

Date: Monday, March 5, 2001
Time: 3.00 p.m.
Place: No. 1 Committee Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

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

Advisory Panel

P. Grant Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions
J. Ross Representative of Development Industry
M. Mortenson Representative of General Public
R. Bruce Scott Representative of General Public

Absent

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

ALSO PRESENT:

B. Adair Development Planner
M. Thomson City Surveyor

Item 3 - 533 East Hastings Street - DE405510 - Zone DEOD

D. Simpson Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects
D. Stout Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects
Y. Chu Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects
Lois Hollstedt CEO, YWCA
Marion Taylor Director of Children and Family Services, YWCA
Monica Stokl Community Developer, Vancouver/Richmond Health Board

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

1. MINUTES

Minutes of February 19, 2001 were unavailable.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. 533 EAST HASTINGS STREET - DE405510 - ZONE DEOD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects

Request: To construct a five-storey mixed-use building with social service centre on the 1st and 3rd floors, child daycare facility on the 2nd floor, and 12 low cost housing units on the 4th and 5th floors, with at-grade parking accessed from the rear lane.

To relax: Parking from 30 spaces to 4 spaces; Loading from 1 space to 0 spaces; and Bicycle parking from 10 spaces to 2 spaces

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Bob Adair, introduced the application, referring to a model and posted drawings. He briefly described the proposal and the site context. Referring to the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 21, 2001, Mr. Adair focussed on the main issues identified by staff, namely, the residential use, livability, parking, and building height and expression.

Multiple dwelling use is permitted in this zone but it must be able to operate independently of other uses in the building. Condition 1.1 seeks secure lobby areas to address this issue, and Condition 1.2 requires a separate parking space to be identified solely for the residential use.

With respect to livability, a reduction in minimum unit size is being sought for eight of the 12 residential units which are proposed at 368 sq.ft. The minimum size permitted under the zoning regulations is 398 sq.ft., relaxable to 319.6 sq.ft. Relaxations have been granted in the past for low-income housing and these units have been approved by BC Housing. The City's Housing Centre also supports the proposed unit sizes, but will seek, as a provision of the land lease, to limit the units to accommodate no more than two persons. Some outdoor open space is being sought in Condition 1.4 which suggests the provision of French-style balconies. A further livability concern relates to the impact of the poultry processing plant at the rear of the site. The plant is a conforming use and is expected to remain for the foreseeable future, and there are two other residential buildings in this block which have co-existed with the poultry processing plant for many years. However, there are issues with odour and noise that Staff believe can be addressed. Condition 1.5 calls for the heating, ventilation and air-conditioning system proposed for the institutional uses to be extended to include the residential component. In addition, Mr. Adair tabled a new condition A.3.5 which calls for the provision of complete details of the HVAC and filter system.

There is no minimum parking requirement in the DEOD zone and the maximum number of parking spaces permitted on this site would be 23. The applicant proposes four tandem parking spaces to accommodate eight vehicles, and no loading. Given the site restrictions, staff propose a legal agreement be attached to the lease to commit the YWCA to properly manage the parking and to require one of the spaces to be used for loading.

With respect to building height, the DEOD requires a minimum height of approximately three storeys along East Hastings Street. The westerly part of the building meets this requirement but the easterly part is only two storeys high. Given the context and the program, staff recommend relaxation of the minimum height requirement, but seek adjustments to the expression of the second floor wall (Condition 1.7). As well, Condition 1.3 calls for increased setback and glazing on the upper two floors.

The major concerns raised in response to notification were parking, the perceived concentration of social service uses in the neighbourhood and lack of retail uses at grade. As noted earlier, there is no minimum parking requirement and staff believe the analysis by the Transportation Branch represents an accurate assessment of the actual parking need. With respect to the concentration of uses, Mr. Adair noted the proposal involves the relocation of two facilities already in the neighbourhood rather than introducing new services. This site is in a "retail encouraged" area but is not a requirement. While retail use would be preferable at grade, staff note that even in "retail required" sections of the street, uses which appear to satisfy the intent of regulation (to maximize pedestrian interest), have been approved. Staff believe the grade level activity spaces, combined with the glazing and overall quality of materials and detailing, are a reasonable response to the intent of the regulation. Further refinements are sought in conditions 1.6 - 1.8, to increase the amount of transparency at grade.

In summary, staff support the proposed uses and the form of development, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report. The Staff Committee recommends approval of the application.

Questions

In response to a question from the Board, Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, said he believes the best way to ensure management of the proposed tandem parking would be as a condition of the lease. With respect to the recommendation for increased glazing on the street and whether this would be compatible with the proposed uses in terms of privacy, Mr. Adair confirmed there would be no objection to the use of curtains. A Board member noted there is no reference to the relaxation of minimum unit sizes in the recommended motion of approval.

Applicant's Comments

Lois, Hollstedt, YWCA, briefly described the history of Crabtree Corner and the proposed program to serve women and children who live in the Downtown Eastside, most of whom are aboriginal. The program provides intervention services to pregnant women, in particular with respect to fetal alcohol syndrome. Marion Taylor described the work at Crabtree Corner, noting it is a unique program bringing together housing, child care and community programs. Monica Stokl, Vancouver/Richmond Health Board, described the Sheway program which provides services to families and their newborns. She noted the Health Board is very committed to this project and looks forward to consolidating the services.

Referring to the Staff Committee Report, David Simpson, Architect, reviewed the conditions which cause them some concern.

With respect to Condition 1.4, they do not believe providing French-style balconies would be appropriate because of safety and security concerns. Nor do they think they would be necessary from a design point of view. He requested deletion of the condition.

With respect to Condition 1.5, Mr. Simpson noted the mechanical ventilation called for is normally only provided for very high end residential uses. Given the height of the units, well above the street, they do not believe the conditions will be very severe. The condition also imposes a significant cost burden on the project (\$5,000 per unit).

Regarding Condition 1.6, Mr. Simpson confirmed the Hastings Street facade is glass but there are privacy concerns as well as the need to allow daylight in. They believe the solution could be a temporary screening, although they would prefer it to be left to them as to how to deal with the privacy issues. In discussion with respect to the elevator, Ye Chu, Architect, advised the elevator cab would not be glazed because of security and privacy issues.

With respect to the size of the proposed residential units and the proposal to limit their occupancy to two people, Ms. Hollstedt said they were concerned this would restrict their flexibility and only allow them take in women who are pregnant and without other children. She stressed the units are not intended to provide long term housing. Cameron Gray said the Housing Centre's concern is that the units are not suitable for families with children over about 2 years old. They are therefore seeking a way to manage the building for its lifetime, beyond the operations of the YWCA, adding they are confident the Y can operate the building in manner that is sensitive to the needs of the residents. In discussion, it was agreed it was an issue to be resolved between the Housing Centre and the Y's housing management.

Some discussion ensued on the issue of extending the mechanical ventilation to the residential portion of the building. It was noted this condition (1.5) was recommended by staff and endorsed by the Vancouver/Richmond Health Board member of the Staff Committee. The condition that the system be of health care quality (A.3.5) was initiated by the Health Board.

With respect to the question of outdoor space, Mr. Gray said he felt little would be gained from the addition of French-style balconies, noting the windows are large enough to provide adequate light and ventilation. In response to a question from the Board, Mr. Gray also confirmed that, generally, social housing does not provide air conditioning. There is no evidence of complaints from the other housing projects situated close to the poultry processing plant.

Comments from Other Speakers

None.

Board and Panel members reviewed the model and posted materials.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Grant advised the Urban Design Panel supported this application. The Panel supported the proposed uses and had no problem with the height and form of the building as presented. The Panel was pleased to note the facade on Hastings Street was split into two components. The Panel would support the design development refinements called for in Condition 1.8. Mr. Grant said the Panel would like to see the glazing on Hastings Street done in as honest a way as possible. He suggested a solution might be to flip the elevator and the stair shaft, which would involve minimal reworking of the plan and effect a better exiting pattern with no loss of efficiency on the upper floors. He added, the facade could still be glazed as well as address privacy issues. The Panel was concerned about the east-facing elevation and would prefer not to see French balconies. It would also be beneficial to introduce some natural light into the west corridor. In general, the Panel thought the project had been sensitively handled. Contextually, it fits well in the neighbourhood.

Mr. Hancock agreed it is a very supportable scheme. In many ways it is very complex and has been well handled. He felt Condition 1.3 was too prescriptive and thought the applicant had presented good reasons to delete 1.4. With respect to 1.5, Mr. Hancock noted the majority of luxury condominiums do not have air conditioning. He questioned whether it is necessary in this case, and, if it is, the condition needs to be more

specific about what it is intended to address. With respect to 1.6, Mr. Hancock felt glazing the elevator shaft would be a useless exercise and flipping the elevator and stair, as suggested by Mr. Grant, seems a very sensible answer. Whatever the solution, it should not involve the use of stucco. Mr. Hancock did not support condition 1.7. He endorsed the design development conditions in 1.8. With respect to the size of the units, he supported the proposal as presented, noting the Board has the authority to relax the minimum size to a far greater degree than is proposed.

Mr. Ross agreed with the deletion of Condition 1.4, given the concerns expressed about having open balconies in this building. Since there is no evidence of problems associated with the poultry plant from the other neighbouring residential buildings, Mr. Ross also recommended deleting the HVAC requirements called for in 1.5. He concurred with Mr. Grant's suggestions with respect to glazing. With respect to the restriction on number of persons per unit, Mr. Ross said he was satisfied this could be dealt with between the parties, outside this development application. He said he was very supportive of the application.

Mr. Mortenson also supported the application. The project will provide a much needed service and the building will add to the street. He concurred with the previous comments on the conditions. He agreed the French-style balconies are not necessary and that there should be something other than stucco next to the elevator shaft fronting Hastings Street. He supported the reduction in unit sizes, given the use is transition housing.

Mr. Scott supported the application. He said he had some concerns about relaxing bicycle parking. While air conditioning may not be practical, Mr. Scott said some sort of forced air system might be appropriate in this location. Some attention should also be given to upgrading the lane which is currently in very poor condition.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley said this is a difficult site and being able to accommodate the three functions together has been quite well done. He noted the project is not expanding services but is attempting to improve the standards for facilities that are currently operating in substandard situations. Mr. Beasley said it is also notable that the street is not a meaningful retail street at present. While the condition related to the elevator and glazing needs some amendment, Mr. Beasley stressed that the more glazing (as opposed to stucco panels) that can be achieved, the better. He also supported Mr. Grant's suggestion to explore switching the elevator and the stairs, if this is possible. He moved approval of the application, outlining a number of revisions to the conditions.

Mr. MacGregor shared Mr. Beasley's view that this is a very difficult site. He noted the YWCA is an excellent operator and he was also pleased to see the involvement of the Vancouver/Richmond Health Board in the project. To achieve the mix of facilities in one project will be very good for the area and for the future generations who will benefit from the services it provides.

Mr. Timm added his support for the project and the services it will provide.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 405510, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated February 21, 2001, with the following amendments:

Amend the approval preamble:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 405510 as submitted, the plans and information forming a part thereof, thereby permitting the construction of a five-storey mixed-use building with social service centre on the 1st and 3rd floors, child daycare facility on the 2nd floor, and 12 low-cost housing units on the 4th and 5th floors, *of which eight units are approved at a size not less than 364 sq.ft., which is below the minimum unit size*, with at-grade parking accessed from the rear lane *in the minimum amount of three parking spaces and one loading bay*, subject to the following conditions:

Amend 1.1 to change the word "secure" to *securable*;

Delete 1.4;

Delete 1.5;

Delete 1.6 and replace it with the following:
design development to consider as much actual glazing on the East Hastings Street facade "openings" by considering switching the elevator and exit stair shafts so that the stair might be glazed;

Delete 1.7;

Amend A.1.3 to add *"which may be less than the normal requirement"*;

Delete A.1.5;

Delete A.1.8;

Amend A.2.2:
design development to eliminate the conflicts with access to ~~stalls 4 and 8~~
parking from the existing power H pole in lane;

Delete the second sentence in the **Note to Applicant** in A.2.5;

Delete A.3.5 and replace with the following:
the applicant must provide complete details for the proposed (health care quality) HVAC and charcoal system demonstrating adequate performance.;

- CARRIED

4. OTHER BUSINESS

The Chairperson noted this is Mr. Grant's last meeting as a member of the Development Permit Board Advisory Panel, having completed his two year term on the Urban Design Panel. Mr. Scobie noted it is always helpful to have a member of the Urban Design Panel advising the Board, and Mr. Grant's advice has been particularly helpful.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5.00 pm.

C. Hubbard
Clerk to the Board

/ch

F. Scobie
Chair
