

Date: Monday, June 29, 1998
Time: N/A
Place: N/A

PRESENT:

Minutes
Business Arising from the Minutes
1221 Seymour Street - DE403244 - DD
Other Business

Board

F.A. Scobie, Director of Development Services (Chair)
J. Rogers, Deputy City Manager
D. Rudberg, City Engineer

Advisory Panel

J. Drohan, Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
A. Waisman, Representative of the Design Professions
A. Gjernes, Representative of Development Industry
S. Kellington-Catliff, Representative of General Public
D. Chung, Representative of General Public
B. Parton, Representative of General Public

Regrets

P. Kavanagh, Representative of Development Industry
J. Oberlander, Representative of General Public

ALSO PRESENT:

City Staff:

R. Segal, Development Planner
M. Kemble, Development Planner
N. Peters, City Surveyor
J. Jessup, Housing Centre

Item 3 - 1221 Seymour Street - DE403244

CLERK TO THE BOARD: Georgia Dahle

1. MINUTES

It was moved by **Mr. Rudberg**, seconded by **Ms. Rogers**, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of June 1, 1998 be approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

3. **1221 Seymour Street - DE403244 - DD
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects

Request: To construct a 12-storey non-market multiple dwelling containing 136 units (for low income persons) and social service centre building. One level of underground parking with 14 stalls is provided.

1. To increase the maximum permitted height from 70 ft. to 120 ft. under the provisions of Section 4.2 of the DODP;
2. To receive a density bonus under the provisions of Section 6.II of the DODP amounting to 10,877 sq.ft. (0.81 FSR);
3. To relax the parking requirement; and
3. To relax the minimum dwelling unit size from 400 sq.ft. to 327 sq.ft. (average 340 sq.ft.)

Development Planner's Opening Comments

The Development Planner, Ralph Segal, presented this application. This interior site, located on 112 ft. frontage on Seymour Street, flanks the Canadian Hotel and two retail stores which face Davie Street. He briefly reviewed the immediate site context and the proposed building. Mr. Segal reviewed the main issues identified in the staff committee report, namely the rear and sideyard relaxations sought from the guidelines, the density bonus to allow for the drop-in facility in the building, the provision to provide for a knock-out panel in the underground parkade, and the parking provision. Mr. Segal went on to explain that only minor design issues were still to be resolved with the applicant, namely the residential entry, greater detail in the podium treatment, and additional landscaping at the lane.

One letter of support was received from the Downtown South Association (formerly the Downtown South Redevelopment Impact Committee). Objections from a significant level of residents at 'Space' (1238 Seymour Street) had to do with the nature of the facility, the users of the building, the drop-in centre, and the possibility of an increase in crime and drug use within the area.

The recommendation is that the Board, subject to Council approving the amenity bonus, approve the application, subject to the relatively minor conditions set out in the Staff Committee Report dated June 17, 1998.

John Jessup of the Housing Centre, briefly explained both the concept behind the project and the acquisition of the site by the city. He further explained that although the square footage of most units would be below the 400 sq.ft. specified in the by-law, it was concluded that the typical unit could be a studio, approximately 340 sq.ft. that would satisfy user needs. Mr. Jessup went on to discuss the intentions of the Coast Foundation, Affordable Housing, and the McClaren Housing Society in relation to this proposal.

(Board and Panel members then took a few minutes to review the model and posted drawings)

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Dane Jansen, Architect, said they had no problem in addressing the conditions and would only note a minor concern in regards to A.2.4. Although this condition could be difficult, the remainder of the conditions set forth from the staff review could be easily achieved. Mr. Jansen further stated that the involvement and the assistance given by City staff towards the project was truly appreciated. **Mr. Bob Nicklin**, Affordable Housing Society, indicated that to satisfy A.2.4, certain legal agreements would need to be created with future developments adjacent to the site, but that this could be dealt with if and when the sites were redeveloped.

Comments from Other Speakers

Roy Johnson 'Space', was concerned about this project from both a resident's point-of-view and his perspective as a mental health worker. Mr. Johnson briefly explained his concerns about the project and outlined some of the more serious issues, primarily the scale of the project, the current number of social service projects within the area, the proposed City park to the south of this development, and the lack of amenity options for people living within the New Yaletown Area. Mr. Johnson stated that a corporate and guardian role must be maintained for the residents in the area and that a balance must be struck if both communities are going to cohabit together in an area.

Mr. Jessup, in response to comments by Mr. Johnson, indicated that the proposal was to assist existing Downtown South residents. It is not the intention of the City or the primary operators' intentions to allow individuals from outside the area to live in the project. The focus is to serve the existing single residents of Downtown South.

Mr. Burnham indicated that the Coast Foundation Social Service Centre has actually been in the area for several years. Currently it is located at 1321 Richards Street, and its original address since 1993, was 948 Richards Street.

Mr. Paul Bennett (Executive, Heritage Vancouver), supported the project and believed that it was a helpful addition to the area. One concern for him was of the longevity of the only remaining heritage building on the block. He indicated that a concern for him was to ensure that the building was not threatened during potential redevelopment of the area.

Panel Opinion

Ms. Drohan reported that the Urban Design Panel strongly supported the project and found it to be an exemplary model of buildings of this type. The Panel found it deserving of the necessary relaxations sought by the applicant. The three areas in which the Panel had indicated concerns were with the tower, the colour of the project, and the French balconies in the units. It was believed that the tower should be more legible to the ground, that the colours of the project, although subjective, could possibly be tempered, and that the balconies could be a concern in regard to dripping and staining in the future. The Panel had also commented on the podium and the open spaces of the project. Ms. Drohan said that repositioning of the residential entry for security was a major concern for Panel members. A stronger expression of the streetwall along Seymour Street, as it relates to 1238 Seymour Street, as well as the street composition should be pursued. A lighter expression to the lane was suggested, and the outdoor amenity space was also seen as needing improvement. Work on the landscape was also recommended.

Ms. Drohan suggested that the connection between the interior and outdoor spaces should be made as seamless as possible to give a greater sense of the outdoor areas to the development. The prior-to conditions from the Staff Committee seem to capture the concerns from the Panel, but with the addition of two further items. Under A.1.2, that a note be added to include

a clause that discusses a more strongly expressed streetwall treatment on Seymour Street. Condition A.1.6 should also be amended to include landscaping concerns. The Panel did commend the applicant on the many levels of careful concern towards the livability of this project.

Mr. Waisman commended the applicant and the project as one of the best proposals the Advisory Panel had seen in some time. He also congratulated all involved parties for the success of the project and the completeness of the proposal. The prior-to conditions are completely sensitive, with the exception of the colour. Mr. Waisman suggested that the applicant should not temper the colour of the building and found the overall design to be exemplary.

Mr. Gjernes recommended approval of the application, but voiced concerns over the flexibility of City regulations in regards to non-market housing proposals, versus market housing developments that go through the same process. The future development to the south should not be penalized for the current relaxations given to this proposal. The requirement of two additional parking spaces should be omitted from the conditions. Adding two spaces would only force the Architect to incur additional costs and impose possible design constraints.

Mr. Chung also recommended approval of the application, but indicated some concern with the overall lack of open space that had been proposed.

Ms. Kellington-Catliff recommended approval of the application, subject to the prior-to conditions and the comments made before her. She too agreed with the Urban Design Panels comments regarding streetscape, architectural details, amenity space, and revisions to prior-to conditions A.1.2 and A.1.6. She also supported the proposed colours of the buildings, and agreed that this was an exciting project that replaced much needed SRO units to the area. The massing is very well resolved for a building as complex as this, and on a site such as this.

Ms. Parton also recommended approval and supported the comments of the previous speakers. She felt that the project was very well done and the architect should be complimented for achieving all the necessary services into one building. The colour of the building is quite positive and it is welcoming to see a building that will be unique to the area.

Board Discussion

Ms. Rogers said she considers the application to be very good and a positive proposal. Relocating the Coast Drop-In Centre seems to be a very positive aspect of the proposal. She recognized that there are social challenges to the changing community and encouraged sensitivity towards the project. Ms. Rogers indicated that she supported the recommendations and the advice from the Advisory Panel and approval of the recommendations as submitted, with the Note to Applicant to condition A.1.2 and adding a Note to Applicant in condition A.1.6.

Mr. Rudberg said that he liked the project and feels it is worthy of approval. This project should be noted for attempting to replace lost SRO units, while incorporating other services into the same building. This proposal should not be seen as a precedent for the area, and strong considerations should be given in the future to these types of relaxations, especially for a project such as this.

Mr. Scobie concurred with the concerns voiced by Mr. Rudberg and suggested that returning to Council and reporting to them some of the constraints felt in attempting to achieve 5.0 FSR should be pursued. Although there is a desire and a need to provide SRO housing, the City

should not compromise building form, views and privacy for adjacent developments just to achieve success in non-market housing developments.

Motion

It was moved by **Ms. Rogers** and seconded by **Mr. Rudberg**, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT, subject to Council approval of the density bonus, the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 403244 , in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated June 17, 1998 with the following amendments:

Amend Note to Applicant in Condition 1.2: consideration should be given to expressing a greater variation and entry definition on the Seymour Street elevation, as well as a strongly expressed streetwall treatment on Seymour Street and to extending the tower massing to grade on the lane side.

Add to 1.6: Note to Applicant: Consideration be given to landscape treatment of the open areas, especially as it supports opportunities for learning and for therapy.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:25 pm.