in cooperation with the police; and
- d) address maintenance issues relating to vandalism such as graffiti.

Condition 1.2 recommends that a storefront police office be considered. There is a possible exclusion of this space through the amenity exclusion provisions of the C-3A District Schedule.

Condition 1.3 concerns neighbourliness and minor reshaping of the building's massing at the southwest corner. Neighbourliness goes to the heart of most zoning policy in Vancouver. Overlook, privacy, view impact, and access to natural light are key considerations in evaluating neighbourliness.

The vacant site next door is zoned RM-4N which permits low-rise medium-density multi-family residential use up to 1.45 FSR, a little less than half of what's permitted in this C-3A application. Another key difference is the 20 foot front yard setback, which positions a potential RM-4N development well behind the subject building.

To further improve compatibility with the front yards and provide a transition between the subject site and the vacant RM-4N site, staff recommend that the massing at the southwest corner be pulled back one full bay width and two storeys in height. This neighbourly gesture will improve sun access, views to the street, and reduce shadowing for the adjacent RM-4N site, while improving the overall urban design for this part of Broadway. This recommendation affects approximately 450 square feet of displaced floor area which may be relocated to the fourth level by extending the end bay approximately 5 feet without affecting the desired urban design performance of the stepped massing. The condition also asks that continuous rain cover be extended and that the walls adjacent to the open space be fully glazed. These concerns are addressed under Condition 1.3

A significant part of the earning in C-3A can be achieved through the enhancement of the public realm. For the subject site this includes a widened and upgraded sidewalk, seven new street trees, a landscaped edge and green wall along the lane and some planters along the perimeter of the roof levels. The Urban Design Panel thought the public realm enhancement had not gone far enough and Condition 1.4 addresses these concerns recommending:

- provide bench seating adjacent to the main entrance;
- provide an art feature in consultation with the Office of Cultural Affairs along the Broadway Frontage; and
- enlarge the roof area as a shared outdoor and landscape amenity.

This area of Vancouver has a higher incidence of crime and mischief than on average. The application represents an opportunity to help repair and further normalize the urban environment along the East Broadway corridor through the application of CPTED design principles. Some of these would include:

- continuous retail frontage that encourages pedestrian activity and provides services;
- continuous glazing of the ground level retail and health care offices above, providing good visibility of the street; and
- health care office uses which will encourage normal street traffic including health care professionals.

A Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) issue of concern that remains involves the west sideyard, where there are potential CPTED issues associated with the narrow space, adjacent to the vacant RM-4N site, made worse by the approximate 4 foot change in grade between the properties. The grades on the adjacent site have been altered at some point in time and are several feet higher than adjoining parcels either side. Staff recommend that a more compatible grade transition be made between properties and that the chosen landscaping should discourage pedestrian traffic through this sideyard. Vancouver Coastal Health owns the adjacent RM-4N parcel, so re-grading of this site could occur during the excavation of the subject site, under a separate permit. This CPTED issue is covered under Condition 1.5.

The application is intended to meet LEED™ Silver Canada Certified standard. The proposed sustainable strategy includes the following:

- exterior mounted solar shades on the south elevation;
- large windows with light shelves and a raised ceiling to increase natural light access;
- two storey green wall at the north façade; and
- construction materials to use recycled content where possible, including fly ash concrete.

Staff are seeking confirmation that the plans illustrate LEED™ Silver standards and to consider the suggestions by the Urban Design Panel to add more greenery to the roof and walls as well as to consider operable windows. These recommendations are identified under Condition 1.6.

The proposal meets the intent of the C-3A Guidelines with regard to building height, form, material expression and primary uses. The UDP supported the proposal and the increase in height and density. It is intended to be a “background” building, appropriate to its intended function, that will fit well within its context. In summary, earning the requested increases in density and height has been achieved primarily through:

- high quality materials;
- good neighbourliness (subject to the Conditions 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5);
- public realm enhancements, (subject to Condition 1.4);
- underground parking accessed off the lane; and
- continuous weather protection.

On that basis, staff consider that the requested increases to density and height have been earned and recommend approval of this application, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Social Planners Comments

Vickie Morris, Senior Social Planner, stated that if approved the proposed facility would replace existing public health services in the Grandview-Woodland community. The proposed array of services is typical of community health centres in other Vancouver health areas; Kerrisdale, Mount Pleasant, Knight Street and Collingwood. These include core public health and primary care services as well as programs tailored to the need of the residents in the area. The location of a full range of public health services, particularly in locations well serviced by transportation has been shown to improve access to those services especially for people with poor health status resulting from disability, language, gender, age, income, etc. The proponent, on behalf of Vancouver Coast Health, made a great effort to involve the City and local residents in the development of the application from the earliest stages. The protocols approved by Council and the Vancouver Health Board emphasizes community engagement and VCH has conducted extensive outreach to the local community regarding this proposal. Details of those activities can be found in Appendix F in the Staff Committee Report. The proposed

facility was supported generally throughout the public engagement process with some concern expressed about traffic and heritage retention. At the open house, two local residents expressed significant objection to the facility due to the inclusion of a needle exchange program as one of the services to be provided. Following the open house the Vancouver Police Department (VPD) provided commentary to the Staff Committee Report and also indicated a concern with a needle exchange at this location. There concern led to discussions between VCH and the VPD and as a result, Condition 1.1 was put into the Staff Committee Report. This condition seeks arrangement for the development of an Operations Management Plan (OMP) for the facility and for the health uses in the building including provisions for onsite security and building maintenance. VCH and the VPD will continue to cooperate in considering the establishment of an ongoing Community Advisory Committee. It is worth noting the two organizations are already actively working in the neighbourhood on drug and alcohol issues. The Grandview-Woodlands Drug and Alcohol Coalition is comprised primarily of residents but also includes the BIA who, for example, have sponsored several initiatives in the past couple of years aimed at improving the quality of life in the neighbourhood as well as for those people who suffer from addictions. The Grandview-Woodland Area Services Team also seeks to bring together all the social and health service providers in that area to better share information and better coordinate their work for the betterment of the community. Staff will be considering whether those existing groups or a new group is required to fulfill Condition 1.1 and Condition 1.2. In conclusion staff believe that these provisions will ensure that the community's chief concerns expressed are addressed and that a mechanism exists for addressing any issues that arise while also insuring that the necessary health services are delivered to the residents.

Questions/Discussion

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

- All the proposed health uses fall within the definitions of the by-law for health care offices.
- There are no special considerations of the use itself as it is an outright use. The conditionality is a result of the request for additional density.
- When a use is an outright use, the Board is not empowered to consider whether the location is a good one for that use. In this case, because all the uses are within the definition of health care office, it is not the purview of the Board to consider whether or not this is a good location for health care uses. Council has essentially answered that question by making the use an outright use within the corresponding zoning. Because the Board was asked for a discretionary increase in density, the Board can consider the issue of scale and size.
- There is an anticipation that the site to the east of the application will be redeveloped sometime in the future. However, there are currently no inquiries for the site.
- There is an assumption that the blank wall on the east façade would be visible for sometime.
- There is a higher than expected amount of property crime in the Broadway SkyTrain Station area.
- The use is influenced by the amount of density approved so there is a relationship between use and density based on the guideline objectives.
- There is enough parking being provided for the ultimately intended use as health care offices.
- The existing retaining wall does not represent the property line.
- The site to the west is zoned RM-4 which is residential use. The health care office is not a permitted use under the RM-4 zoning. The site could be redeveloped as multi-family, medium density with a maximum height of 35 feet.

Applicant's Comments

John Conicella, Vice President of Design, WesGroup, had no concerns with the conditions in the Staff Committee Report. He said they elected to go beyond the standard for public consultation and thanked City staff, Vancouver Coastal Health and the community for being respectful and professional regarding the process. He added that he was proud of the entire team.

Lynn Buhler, Director, Vancouver Community, noted that Vancouver Coastal Health (VCH) will be the main tenant. Vancouver Coastal Health already provides the majority of services that will be available in the new facility in other locations in the neighbourhood. The services are spread out and they are operating in facilities that are deteriorating, and crowded and that are not well designed for health care services and providing access to the public. For the past six months VCH has been out in the community letting residents know about their plans to relocate their services as well as letting their current clients know about the change in location. As a result of the consultation and community engagement, Ms. Buhler said they feel supported by many of the residents and community groups in the area. They also met with the VDP to ensure an understanding of what VCH is trying to achieve and how the many health care staff who will be working in the building will have a positive contribution to the neighbourhood. Ms. Buhler noted that they are committed to continuing their work with the community and to being a good neighbour and most importantly they will be there to meet the health care needs of the neighbours in the Grandview-Woodlands area who rely on their services.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The Class B loading bay is a wider loading bay and adding another loading bay will take another foot out of the wall. There are also height issues because of the exhaust equipment.
- It will be possible to balance the grades between the property and the one to the west and in the future, when that property is developed, adjustments could be made to the grade.
- The blank east wall could be improved by using a green screen material or mural. The UDP didn't think a mural was a good solution. The solution will need to be as thin as possible as there are only a couple of inches between the building and the property line.
- It is a long term lease between the property owner and Vancouver Coastal Health.
- There is a mandate from the Ministry of Health that all of Vancouver Coastal Health's own buildings will be built to LEED™ Gold. However, as a tenant VCH will work towards LEED™ Gold for the interior. The exterior will be LEED™ Silver.
- The current services are between three and nine blocks away from the proposed site.
- There is a lower crime rate at the other sites compared to the SkyTrain station area.
- The services at the new location will enhance and normalize the neighbourhood.
- The services being provided at the North Health Office are a dental health program for children, services for adult home care, addiction services, counselling and needle exchange. At the mental health site the services include counselling and support for people with mental illness.
- The services are intended for the entire community similar to other community health centres in Kerrisdale, West End, Broadway and Quebec and the other eight sites across the lower mainland.
- The clients will come from the local community other than the dental program which will take children from across the city.
- The estimate of people using the facility is around 150 clients per day. The facility will also have approximately 150 staff with half the staff working in outreach services.

- WesGroup will lease the 3rd and 4th floor, which are for Vancouver Coastal Health's future use.
- The hours of operation will be from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 or 6:00 p.m. although the facility may be open later for community meetings. It will not be a 24 hour service.
- VCH has a needle exchange with a fairly extensive recovery program. The program is monitored by the Alcohol and Drug Coalition.
- The needle exchange program is not a one-for-one exchange.
- There is a regular needle program and the team goes around picking up needles 3-4 times a week. There is also a hot line that people can call if they see a needle.
- The new facility will be consistent in size and use with two other current facilities.
- There is also a facility near the Joyce SkyTrain station which has a fairly low crime rate and which hasn't varied since the centre was established.

Comments from other Speakers

Ms. Warren, Chair, noted that the Development Permit Board had received three letters since the report was written. Two are in support of the application and were from the Grandview-Woodlands Drug and Alcohol Coalition and from Crossroads Community Project at the Grandview Calvary Baptist Church. The third letter was not in support of the application and came from Francoise Robertson.

Harold Jauk, who has lived in the neighbourhood for twelve years, suggested that a community plan was needed for the area. Mr. Jauk thought the facility was not going to make the neighbourhood better and he also thought the building was not going to age well.

Eileen Mosca was concerned about the location for the facility. She suggested that appropriate security measures needed to be put in place and that VCH make a commitment that the needle exchange program would be limited to the current square footage and hours of operation in the present location. She also suggested that there shouldn't be any benches in the public realm.

Jaret Clay, Chief Operating Officer, Pacifica Treatment Centre, was in support of the application. He noted that they are involved in the community and care for their property. He noted that there are not enough services currently in the area and mental health services are extremely hard to find in the neighbourhood. He added that the facility will be an excellent addition to the community and will help provide stability.

Ian Marcuse was in support of the application. He is a 20 year resident of the area and a volunteer for the Drug and Alcohol Coalition. He said the new facility would bring together a number of programs under one roof and thereby improve the services to the community.

Lee Nichols is a clinical supervisor for a program established by the Organ Institute in the US and in cooperation with the Vancouver School Board, Primary Research Institute and the National Institute of Health. They are in the fourth year of a five year project doing research on an AIDS prevention strategy and work mostly with 1st Nations people. He was in support of the application as the facility will be across the street from their offices and will be convenient for their clients who are mostly single parent mother or grandmothers and poverty is an issue.

Francoise Robertson has lived in the area for 3 yrs. She noted that there is heavy drug use in the community and thinks the new facility will attract more addicts especially if they offer a needle exchange program. She suggested that they have a one-for-one needle exchange to help account for the needles as the facility will be dealing with a part of the population that does not take responsibility for their actions.

Bob Prite sent a letter to the Development Permit Board strongly objecting to the application. He thought some improvement to the area was needed. He has lived in the area for 30 years and the drug users and dealers are rampant in the area.

Roland Jauk thought the new facility would not improve the community. He said that closing down two centres and creating a super centre wasn't going to help reduce crime or make the community safer. He noted that it is just another health care facility in an area that already has a methadone clinic and other medical buildings. He suggested adding more retail or restaurants to the area.

Raj Gojai said he had been connected to the community for 40 years. He said the police can't handle the problems around Commercial Street and East Broadway now and didn't see how having a needle exchange program in the new facility would help the area improve.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The retail area will not be a pharmacy but the tenants have not as yet been selected.
- In order to have a pharmacy in the facility it would have to have been included in the application. If the owner decides at a later date to include a pharmacy in the building, they would have to come back to the City with a new development application.
- Pharmacy use would not meet the current by-law guidelines for the area.
- There has been a lot of discussion with the Police Department for providing a community policing office in the building but there are funding and policing issues that have not been resolved as yet. However the police have expressed a willingness to provide a community policing office in the new facility.
- VCH has no plans to expand their needle exchange program.
- VCH undertakes needle exchange under a provincial program. The Provincial medical health officer is not requiring a one-for-one exchange. It could be interpreted as a needle distribution program.
- In discussion with the police, the owner has offered space for a community police office but is up to the Police Department to determine if they will take the offer.
- The criteria for VCH facilities is that they provide services to the residents and are centrally located, accessible to transportation and visible so that people in the community know VCH has a facility in their community.
- The issue of being a crime "hot spot" wasn't an issue when the location was first identified and only came up when the VPD identified the area with respect to crime.
- The VPD has requested closed circuit TV as part of VCH's crime prevention solutions.
- An analysis has shown that there is no relationship between having a needle exchange program in a community and more crime.
- VCH expected around 800 clients visits a week. Most of their staff will be out in the community each day as part of the outreach programs. Much of their office space will be used by staff.
- 80% of the visitors who will come to the site will be coming to the mental health team. The children's dental program has 8 chairs. Clients will be coming to the site for scheduled appointments including rehab assessments, psychiatrist and counselling appointments. As well there will be a clinic for elderly people. About 5% of their clients will be for addiction related services.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall thanked the public for their comments. Mr. Wall, who lives in the neighbourhood, about five blocks from the SkyTrain station, agreed that there were problems in the neighbourhood. The Urban Design Panel (UDP) supported the application. They were concerned about the way the building fits into the neighbourhood and suggested sculpting the building as it addresses its neighbour to the west. Regarding sustainability, the Panel thought the application could go further than LEED™ Silver but commended the applicant for going as far as they had with sustainable measures. They noted that improving sustainability would benefit the users, tenants and the building owner and increase the longevity of the building. The Panel also thought the building needed some fine-grained detailing that would relate to the Commercial Drive neighbourhood as they thought the building read like an institutional building. Regarding the blank east wall, Mr. Wall noted that the Panel thought it would be appropriate for additional articulation in terms of materials being used as the wall would be visible from the SkyTrain station and the East Broadway and Commercial Drive intersection. The final concern of the Panel was around improving the landscaping a concern which had been picked up in the prior-to conditions in the Staff Committee Report. Mr. Wall agreed with the public that having a bench in the public realm would not be a good idea unless the tenant group could maintain the benches. Mr. Wall said he was in support of strengthening Condition 1.1 and that the applicant should liaise with the VPD for a community policing station in the new facility.

Mr. Tatomir recommended approval but was disappointed in the final design despite the LEED™ Silver qualification. He noted that there were no visible sustainable features on the building. He agreed that the blank wall on the east of the building could be a problem and suggested it could be mitigated with the use of architectural formwork. Mr. Tatomir said he didn't understand the concrete projections on the 3rd floor as they were too high for shadowing the windows. He also thought it was a lost opportunity to not have access to the roof to mitigate overheating of the roof in the hotter months. Mr. Tatomir thought the art feature on East Broadway wouldn't do much for the streetscape and suggested having a book store or coffee shop as the retail tenants.

Ms. Nystedt agreed that there were some complex problems in the neighbourhood and she said she understood the desire for VCH to consolidate their two offices near transit. She thought the prior-to conditions in the Staff Committee Report dealt with the major concerns. Ms. Nystedt thought the security plan was well addressed in the conditions but thought VCH should do more to address the concerns of the community. She agreed that a community policing station should be included in the facility. She also agreed that the benches should be omitted from the public realm. Regarding the blank east wall, she noted that a solution needs to be found and that CPTED issues have to be addressed. Ms. Nystedt encouraged the applicant to pursue LEED™ Gold. She recommended approval of the application as she was satisfied that the larger concerns have been addressed. Ms. Nystedt added that she was disappointed that there wasn't a Vancouver Police Department representative at the Board meeting.

Mr. Chung said he supported the conditions in the Staff Committee Report and suggested VCH appoint a neighbourhood liaison to address the community so they have one person to talk to when they have issues with the facility. Mr. Chung thought it would be a good idea to have a police presence in the building. Mr. Chung also thought the blank east wall needed to be addressed as it would be a magnet for graffiti artists. He also thought the design was unassuming for the building and that the applicant could do better. He said it was one of the least favourable applications he had seen in terms of architecture in his term on the Advisory Panel. Mr. Chung recommended approval of the application and encouraged the applicant to improve the design of the building.

Mr. Hung thanked the public for their comments and acknowledged that it was an area with lots of problems. He noted that the application was a consolidation of services and VCH would not be expanding their services. Mr. Hung recommended approval of the application noting that an Operations Management Plan was needed. He said he agreed with the speakers that local residents should be involved in drafting the plan. He added that he also didn't like the needle exchange or distribution but noted that the Province had already agreed to the service. He asked VCH to keep the needle exchange because without the service there would be more needles left on the ground around the area. Regarding the blank east wall, Mr. Hung suggested adding a mural to make the wall more interesting. He agreed that the presence of the community policing station would help mitigate problems in the area. Mr. Hung thought the area would be more vibrant if more businesses were attracted to the area. He said he hoped that with the help of the City the developers would come to the area and develop retail and other service-oriented facilities.

Mr. Braun recommended approval of the application and agreed that the benches should be deleted and that a condition for improving the blank east wall should be added to the prior-to conditions.

Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian asked staff if they would prefer removing the condition regarding the benches in the public realm or making the condition a consideration. Mr. Morgan said he would prefer the condition was removed from the report noting that the suggestion came from the UDP.

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

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

Mr. Timm seconded the motion and suggested a small change that Mr. Toderian accepted. He said he appreciated that there were important issues for the community. He agreed that it was not the role of the Board to determine how VCH delivered their services. He added that VCH does good work in the community and the services that will be provided at the new facility should be welcomed into the community. Regarding the architectural expression for the blank east wall, Mr. Timm noted that Engineering Services had used architectural formwork for some of their concrete walls which made for a more interesting wall. He added that he supported that idea noting there would be less maintenance.

Mr. Andrews said he supported the amendments put forth and thanked the residents and the people representing the helping services for their passionate comments. He noted that it was difficult hearing the level of passion since the Board had limited authority regarding social challenges. Mr. Andrews noted that the public had left him with a lot to think about.

Ms. Warren thanked the community noting that many of their comments were reflected in the prior-to conditions.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE412066, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated July 16, 2008, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.1 to read:

arrangements for an Operations Management Plan for the Health Care Office use of the building, *in consultation with the various community voices*, to the satisfaction of Director of Planning in consultation with the Managing Director of Social Development, to include;

Amend Condition 1.1.2 to read:

following occupancy, to establish an on-going *community liaison person and broadly represented* community advisory committee, in consultation with the Vancouver Police Department (VPD) and neighbourhood organizations, to serve as a liaison for discussing opportunities and issues with respect to the Community Health Centre;

Delete Condition 1.4.1;

Amend Condition 1.4.2 to read:

provide an art feature along the Broadway frontage and within the property boundaries, *perhaps incorporated into the architecture or public realm design*;

Renumber Condition 1.4.2 to 1.4.1 and Condition 1.4.3 to 1.4.2;

Amend the Note to Applicant in Condition 1.6 to read:

Note to Applicant: The intent is to define on the final approved permit drawings those features referred to on the LEED™ checklist to attain minimum Silver level or equivalency. *The applicant is encouraged to consider the Provincial commitment to achieve LEED™ Gold for all provincial facilities.* Consider the use of operable windows for natural circulation and cooling and the provision of an extensive green roof *or white roof*.

Add a new Condition 1.7 to read:

design development to mitigate the blankness and improve the visual appearance of the east elevation;

Note to Applicant: The adjacent C-3A site to the east may not be redeveloped for some time and this blank wall will be visible from points east of the site looking west, including the SkyTrain station. The applicant is encouraged to investigate creative ways in which this wall may be enlivened and given significance, recognizing the temporary nature of its visibility. Options include consideration

of a green wall treatment, urban mural, or architectural form work to soften this edge and further promote sustainable values.

**4. 1102 HORNBY STREET - DE412079 - ZONE DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Brook & Associates Inc.

Request: To develop this site with a six storey multiple dwelling building containing a total of 21 units, all over a common underground parking garage containing 47 vehicle spaces. Furthermore, the project includes a heritage transfer of density of 3,600 sq. ft. to the site from donor site 55 East Cordova Street.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ralph Segal, Senior Architect/Development Planner, introduced the project noting that it was an example of what can be designed for a small site in the downtown south area. The site qualified for 3 FSR and a height of 70 feet plus a 10% heritage density. As required under the zoning the 10% heritage density must be approved by the Development Permit Board. Mr. Segal stated that there were no substantive issues with the application other than the condition to improve daylight access to the bedrooms on level two. Also staff are asking that the applicant provide a stronger front door expression and a notation on the plans regarding the sustainable measures.

Mr. Segal reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated July 2, 2008. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The developer has a history of designing rather unique floor layouts and staff are relying in good faith that the double height spaces wouldn't be modified in the future.
- Staff have confidence that they have addressed the issue of the building expression, the configuration of the massing and the façade treatment. Although unique, the building will add to the diversity of the area.

Applicant's Comments

Stuart Lyon, Architect, referred to the model and further described the application. The site has been designed within the by-law and guidelines for the area and will provide 21 residential units. The suites are different from other market products with a pinwheel arrangement at the core of the building. The building has been designed with a heavily glazed element on the north-facing façade and a conservatory element on the top of the building. There are no cantilevered balconies as the developer wanted to create terraces that would be more liveable. The units are large with high ceilings with some units that are double and triple volumes. Privacy has been maintained around the edges of the site by raising the units and landscaping. Mr. Lyon had expressed some concerns with Conditions 1.1 to 1.3 and stated that they could work with the rest of the conditions.

Dan Roberts of Kane Consulting said they took a proactive approach to sustainability and brought the engineers to the table early on in the design. He noted that they don't have direct sun to deal with on the building but wanted to optimize the daylight. For energy needs, Mr. Roberts stated that they are looking at systems for ground source or geothermal which will be topped off with a boiler system. They will also be using Energy Star appliances as well as green roofs and other sustainable measures.

Avril Woodend of Forma Design, described the landscape plans for the project. She noted that they will be wrapping the bottom of the building with generous landscaping which is intended to offer a buffer to the outdoor terraces from the street. They plan to green as much of the building as possible with vertical plantings, a green roof and planting in containers.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The building will not be LEED™ certified but could achieve at least a high LEED™ Silver or Gold.
- There isn't a pure language to the architecture of the building but is based on the client's experience.
- The suite layouts are unique with some open plans to maximize the filtration of light.
- The residents will be mixed; from singles to young families to empty nesters.
- The building will have a strong townhouse rhythm at the base which is represented by a three storey glazing.
- The building stone colour is intended to be ivory.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall said the Urban Design Panel (UDP) supported the project with a few minor concerns. They thought the public realm interface was well handled and liked the deeper terraces as they thought it was an interesting change from the typical downtown layouts. They also thought the building was fortunate regarding solar gain as it is surrounded by tall buildings. The Panel were concerned with the amount of glazing on the top of the building and thought there could be some loss of energy during the cooler months. Another concern for the Panel was the bedroom units as they thought they might not get a lot of natural light. The Panel did recognize the application as a unique project and that there is a place within the city for this kind of architectural vocabulary as it would add to a richer urban fabric. Mr. Wall thought there was a bit of a disconnect between the interior and exterior and felt it would be a stronger project if those two elements were more closely married.

Mr. Tatomir said he thought it was a unique project. He said he liked the roof but would have liked to have seen a lighter material. Mr. Tatomir recommended support of the application.

Mr. Shearing recommended approval of the application. He said he liked the diversity as it would add something different to the skyline of the city. What doesn't work is the relationship between the solids and the glass elements and Mr. Shearing noted that the building needed a strong connection to the street. He thought it was missing a heavier base to support the glass element of the building.

Ms. Nystedt said she liked the project and recommended approval of the application. She added that she thought the building had tremendous personality.

Mr. Chung liked the diversity in the architecture adding that the applicant had created something unique. He thought the terraces would add an architectural feature that was lacking in the downtown. Mr. Chung recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Hung commended the architect for the design of the building. He thought it would be a unique building in the downtown. Also, he thought the building would have good energy performance based on the sustainable measures. Mr. Hung thought that there might be a challenge with furniture placement in some of the suites because of the curved walls but that the suites would be interesting for the buyers. Mr. Hung said he liked the design and recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Braun commended the applicant for trying to design something different in Vancouver. He said that personally he would have preferred a building that more referenced Vancouver. Mr. Braun recommended design development to make sure all the elements were well integrated so that the building was cohesive and sophisticated.

Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian made a motion to approve the application with an amendment. He said beyond the building's commendable sustainability and well resolved scale and massing, he wasn't all that sure how he felt about the building's architectural language. He said that for two years he's been saying that he wanted architects to take more risks with their architectural expression and that our usual architecture hadn't gone far enough. Mr. Toderian said he didn't like the building because of its mixing of styles but he pointed out that the Director of Planning doesn't have to like the architectural style choice of a building and it gave him an opportunity to commend the architect for taking risks. He questioned whether the design met the City's aspirations around urban relationships and felt that it would with the design development conditions proposed by staff. He said that there was still work to be done but would recommend approval of the application. Mr. Toderian said he was anxious to see it once it was built and to get people's opinions of the design. He thought they would either love or hate the design but that it would support an architectural dialogue that was needed in the city.

Mr. Andrews had asked Mr. Lyon if he understood what Mr. Toderian was saying around the architecture to improve the design. Mr. Lyon stated that understood and was happy to work with staff to improve the design.

Mr. Andrews said he agreed with the Mr. Toderian's amendment and seconded the motion.

Mr. Timm thought the design was interesting and that people either would like the building or not. He agreed that the architecture would likely create a lot of discussion. Mr. Timm added that he was in support of the application.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE412079, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated July 2, 2008, with the following amendments:

Add a new Condition 1.4 to read:

design development to more strongly integrate the building elements including the relationship between the column architectural expression with the rest of the building expression.

**5. 1601 WEST 7TH AVENUE - DE412144 - ZONE C-3A
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Neale Staniskis Doll Adams Architects

Request: To construct a 9-storey mixed-use building containing 62 residential units and a Social Service Centre located on the ground and second floors, totaling 919 square metres. The applicant is seeking the Board's approval for the increase in the maximum floor space ratio for a Social Service Centre to be operated by Motivational Power and Achievement society in accordance with section 5.3 of the C-3A District Schedule.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Paul Cheng, Development Planner, introduced a social housing project at West 7th Avenue and Fir Street. The development is one of the 12 city-owned sites included in the Social and Supportive Housing Partnership between the City and the Province.

The neighbourhood context includes older low-rise office and industrial buildings directly adjacent to the site and more recent residential or mixed-use towers to the south. The site is zoned C-3A, which allows an outright density of 1.0 and a conditional density of 3.0 FSR. Further increases in density may also be considered by the Development Permit Board for any public, social or recreational facility. With respect to building height, the applicable design guidelines consider this site as suitable for a tower element, and recommends 100 feet as a discretionary building height for this neighbourhood.

The proposal is for a 9-storey mixed-use building containing 62 residential units on the upper floors and a Social Service Centre on the ground and second floors. All of the proposed living units are below 398 square feet in floor area and therefore seek conditional approval for a reduced dwelling unit size. The Social Service Centre will be operated by the Motivational Power and Achievement Society (MPA). The overall density of the residential component is 2.94 FSR, which is below the conditional 3.0 FSR, bringing the total density to 3.81 FSR.

The proposed building height is 110.5 feet up to the main parapet wall and 119.4 feet to the top of the elevator penthouse. Staff support the main parapet wall height on the grounds that the subject property has a significant slope of approximately 10 feet. If the building height were calculated from the highest elevation point, the parapet of the building would be very close to the guideline-recommended building height of 100 feet.

The elevator penthouse, however, is in a prominent location on the periphery of the building against West 7th Avenue, and staff are recommending Condition 1.2 to reduce the height of the rooftop elements, thereby arriving at a building form that is in line with the general intent of the zoning by-law.

As part of the initiative for Social and Supportive housing, the proposal is committed to attaining LEED™ Gold certification or equivalent.

In response to neighbourhood notification, eight letters were received in support and forty-one letters were opposed. The main concerns included the locating of the Community Resource Centre on the site; that the Centre could pose safety risks to the surrounding neighbourhood and of negative effects on views and daylight access for existing residents nearby.

The proposal was unanimously supported by the Urban Design Panel, but there were some design conditions that staff recommended for further refinement to the building and the public realm interface.

Mr. Cheng reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated July 16, 2008. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Senior Housing Officer's Comments

Mr. Whitlock, Senior Housing Officer, noted that the site was endorsed by Council as part of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the City and the Province to include the development of 1,100 to 1,200 dwelling units to take place on 12 City-owned properties.

This initiative is intended to expand the network of services and housing for people with mental illnesses and addictions, many of whom are homeless or at risk of homelessness. The site on West 7th Avenue will provide housing for individuals who suffer from mental illnesses on low incomes. A third to a half of the units will be referred through the Vancouver Coastal Health's mental health program, while the remaining tenants will come via a new centralized access system being developed by BC Housing in conjunction with the housing sponsors.

As part of the MOU, Council also endorsed the inclusion of the Motivation Power and Achievement Society (MPA), community resource centre, which presently provides counselling, vocational advice and other services to people with mental illnesses in this part of the city. The current resource centre is located nearby, on 4th Avenue east of Burrard Street, in an older commercial building.

The resource centre has existed in this community for over 21 years. The centre was given notice that the owner wished to redevelop the site. The MPA Society contacted City staff as they faced the reality of relocating out of the area because there were no suitable alternative locations. Because the relocation would have meant creating a void in mental health services in this part of the city, the site at Fir Street and West 7th Avenue was identified as a possible location which would allow the service to be maintained in the community, and it would work hand in hand with the proposed supportive housing project planned for the site.

The approvals process involved two distinct stages. In November and December of 2007, Council heard delegations regarding the overall 12-site supportive housing strategy, including Fir Street and West 7th Avenue. People spoke at length, providing pros and cons to the overall initiative, and a few people from the area expressed their concerns about this particular

project. On December 19th, Council unanimously endorsed the MOU between the City and the Province to proceed with the 12 sites.

The process for the application has involved notification of property owners within a two block radius of the site, two newsletters prepared by the housing sponsors that were delivered to residents in the community, and an open house held on June 10, 2008, which was attended by 140 people.

Staff from the City, Vancouver Coastal Health, BC Housing and the sponsors of the project recognize there is both support and opposition in the community about this project. Concerns can be categorized into three general areas:

- Personal safety and crime;
- Increased activity in the neighbourhood; and
- Impact on property values.

The experience of Vancouver Coastal Health and sponsors such as the MPA and Katherine Sanford Housing Society is that threats to personal safety have not occurred. A review of complaints filed with Licenses and Inspections and the Vancouver Police Department showed that concerns for personal safety, increased property crime, drug activity, noise or odd behaviour have not been substantiated. Outside the Downtown Core, few calls to police have been made by neighbours of supportive housing. These calls are often related to activity unrelated to the building and its occupants and users of its services.

Some people will be concerned with the presence of those on low incomes who will come and go from the site to attend the community resource centre and who may not look the same or behave the same. But the City must balance the needs of communities along with the need to help those who cannot cope with daily life because they have a mental illness. Mental illness is not restricted to those with low income; they just have far fewer opportunities and resources to manage their circumstances.

All studies of the impact on property values because of social housing projects indicate no effect, including one undertaken by the Province in 1995, and revisited in 1999/2000. This study looked at the impacts on property values for a control group close to the social housing projects, and the broader community beyond. In both studies, there were no negative impacts on the sale prices of homes in the immediate area. The study included both family and special needs social housing projects.

However, to respond to community concerns about this particular project, Mr. Whitlock noted that staff recommended a development of an Operations Management Plan (Condition 1.1). This OMP would establish site contacts and dispute resolution mechanisms, and a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) which will involve the funders, including staff from Vancouver Coastal Health and the City, the sponsors for the project, BC Housing when needed, and representatives from the community, in regular meetings, to monitor the effects of the project in the local community, and to adjust when needed. Mr. Whitlock stated that it was important to note for the Board's information that his experience with OMPs and CACs was excellent. For example, in the case of the Triage project at East 39th Avenue and Fraser Street, which is comparable in that it serves a similar population, there has been nothing but positive relations with the community over its first year of operation, and the CAC has little to do. At the last meeting of the CAC, the observation was made that Triage staff serve as eyes on the community, and have been in part responsible for reduction in criminal activity around that site. Similarly, the resource centre for youth at 1134 Burrard Street has not had to deal with

the kind of impacts that were anticipated by that project when it was going through the approvals process.

To respond to community concerns, all participants are supporting the establishment of the OMP and the corresponding CAC. This mechanism will ensure that any negative consequences of the project will be dealt with in a quick and attentive manner.

In closing, Mr. Whitlock said it was also important to position the general 12 site initiative and this project relative to Council policy. In 1989 and again in 2001, Council confirmed its priorities for social housing to include families with children, seniors on fixed incomes or in need of support, SRO residents, and the mentally ill, physically disabled and others at risk of homelessness. The City has been an active partner in the development of supportive housing, which is part of Vancouver's housing continuum and part of the City's long running commitment to creating inclusive neighbourhoods open to all residents. It is also part of a more general movement toward health care delivery that puts increasing emphasis on community-based services. The location of supportive housing city-wide provides opportunities for people to access both housing and support services where family and friends are nearby, and where individuals are familiar with the services and the neighbourhood.

Questions/Discussion

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

- If there were a market development planned for the site the massing would be similar.
- The building does not infringe on any view cones.
- Priority will be given to residents with connections to Kitsilano and Burrard slopes.
- Council already considered the appropriate uses on the site and it is not the purview of the Board to reconsider those uses.
- The zoning guidelines for this area recommend a height of 100 feet. The intent is that it is the base type of height that staff envision for the neighbourhood.
- Staff felt the elevator overrun was too noticeable and keeping in mind the original intent of the zoning, staff felt it should be lowered.
- There is no elevator access to the roof only stair access. There is a large machine room above the slab of the roof. There are other technologies that have a minimum machine room.

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

Applicant's Comments

Bonnie Rice, Executive Director, Katherine Sanford Housing Society, gave a brief overview of the society. They are a charitable non-profit organisation with a mandate to provide housing for people with mental illness. They currently have 19 projects in the lower mainland and have a long term partnership with the MPA. Ms. Rice said their commitment to the neighbours and the community is to ensure that the building will be well maintained. She added that along with the MPA they are committed to being a good neighbour and to building a strong

relationship with the community. Ms. Rice said they were grateful to the City and the Province for the opportunity to provide an additional 62 units of much needed supportive housing.

David MacIntyre, Executive Director, Motivation, Power & Achievement Society (MPA), gave a history of the society. The MPA Society is a non-profit foundation that was founded in 1971. It was formerly known as the Mental Patients Association and its mission was to inspire hope in individuals with mental health issues. The MPA operates social, vocational, recreational programs and housing that supports people in their communities. The MPA has developed a variety of supportive housing options depending on resident needs, staffing levels and support. Services range from on-site staffing 24 hours a day to supportive independent living units. The MPA houses over 400 people in 17 locations throughout Vancouver and two locations in Maple Ridge.

The MPA is a partner for the site at West 7th Avenue and will provide staff and services for the supportive housing units as well as the Community Resource Centre. Thirty of the sixty-two units will be supportive housing units for people with mental illness referred by the Vancouver Coastal Health. Priority will be given to residents of Fairview and Kitsilano and those with supportive families in the area and those who are clients of the area's Mental Health Team. All residents who come from the VCH referral process will be linked with mental health treatment services in the neighbourhood. The remainder of units will be available to individuals with low income who are homeless or at risk of being homeless. These individuals will be referred to the BC Housing again with priority going to Fairview and Kitsilano residents. There will be 24 hour a day staffing on site to support all residents. For those residents with mental illness there will be a combination of on site services provided by the MPA as well as referrals of health care services in the community.

The Community Resource Centre is the second component to the project. The MPA currently operates a Community Resource Centre in the area on West 4th Avenue. They have been there for 21 years. The centre offers opportunity for social interaction, a meal program, peer consulting, and assistance in accessing community resources. The landlord has currently given them notice that he wishes to redevelop the current site. A location close to the current operations in a central location is necessary to maintain services to those living in the Kitsilano and Fairview community. Members of the Community Resource Centre are people living with mental illness and who are in need of a supportive environment in which to socialize, engage in peer support and learn about community resources available to help them deal with their mental illness. Only registered members may use the Community Resource Centre.

Mr. MacIntyre said he is very pleased by the level of support they received at the public Open House on June 10th. Although they had much support for the project they also heard several concerns expressed that they took seriously. The MPA is committed to being a good neighbour. The new building will allow them to address a number of challenges faced at their current location. In the new location they have had an opportunity to work with their partners to design a space that meets the current programming needs while increasing their ability to monitor activity at the centre. The project is being designed using Crime Prevention Through Environment Design Principles (CPTED) as well as incorporating several technical security systems including cameras. The Community Resource Centre will maintain its current schedule and although the resource centre itself will not be open after hours there will be MPA staff in the building for the housing component that will allow for increased monitoring. The design of the building provides patios which will allow members a place to be outside without having to be on the street in front of the building. The design also allows an area that can be used for storage of such things as shopping buggies. Mr. MacIntyre said they were committed to being a positive neighbour in the community and are making efforts to ensure that the Community

Resource Centre is a positive neighbour. Members are not permitted to loiter before opening and after hours. Staff will monitor the exterior of the building on a regular basis.

The Community Resource Centre will maintain a strong liaison with the neighbourhood and will continue to invite the Vancouver Police to visit on a regular basis. He said they believe a strong relationship with the VPD is important and continue to welcome their involvement at the centre. On site staffing during operation hours will include mental health workers, a program manger, advocacy workers, administrative and kitchen support staff, member volunteers and an on call psychiatric nurse. The Community Resource Centre is also linked to community mental health services that provide additional support and assistance to staff and members.

The MPA will continue to provide outreach services to the Kitsilano area community in an attempt to engage homeless individuals with a mental illness and help them access appropriate services such as housing. The MPA will work with community partners to identify people in need of these services. They will help create a community liaison process that will allow for regular opportunities for the community to provide open discussion and feedback on any impacts on the neighbourhood in ways to strengthen the community relationship. They will provide a contact who can respond to any site related issues. They will create staffing and management protocols addressing building safety, nuisances, staffing plan and community responsiveness. They will also help to create a resolution mechanism to address any impacts the project has in the community, if any should occur, and will develop a report protocol to the City.

Kim Calsaferri, Contract Manager, Vancouver Coastal Health, noted that VCH has had a long term relationship with the MPA Society. VCH has funded the MPA for over 20 years. During this time MPA has provided excellent services to individuals with mental illness through their housing and community services. As part of the spectrum of mental health services, VCH wants to continue to provide access to the Community Mental Health Resource Centre in Kitsilano to meet the needs of citizens in the area who have a mental illness. The MPA has existed in the community for 37 years and is a critical part of the services available to mental health clients. The centre provides a supportive environment where they can meet each other, participate in activities and get information about other resources and support that they may need. The existing program with present funding is relocating to a better space. VCH has community resource centres in other sites across the city. These work very closely with the mental health team in the catchment area and with other mental health resources to meet the needs of people with mental health issues. Ms. Calsaferri said they were looking forward to the opening of the site as it will be an improved environment for those individuals with mental health issues and for the team.

Larry Adams, Architect, said he had no concerns with Condition 1.1 but had some minor issues with Condition 1.2 noting that there isn't elevator access to the roof. The elevator needs twenty-two feet for the overrun but Mr. Adams said that they can work with the condition and lower the roof, however this would require a more expensive elevator. Mr. Adams asked the Board to turn Condition 1.3 into a consideration item. He noted that there had been an enormous amount of discussion regarding the east façade. The canted windows were oriented to buffer the noise and lights from the bridge. Regarding Condition 1.4, Mr. Adams said that adding more windows would compromise the furniture placement in the unit. Mr. Adams said they could work with Condition 1.5. Regarding Condition A.1.1, Mr. Adams said they currently are showing 8 stalls but Engineering Services is requesting another 6 stalls. BC Housing has agreed to fund the additional level of underground parking and they will be meeting that requirement. Mr. Adams would like to have Condition A.2.7 removed as he felt it was not the

appropriate response to provide two benches. Mr. Adams said the condition causing the most difficulty was Condition A.2.4 regarding loading. Engineering Services requires a Class B loading bay with maneuverability on the site. He noted that there is no back lane and they have already dedicated ten feet for a half a lane to provide access to the underground parking and loading. Also, the lane doesn't go through yet. Mr. Adams stressed that it would be a hardship as the maneuverability would have to be internal and this would cut out part of the ground floor because they would have to cut back 10 feet in order to get enough room. He added that any deliveries would be with smaller trucks and there is no need for this size of loading bay. Mr. Adams added that he didn't have any concerns with any of the other conditions.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The metal panels are a champagne colour with harvest rust on the bays and a light coloured brick.
- The benches in the public realm are listed in Appendix H.
- Police are invited to the MPA facility each week to help their members feel comfortable talking to them. It is rare to have any problems at their facility.
- There will be a separate dining room for the resource centre and the housing centre. The kitchen facilities will be shared.
- It is not a community kitchen and is for the members of the MPA and housing centre only.

Comments from other Speakers

The Board agreed to limit the speakers to 5 minutes.

Gillian Reid, member of the MPA and a Board member, said she was at risk of becoming homeless and was grateful to be involved in the project. She added that the project was crucially needed to offer support to the members and to benefit the community.

Dr. Cathy Baranyi works in psychiatry and is part of the Community Advisory Committee for VCH. She said she was glad the City and Province were moving forward to provide low cost housing. She noted that the MPA is not a drop-in centre but has people who are trained to offer peer support. This is an empowering situation and she didn't think the community would notice anything different in their neighbourhood. Dr. Baranyi added that it was important as a community that we fight stigma relating to mental illness as no one intends to get mentally ill.

Jude Swanson works for the Kitsilano Mental Health Team and has lived in the DTES for 12 years. She said the MPA had been a real resource for her and a place to get away from all the problems in the DTES. She added that she hoped the project was approved as the new facility will be an improvement over the current MPA location.

Charles Liard said he arrived in BC in 1998 with no money and soon became a member of the MPA where he received useful help and information to overcome his denial of mental illness. Mr. Liard added that his standard of living had improved and that he is now employed and no longer receiving disability benefits.

Eleanor Bridge lives in the neighbourhood and supported the plans for the supportive housing units and the resource centre.

Tony Podlecki has lived in the neighbourhood for 10 years. He was in support of the project noting that people with mental health problems need help. Mr. Podlecki thought it was a good project and supported keeping the park benches noting that people ought to be able to sit and enjoy their neighbourhood.

Joan Nazif was full of admiration for the people who had the courage to speak to the Board and talk about the help they have received. She asked the Board to find a solution to the loading bay problem that doesn't diminish the size of the resource centre.

Eric Appleyard was opposed to the drop-in centre noting that West 4th Avenue is different from West 7th Avenue as the new facility would be in a more residential neighbourhood. He was concerned that the MPA didn't have any set plan to deal with conflicts.

Gareth Sirotnik has lived in the neighbourhood for 16 years and has seen it change to a more residential area. He said he welcomed both the resource centre and the supportive housing units but felt that an Operational Management Plan was important. He was concerned that there might be an increase in vagrancy and loitering and would like to see a security patrol.

Richard Dixon owns a condo at West 6th Avenue and Arbutus Street and fully supported every aspect of the project.

Barb Bawlf, Executive Director and Mental Health consumer, supported the MPA proposal for the Community Resource Centre and the supportive housing units. She noted that housing is the key to mental health.

Janet Ashdown works with the Vancouver Community Mental Health Services. She grew up in Kitsilano and has run projects out of MPA. She noted that people who have gone through the MPA have gone on to get a masters degree, work in alternative health and become research assistants. They also give back to their community by becoming pier support workers. Ms. Ashdown said she thought the benches should be included in the public realm.

Barb Bawlf read a letter from Mark Ash who was unable to attend. Mr. Ash

Nora Stevenson represented the owner of the property to the north and west of the project. She said the owner did not have any concerns regarding the operation of the new facility. The owner plans to redevelop his site and be long term owners. The owner asked that the patio and balconies that will be overseen by his property be well maintained. Ms. Stevenson asked that the City give written confirmation that they would not be subject to setbacks as it would render their property undevelopable. She also asked that access for the bicycle stalls and the shopping cart repair be moved to Fir Street. Ms. Stevenson asked to have representation on the Community Advisory Committee.

Carlos Medina was concerned about people sleeping around the area and would like to see a better designed building. Mr. Medina said he was against the drop-in centre.

Patrick Hall lives across from the site. Although he said he understands the need for the facility he had concerns regarding the drop-in centre and would like to see a policing commitment on site. Mr. Hall would also like to see the street lighting increased in the area.

Carol Moffatt is a resident of the area and Vice Chair of the Burrard Granville Business Association. Ms. Moffatt said her organization had some concerns regarding the City's proposal

and the safety for the community. She said they would like to see a risk management plan that could monitor and record any problems. She added that there is the potential for a rise in the crime rate and asked the Board to reconsider the MPA's Community Resource Centre. She suggested the ground floor could instead be used for a coffee shop or grocery store. Ms. Moffatt noted that there were 300 signatures on a petition against the drop-in centre as they feel it wasn't a good fit for the neighbourhood. She said she supported the social housing component and would like to be part of the Community Advisory Committee.

Diane Thurston has been a member of the MPA for several years as a volunteer offering peer support. In the past she has brought her grandchild there and has never felt unsafe. She added that people in the resource centre take care of each other and the neighbourhood. Also, the MPA is not a drop-in centre but is for members only.

Leila Bell is a resident and owner living one block from the proposed facility. She expressed appreciation for everyone associated with the development as she thought they had paid a great deal of attention to the concerns of the community. She added that she welcomed the housing and resource centre.

Rachel Black is a resident who lives across the street and was concerned as she felt they hadn't been consulted. She said she had a feeling that the City had pushed the facility on them. She said she was also concerned that this kind of development would attract the drug element to the neighbourhood and strongly opposed the drop-in centre moving to her area.

Tracy Schonfeld is a Director of Community Services for Coastal Mental Health. The program was started in 1990's. There is a need for services in the community to assist people to move forward in their lives. Ms. Schonfeld said she fully supported the resource centre and supportive housing units.

Mark Dennis lives on Pine Street and had some concerns with the new facility. He asked the Board why they would allow buildings to go over the height restrictions as he had density concerns. He hoped that any exception to the rule given for non-market housing would be made for market housing.

Questions/Discussion

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

- The intention is to have an Operations Management Plan for both operations.
- The adjacent lot would not qualify for a tower project. The site needs to be a minimum width of 125 feet. The exception is a corner site. Also a tower project could result in a blank party wall which would have impacts on the open space on the 3rd floor.
- One of the design conditions deals with moving the bicycle storage and shopping cart repair into the parkade.
- There is a request for four new lights along West 7th Avenue to assist in the greenway and bike route.
- The resource centre and supportive housing is not a treatment facility. In order to use the resource centre, people need to become a member and have a mental health illness. Some of the members may have an addiction problem also and would be encouraged to seek treatment.
- Members who attend the centre are expected to have good behaviour.

- The MPA has 17 other locations through Vancouver. They have socialization programs, advocacy programs, and an outreach program that targets people who are living on the street in Kitsilano.
- The massing of the building has been pushed to the setback on Fir Street and the entrance has been oriented in an attempt to limit the amount of noise from using carts and bringing them to the centre. People will be arriving at the more commercial portion of Fir Street and there won't be access on West 7th Avenue. Also there isn't any active space facing West 7th Avenue.
- In order to address the noise and loitering issue, the intent is to have people wait in the courtyard.
- The selection of members for the Community Advisory Committee does not have a standardized process. People who have attended the Open House and DPB Meeting and who have asked to be involved will be contacted. The process involves a third party facilitator who works with the community and City staff and then reports to the Managing Director of Social Development.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Wall thanked the speakers and thought many of the comments were educational. He said it was important to hear from the community. The Urban Design Panel supported the project and was enthusiastic about the architecture. They thought the building had earned its height and density through excellent design. Mr. Wall said he was a bit surprised by the number of prior-to conditions and wondered if they were a little too onerous. Mr. Wall said he would support the applicant's suggestion to put forward as a consideration item Condition 1.3. Mr. Wall said the Panel thought the architecture was elegant and that the interior and exterior social spaces were well handled. Regarding the benches in the public space, Mr. Wall said he would defer to staff and the applicant team. He thought they would be an important aspect and would allow neighbours to get to know each other. Mr. Wall pointed out that people aren't loitering outside their own building. Regarding the elevator overrun, Mr. Wall noted that the elevator architectural treatment was well handled and added to the character and interest of the building. Since there aren't any view impacts he thought a relaxation should be allowed for the height. Mr. Wall encouraged the applicant team to work towards a solution regarding the loading bay that didn't impact the program of the building. Mr. Wall said he was a bit on the fence regarding the bay windows noting that some of the Panel thought they were fine and some thought they should be open to the views to the north. He added that there are merits to both options and thought it should be a consideration item and the applicant could work with the Director of Planning to find the best solution.

Mr. Tatomir thanked the public and recommend approval of the application. He said he did not support Condition 1.2 as he thought the elevator overrun added to the architecture of the building. Mr. Tatomir commended the applicant on all the sustainability features noting that this was a good example of what can be done when everyone works together. He thought it was a good example of green design and that on any block the building would put some market buildings to shame. Regarding the loading, Mr. Tatomir said there was a solution and didn't recommend taking space out of the kitchen area.

Mr. Shearing thanked the speakers and said they gave a great deal of understanding to the context of the development. He commended the design team and the applicant on the building design saying that it would be a great piece of architecture. Regarding the FSR on the neighbouring site, Mr. Shearing thought the building massing addressed that issue with stepping back from the west property line. Mr. Shearing said he supported keeping the benches. He also thought the additional Class B loading bay was a potential hardship and would result in the loss of programmable space. He also thought the design worked and thought the windows

should be left as they were. He added that the real impact on liveability could be the shopping cart noise and that there should be some sensitivity around that impact.

Ms. Nystedt thanked the public noting that she lives in Kitsilano and use to have offices at West 5th Avenue and Fir Street as well as on West 4th Avenue near the existing MPA centre. She said she has seen the changes but thought the facility would be positive for the community. Ms. Nystedt noted that a similar project had come before the Board at the previous meeting and as a result of a lot of public consultation the concerns of the community had been assuaged. Any concerns the neighbours have for the new facility, Ms. Nystedt thought were contained in Condition 1.1 and will come down to the community participation. Ms. Nystedt said she was in support of the application.

Mr. Hung thanked the public and was happy to see that the majority of speakers spoke in favour of the project. He noted that the Community Resource Centre is already in the community providing a service and that is just a relocation of the services to another building. Mr. Hung said he was in support of the application with the conditions and agreed that Condition 1.3 could be a consideration item. Mr. Hung added that he hoped the architect could work with the City to find a solution for the loading bay.

Board Discussion

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

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

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

Mr. Andrews thanked the speakers particularly those who shared their personal stories. He noted that many of the Board work on policy outside the DPB and can't help take the information forward. He said it was important to understand human needs and that many of us have been touched by mental illness. He noted that the facility was part of the solution that

maybe has been missing. Mr. Andrews supported the amendments and the motion. He added that he also supported the height of the elevator overrun as he was worried about losing the strength of the architectural punctuation. Mr. Andrews said he supported leaving the benches and agreed that this would be home for many people and they need a place to interact with the community.

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

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE412144, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated July 16, 2008, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.1 to read:

provision of a final Operational Management Plan (OMP) *to include both the resource centre and supportive housing*, in consultation with neighbouring property owners, residents and businesses, to the satisfaction of the Managing Director of Social Development prior to occupancy, with the following elements;

Amend Condition item a) in Condition 1.1 to read:

establishment of a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) that meets regularly to discuss issues that may arise from the operation of the *overall* project;

Amend the Note to Applicant in item a) in Condition 1.1 by including *KSHS* before Motivation;

Amend item b) in Condition 1.1 to read:

protocols for security and monitoring of security issues related to *both operations*;

Amend Condition 1.2 by deleting "design development" at the beginning of the paragraph and adding *consideration*;

Amend Condition 1.3 by deleting "design development" at the beginning of the paragraph and adding *consideration*;

Delete Condition A.2.4;

Renumber Conditions A.2.5 through A.2.12 to A.2.4 to A.2.11.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:53 PM.

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

C. Warren
Chair

H:\Clerical\DPB\Minutes\2008\12-July28-08.doc