

Date: Monday, November 22, 2004
 Time: 3.00 p.m.
 Place: Council Chamber, City Hall
 and
 Date: Monday, December 6, 2004
 Time: 3.00 p.m.
 Place: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

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

Advisory Panel

B. Haden Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
 J. McLean Representative of the Development Industry
 E. Mah Representative of the Development Industry
 D. Chung Representative of the General Public
 C. Henschel Representative of the General Public
 G. Chung Representative of the General Public

Regrets

J. Hancock Representative of the Design Professions
 K. McNaney Representative of the General Public

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

R. Segal Development Planner*
 J. Barrett Development Planner*
 V. Potter Project Facilitator
 M. Thomson City Surveyor*
 D. Robinson Social Planning
 C. Gray Director of the Housing Centre
 M.B. Rondeau Development Planner
 V. Harrison Vancouver Police Department
 J. Brooks Director of Social Planning

822 Seymour Street

W. T. Leung W. T. Leung Architects*

1500 Homer Street

N. Milkovich Nick Milkovich Architects*
 A. Prince Nick Milkovich Architects*
 A. Erickson Arthur Erickson Architect*
 P. Webb Concord Pacific Group*

1134 Burrard Street

T. Nichols Family Services of Greater Vancouver
 R. Aebi Family Services of Greater Vancouver
 A. Markwart Asst. Deputy Minister, Ministry of Children & Family Services
 J. Vornbrock Vancouver Coastal Health Authority
 D. Jansen Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects

Clerk to the Board: C. Hubbard

*present November 22, 2004 only.

1. MINUTES

DE408652 - 1280 West Pender Street

p.13 and 14: Mr. Beasley requested an amendment to condition 1.4, to add "and use" after "massing". With respect to condition 1.1, Mr. Rudberg requested adding "no more than" instead of "approximately" to the first item listed, noting this is a better reflection of his intent that the east-west dimension should not exceed 82 ft. In addition, "Elevator/mechanical" was added to the amended condition 1.2.

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

THAT the Minutes of the Development Permit Board and Advisory Panel Meeting of November 8, 2004 be approved as amended.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

DE408652 - 1280 West Pender Street

In accordance with the Board's November 8, 2004 resolution, a revised Appendix B was presented for approval.

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

THAT the Notes to Applicant and Conditions of the Development Permit set out in the revised Appendix B of the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated October 27, 2004 be approved.

3. 822 SEYMOUR STREET - DE408776 - ZONE DD (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: W. T. Leung Architects Inc.

Request: Interior and exterior alterations to combine two (2) dwelling units into one (1) dwelling unit on Level 13, and to add a new stairwell to access a new roof deck in this existing mixed use commercial/residential building, thereby seeking 191 sq. ft. by way of a transfer of heritage floor space pursuant to Section 3.12 of the Downtown Official Development Plan.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Ralph Segal, Development Planner, presented this application. He explained that the requested transfer of heritage floor space requires the approval of the Development Permit Board. No issues are identified and the proposed roof deck more closely meets the Downtown Design Guidelines. The application is also consistent with the Transfer of Density Policy and Guidelines. Staff recommend approval, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report dated November 22, 2004.

Applicant's Comments

Wing Ting Leung Architect, advised he can meet the conditions recommended by staff.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

The Advisory Panel unanimously recommended approval of the application.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 408776, in accordance with the Staff Report dated November 22, 2004.

**4. 1500 HOMER MEWS - DE408703 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Nick Milkovich Architects

Request: To construct an 18-storey residential tower (Tower 1K) with 47 units, and a 2-storey residential low rise containing 14 townhouses for a total of 61 units, with 3 levels of underground parking with 158 spaces for the residential and 11 spaces for the adjacent marina, for a total of 169 spaces.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Jonathan Barrett, Development Planner, presented this application for the last market residential development of the Beach Neighbourhood. The site currently contains the Concord Pacific presentation centre and is bounded by Beach Crescent, Homer Mews and the False Creek waterfront. The Beach Neighbourhood was first rezoned CD-1 in 1996, followed by a number of Text Amendments. When the most recent Text Amendment was considered in May 2003, Council resolved that any requests for additional height should be considered by Council before staff review. Since this application proposes a height beyond that specified in the guidelines it was referred to Council on October 21, 2004. The guidelines specify a height of 16 storeys and the application seeks 18 storeys. Council advised it would be prepared to consider approval of a final form of development which includes an additional two storeys within the already permitted height.

Referring to an architectural model, Mr. Barrett described the other areas in which the application deviates from the guidelines, namely, the southerly shift of the tower location by approximately 8.5 m, the low-rise block massing, the tower floor plates and the setback from the waterfront walkway. Mr. Barrett briefly reviewed the recommended conditions of approval. Condition 1.1 calls for the height to be reduced by 0.7 m to 53 m as measured from base surface. The applicant has measured the height from the lobby level. This may be permitted by the Development Permit Board, but since Council discussed limiting the height to 53 m, Staff Committee was concerned about recommending a relaxation.

In summary, staff believe the proposal achieves a good balance between public and private objectives for the site and recommend approval, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report dated October 27, 2004.

Questions/Discussion

Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding condition 1.8 which calls for submission of a preliminary LEED score card, noting that while the City and the industry are aspiring to achieve improved sustainability, there is not yet a Council policy in place to justify making it a

requirement. Mr. Beasley noted that a sustainability policy is anticipated to be established in about 18 months. Mr. Barrett agreed that no policy exists currently that would require sustainability measures but noted that Concord Pacific has been at the forefront on other Beach Neighbourhood sites where a LEED score card approach was successfully pursued.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley regarding the children's play area, Mike Thomson, City Surveyor, advised an unequipped play area was also sought for the recent Coopers' Neighbourhood development. Condition 1.7 calls for provision of a resilient surface for the designated play space, without play equipment.

Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding the height (condition 1.1). Mr. Barrett said he did not believe it would be difficult for the applicant to decrease the height by 0.7 m, by reducing the floor-to-floor height of each floor. He noted there is a relaxation provision that allows for height to be measured from the lobby rather than the base surface. This provision was added to the original Beach Neighbourhood CD-1 in recognition of the sloping sites, particularly at the westerly end of the neighbourhood. However, because of the sensitivity regarding height in this neighbourhood, the Staff Committee was not able to recommend a relaxation but considered the matter would best be resolved by the Board after receiving input from any neighbours. In response to a further question from Mr. Beasley about the impact of the additional 0.7 m, Mr. Barrett said the view impacts are imperceptible. In further discussion about the height, Mr. Barrett confirmed the height would be about the same if the guideline with respect to tower location was met.

With respect to condition 1.4, Ms. Forbes-Roberts questioned whether the 1 m vertical separation being sought affected disabled access. Mr. Barrett explained that accessibility for townhouses is achieved from the interior of the site, in accordance with the guidelines.

Prompted by a question from Ms. Forbes-Roberts, further discussion ensued regarding the unequipped play area. Mr. Barrett advised that future provision of play equipment would be at the discretion of the strata corporation. Mr. Beasley added the condition provides for a suitably surfaced play space rather than a playground that includes play equipment, noting also the aesthetic goals sought by the applicant for this development.

Applicant's Comments

Nick Milkovich, Architect, said the proposal responds to the site's unique location between the highly developed residential neighbourhood and David Lam Park. He said they wanted to keep the low rise component as low as possible to better relate to the park. Mr. Prince further discussed the height issue and said they believe a reduction in floor to floor height will unnecessarily penalize the development. He added that it may be possible for their mechanical engineer to achieve a reduction in the size of the mechanical penthouse, which will effectively lower the height.

Peter Webb, Concord Pacific Group, said they believe the proposal meets Council's intent regarding height. In response to an earlier question from Mr. Scobie regarding the provision of a loading bay, he confirmed they have no problem with the shared use of the marina loading space by residents. With respect to sustainability, Mr. Webb said they think it would be unfair to impose a requirement on the last development in the neighbourhood. He stressed they are interested in pursuing sustainability measures, including the provision of green roofs for the townhouses. While they have no problem with condition 1.8, Mr. Webb said they believe it is unnecessary since they are voluntarily including sustainability measures.

Questions/Discussion

In response to a question from Ms. Forbes-Roberts regarding the height, Mr. Webb stressed that they wish to maintain the floor-to-floor height as proposed for the very large units in this building. He agreed the net effective height might be reduced by some reworking of the mechanical penthouse.

Mr. Scobie noted the proposal does not include enclosed balconies which could impact its apparent bulk. Mr. Webb said the future enclosure of individual balconies would require the approval of the strata corporation. In discussion, he agreed that a balcony enclosure prohibition could be considered in marketing the development.

In response to a question from Mr. Scobie regarding the comments of the Processing Centre - Building and Fire & Rescue Services, Mr. Webb confirmed they have no problem with the items contained in Appendix C of the Staff Committee Report.

Comments from other Speakers

Joe Schuller, 2305 - 1483 Homer Street, said he spoke for several owners of his building (the Waterford) and their main concern relates to height and he stressed that any increase will have an impact on views from some upper units. He suggested that if height is a concern to the Board then an obvious solution would be to reduce the building by one floor and remain within 53 m. Mr. Schuller sought clarification regarding the effect of the increased floor plate size. Mr. Scobie advised that while the floor plate is larger than that recommended in the guidelines, a rectangular building might have even larger profile than the proposed circular form. Notwithstanding their concern that the building exceeds 53 m, Mr. Schuller said he appreciated the developer's sensitivity about the size of the mechanical penthouse and any reduction in its height and width would be welcomed by residents of the Waterford.

In response to a question from Ms. Forbes-Roberts, Mr. Schuller confirmed he would not oppose the application for the sake of a 2.3 ft. building height beyond the guideline maximum of 53 m but would not support anything higher. Questioned by Mr. Beasley about the proposed two-storey townhouses in place of the 6-storey form indicated in the guidelines, Mr. Schuller confirmed this is very beneficial to the Waterford residents.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Haden advised this project was unanimously supported by the Urban Design Panel. The Panel considered the proposal to be substantially better than the guideline scheme with respect to shadowing, massing and view blockage. The Panel also strongly supported the green roofs of the townhouses which offer much improved overlook. Mr. Haden advised the conditions recommended by staff generally reflect the Panel's comments. He recommended deletion of 1.1 and noted that even a very small shift in height can have serious ramifications from a technical resolution point of view. With respect to condition 1.2, Mr. Haden commented that the Panel noted that the drawings, particularly of the elevation facing the park, were somewhat uninformative in terms of how it will be resolved. To this extent, the Panel urged that the design architect also be involved at the construction drawing stage, and was encouraged to learn that was the intent. Mr. Haden stressed that a building such as this is very dependent on a high level of detail resolution for its success. Mr. Haden said while he is strongly supportive of green principles in building he was uncomfortable with condition 1.8 in the absence of specific Council policy.

Mr. McLean concurred with Mr. Haden's comments and said it is a great piece of architecture. He thought the height should be measured from the lobby, and the mechanical penthouse limited to 25 ft. He recommended approval with the deletion of condition 1.8.

Mr. Mah agreed that this proposal is a significant improvement over the guideline scheme. He recommended deletion of condition 1.1 given the technical analysis indicates an imperceptible impact. He recommended retention of 1.7 as written, and deletion of 1.8. Mr. Mah did not support requiring a reduction in the height of the mechanical penthouse, noting it is already smaller than is typical in this area. He recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Chung also recommended approval and said it is a very distinctive building. He recommended deletion of condition 1.1 and was encouraged that the applicant is willing to minimize the size of the mechanical penthouse.

Mr. Henschel agreed the proposal is an improvement over the guideline scheme. He had no concern with the additional 2.3 ft. and thought the height should be measured from the lobby. He recommended retention of condition 1.8, noting it only requires submission of a preliminary LEED score card which may draw attention to green initiatives that might be introduced. With respect to condition 1.7, Mr. Henschel noted the children's play area is very small.

Ms. Chung said this will be a good addition to the neighbourhood. She thought there should be greater clarity provided with respect to whether play equipment will be included in the play area, including guidelines as to what would be appropriate.

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley supported the proposal and commented it is very refreshing to see a different kind of building in this area. It portends to be an excellent piece of architecture. As well, it also appears to be a much more neighbourly building than the guideline scheme because the design benefits many lower units in surrounding buildings. Mr. Beasley noted in particular that the profile of the building, because of its shape, has much less impact than the guideline massing. Mr. Beasley said he did not believe Council intended to be rigid about the height, only that the building should not be significantly higher in any way that would adversely impact the neighbours. He noted the by-law does allow the height to be calculated from the lobby, and said he thinks the proposal is quite consistent with Council's resolution. Mr. Beasley said he did not believe the Board can require a LEED specification at this time but accepted the applicant's stated intention to pursue green initiatives. He said his concern was not so much with this application but with the City's relationship with all developers who might be impacted by the random imposition of such a requirement, until such time as there is a specific policy in place.

Ms. Forbes-Roberts agreed it is an exemplary application and a lot better solution than the guideline scheme, not only with respect to urban design and the respect for its location but in terms of reduced impact on the neighbours. With respect to the children's play area, Ms. Forbes-Roberts said the City's guidelines for playgrounds can be provided to the developer. Since the provision of play equipment will be decided by the strata corporation and it is a very small space, she agreed the space should remain unequipped to allow the space to evolve according to the needs of the residents.

Mr. Rudberg agreed it is a very supportable project. He suggested an amendment to Mr. Beasley's recommended new condition 1.1, to which Mr. Beasley concurred. Mr. Rudberg stressed that a reduction in the size of the mechanical penthouse not only relates to its height but its overall appearance (i.e., architectural screening).

With respect to sustainability, Mr. Rudberg said he would have preferred to retain 1.8, noting the applicant has volunteered to submit a preliminary LEED score card. Mr. Beasley explained

there has been considerable discussion with the Urban Development Institute on the question of sustainability and UDI is specifically concerned about the incremental application of requirements as well as a clear understanding of what those requirements mean. In discussion, Mr. McLean, who is a member of UDI, said it would be very unusual to impose a condition in the absence of Council policy, but the Institute looks forward to working with the City to establish a policy. The Board noted that the applicant has undertaken to provide the LEED score card in any event. Ms. Forbes-Roberts agreed the Board should not request, as a condition of development, something for which there is yet no Council mandate. At the same time, she encouraged applicants to include sustainability measures because it is obviously an issue that is very important to Council.

Mr. Scobie commented that the Staff Committee Report was particularly well constructed and very helpful in explaining the key issues. He added, he appreciated the sensitivity of the Staff Committee regarding the height, and he concurred with the Board's conclusion.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 408703, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated October 27, 2004, with the following amendments:

Amend the approval preamble to include "as" before "submitted";

Replace 1.1 with the following:

design development to consider minimizing the height and profile of the mechanical penthouse where practical to reduce view impacts for neighbours;

Delete 1.8.

The meeting adjourned at 4.50 p.m. and reconvened in the Council Chamber at 5.30 p.m.

5. 1134 BURARD STREET - DE408648 - ZONE DD (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Applicant: Family Services of Greater Vancouver

Request: To renovate this existing City-owned building and change the use to Social Service Centre, to accommodate an integrated youth services centre with surface parking.

The Chair briefly described the Board's process for the benefit of the members of the public present.

Given the long Speakers' List, Mr. Scobie asked if the Board wished to establish a time limit on delegation presentations. Mr. Beasley said he believed it would be respectful for speakers to be as succinct as possible and to restrict their comments to five minutes, with the exception of those who may be speaking on behalf of organizations. Mr. Rudberg and Ms. Forbes-Roberts concurred.

Staff Presentation

Doug Robinson, Senior Social Planner, introduced City staff and briefly described this application for a change of use and interior renovations to an existing single storey building. Family Services of Greater Vancouver (FSGV) is contracted with the Ministry of Children & Family Services to provide services in the downtown for at-risk youth and outreach youth services for the city as a whole, based on the Ministry's plan for youth services in the city. The FSGV objective is to engage homeless youth, sexually exploited youth and youth at risk of becoming exploited in the sex trade in this area within the first 48 hours of being homeless in the downtown and offer them alternatives to the street and illicit marketplace. FSGV is also responsible for city-wide outreach for youth. The proposed integrated youth services centre is to assist youth to vacate the street and be reintroduced to housing, employment, counseling and their home community. The Ministry's plan for providing this integrated service is based on research carried out at University of Victoria which indicates this is the best way to respond to youth at risk.

The proposed centre replaces two existing facilities presently located at St. Paul's Hospital and 1065 Seymour Street which will be closed. The centre is one of four integrated youth service centres planned by the Ministry for the city. The other centres are in mid-town, south Vancouver, and a targeted centre for aboriginal youth. The draft Homelessness Action Plan unanimously referred by Council for further public review on November 2, 2004 calls for further development of outreach services and 24/7 drop-in centres including for youth.

Referring to the Staff Committee Report dated November 10, 2004, Mr. Robinson noted the staff review of applicable by-laws and guidelines (the Downtown Official Development Plan and Downtown South Design Guidelines for Burrard/Granville) indicates the proposal is in compliance. The use for the site as proposed is institutional and more particularly a social service centre. The proposal by FSGV does not include a needle exchange or safe injection facilities, although they are approvable under "social service centre". Staff are recommending these uses be specifically prohibited (condition B.2.5 of the development permit). Staff support the location of the centre and consider it an improvement over the previous application for 1210 Seymour given general concurrence with criteria established prior to site search. The building has a flat façade, making security issues easier to manage. The site is in reasonable proximity to the two existing facilities which will be closed. The program for the facility is fully funded and can address issues which the previous application could not. The need for the downtown location and the Ministry's plan is supported by the City under the Vancouver Agreement. The Vancouver Police Department supports the facility and its location and a letter of support has been received from the Chief Constable.

Staff recognize that some residents and businesses in the area are very concerned with issues of safety and security in their neighbourhood. Staff can find no statistical evidence to support a claim for a direct causal relationship between crime and social service centres, nor is there evidence to support a claim that property values will decline in proximity to such facilities. Staff acknowledge that as a destination for youth, some of whom are involved in disruptive street related activities and harm, measures are warranted to limit and mitigate the opportunities for damage. Some of the mitigation measures have already been identified by FSGV during the focus group forums conducted prior to their application for a development permit (Appendix J of the Staff Committee Report). Staff are recommending that FSVG clarify and amend the draft management plan, as required in condition 1.1 contained in the report. As indicated in a memorandum dated November 22, 2004, the funders for this project have now committed the funds necessary to ensure that the facility will be operated on a 24 hours/7 day a week basis. Several minor amendments to the conditions are recommended to reflect this change. Staff believe the 24/7 operations will reduce the demand for security.

Vicki Potter, Project Facilitator, noted a number of neighbours expressed concern over the public consultation process, both pre-application and post-application. Referring to her memorandum dated November 22, 2004, Ms. Potter noted additional correspondence has been received from neighbours since publication of the report and now includes eight letters in opposition and 14 in support, three petitions in opposition, one petition in support, and letters of support from the Chief Constable, Vancouver School Board, Davie Street Community Policing Centre and the Davie Village Business Improvement Association. Ms. Potter briefly reviewed the public consultation that took place, as detailed in the Staff Committee Report. Some neighbours also questioned the City's ability to fairly consider this application given its role as property owner and that the Mayor has stated publicly his support of this application. The Chair of the Development Permit Board declined a formal request from the Burrard Davie Neighbourhood Coalition for a third party decision maker to be appointed, citing provisions of the Vancouver Charter and other City policy. In summary, there have been a number of pre-application and post-application avenues available for neighbours to learn more about the application and share their opinions. Staff are hopeful that more fruitful discussions between FSGV and neighbours can occur as the management plan is further developed, and that the neighbours will be ongoing participants through the Community Advisory Committee (CAC).

Questions/Discussion

Inspector Val Harrison, Vancouver Police Department, responded to a question from Mr. Beasley, about whether there has been any research on linkage between social services and patterns of crime. Inspector Harrison said crime statistics for the Downtown peninsula were reviewed, and specifically a five block radius around the current facilities. The number of incidents involving youth totaled 46 over an 11-month period, of which 23 involved local street youth. In three of these 23 incidents, the street youth themselves were the victims. Inspector Harrison said the number of incidents is considered to be negligible. As well, no "spikes" in criminal activity were identified around any of the facilities. The Police Department receives a lot of complaints about disorder generally on the streets but there is no evidence there are more complaints around these facilities.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley concerning youth congregating outside the facility, Mr. Robinson advised there is an area of about 1,100 sq.ft. for assembly inside the entry of the facility.

Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding the operating agreement. Mr. Robinson advised there is a recommended condition requiring the applicant to report annually to the Director of Social Planning on performance and outcome associated with the program. If issues are not able to be resolved by the mechanisms in place with the CAC, it would be referred to Council for resolution, and in the worst case scenario, Council could evict FSVG from the building.

Mr. Beasley noted that the previous application for this facility at 1210 Seymour Street severely limited the options for residential neighbours to reach their destinations without walking by the facility. Mr. Robinson confirmed the closest residential neighbours to 1134 Burrard are across the lane. There is no intention to have a client entry to this facility from the lane. Mr. Robinson also confirmed the applicant will be required to make improvements along the lane frontage.

In response to a question from Mr. Beasley about the impact of a 24/7 operation of the facility, Mr. Robinson advised staff believe it will considerably reduce problems on the sidewalk and improve the ability for FSGV to respond to any concerns. The provision of a 24 hour, 7 day a week operation will be a condition of the development permit.

Ms. Forbes-Roberts noted that a concern raised about the previous Seymour Street application was the make-up of the CAC and the dispute resolution process. Mr. Robinson advised membership of the CAC is not yet concluded but the intent is that all community interests are represented while making it possible for FSGV to provide the needed services. The dispute resolution mechanism is also under discussion and not yet finalized. With respect to the annual report to the Director of Social Planning, Mr. Robinson said staff will be interested to know how the program is meeting its mandate and how neighbourhood issues are being addressed. Jeff Brooks, Director of Social Planning, added the program will be carefully monitored because all interested parties are keenly interested in its success.

In response to a question from Mr. Haden regarding the number of clients expected to use the facility, Mr. Robinson said the current Dusk-to-Dawn facility serves 47 - 50 children per night. The program will be managed in such a way that youth are engaged and brought into the facility and will not be permitted to loiter in front of the building. FSGV will also be encouraged to collaborate with security providers in the neighbourhood.

Ms. Forbes-Roberts sought clarification about other "hub" facilities in the city. Mr. Brooks advised there is a hub in the Broadway/Fraser area and an aboriginal youth program in the Commercial/Hastings area. There are also other facilities such as safe houses, group homes and other services scattered throughout the city. A hub is also being developed in south Vancouver. The facility at 1134 Burrard will be the first larger operation that will be in operation 24/7.

Applicant's Comments

Teri Nichols, Director, Family Services of Greater Vancouver, expressed appreciation for the very thorough staff report and she confirmed acceptance of all the recommended conditions. She said the project provides the opportunity to combine two youth services in one location and this site meets the criteria established after the last application. Ms. Nichols introduced her team and described the history of youth services in the area. She said they are committed to creating a centre of excellence for youth and they will continue to be part of the solution to end homelessness. She said they are very pleased that funding for 24/7 operations has been obtained and confirmed they will establish a CAC for the new site.

Renata Aebi, Director of the Centre, briefly described her mandate. She said they expect to serve up to 80 young people per 24 hour period and are committed to ensuring the centre, both inside and out, is a safe, well managed facility for youth, staff and the neighbourhood. A security company will be employed to patrol the perimeter of the building at regular intervals and security cameras will be installed to ensure the entrances are monitored at all times. They will also ensure the entrances remain clean, well maintained and well lit at all times. Ms. Aebi said they recognize their Seymour Street facility has had problems with loitering, noting there are a number of social services in the immediate vicinity and there is a large overhang at the entrance. The proposed site is ideal because there are few other social services nearby, it has a flat façade and no street level windows. The new facility will also include an indoor reception area for youth as well as an indoor smoking area. They are committed to working closely with the community to ensure the facility remains accountable to all stakeholders.

Alan Markwart, Assistant Deputy Minister, Ministry of Children & Family Services, stressed the importance of the proposed new centre, noting it is for a highly vulnerable and needy youth population. The purpose of the services is to get the youth off the street and help them make a better start for their lives. The centre also addresses concerns about fragmented and uncoordinated social services by bringing together a variety of services provided by a number

of agencies. FSGV is a highly reputable, long-standing agency in delivering services to youth. The Ministry has complete confidence they will be able to put into place highly effective services and be able to accommodate the concerns of the neighbourhood. Mr. Markwart stressed the Ministry has a continuing interest in ensuring the centre works well and will be monitoring the services provided and looking for outcomes and assessing effectiveness, and this will include an assessment of the relationships with the neighbourhood. Mr. Markwart briefly described the other integrated youth services proposed elsewhere in the city, including an aboriginal service centre, a south Vancouver centre and a mid-town service centre.

Jennifer Vornbrock, Vancouver Coastal Health Authority, explained that VCHA provides alcohol and drug services as well as a range of health services to youth, most of which is provided outside of the downtown core. Ms. Vornbrock noted that significant capital funds have been committed by VCHA for the necessary building renovations, and funding for 24/7 operations will be provided in partnership with the Vancouver Agreement. The VCHA strongly supports the project.

Comments from other Speakers

The Board agreed that people on the speakers list who are not present when called will be called again when the meeting is reconvened. As well, any delegations not already on the speakers list will also have the opportunity to address the Board at the reconvened meeting.

The following speakers were opposed to the application:

Armida McDougall, Strata Council President, 1050 Burrard Street (also presented a petition with 106 signatures and two letters of opposition)
Robyn Durling, Burrard-Davie Neighbourhood Coalition
Philip Jhin, 1 Wall Centre
Shamin Lalani, 938 Nelson Street
Tom Attwood, 1177 Hornby Street
Nell Dragovan
Pia Collins

The following speakers spoke in favour of the application:

Michael McCoy
Angie Myers, peer counsellor and former street youth
Randy Atkinson, Davie Village BIA, Yaletown BIA and Downtown Vancouver Association
Dr. Trevor Corneil, area resident and public health physician
Tanya Wilcox, former street youth
Dr. Ian Martin, local resident and family physician
Sheila Davidson, Child & Youth Advocate for the City of Vancouver
Lisa O'Reilly, 1177 Hornby Street
Ruby Turner, member of FSGV Board of Directors and downtown resident
Charmaine Spencer, Burnaby Street
Karen Lopas, 950 Drake Street
Tea Greenberg, Youth Working Group, Regional Steering Committee on Homelessness
Summer Rain

The meeting adjourned at 10.10 p.m. and reconvened at 3.00 p.m., December 6, 2004.

The Chair reintroduced the City staff involved in this application and who are available for questions.

The Board requested that delegations try to limit their presentations to 5 minutes to allow everyone the opportunity to speak.

The following speakers were opposed to the application:

Elena Okon, 811 Helmcken Street (also presented a petition containing 19 signatures in opposition)

Philip Lee, 909 Burrard Street

Charles Lee, 1177 Hornby

Vera Polonicoff, 1055 Harwood Street

Auguste van der Veen, 1055 Harwood Street

John Krol, 1160 Burrard Street

David Kotula, Burrard Motor Inn

Mary Power, 1050 Burrard Street

Angela Jhin

Alan Clogg, Century Plaza Hotel

The following delegations spoke in support of the application:

Roland Smitas

Caitlin Padgett

Fred Milowsky, Deputy Child & Youth Officer for BC

Sharon Promislow

Jim Deva, Davie Street Community Policing Centre

Stephanie Docherty, Counsellor, Street Youth Services (also spoke on behalf of Davina Boone)

Brent Granby, West End Residents' Association

Peter Leask, Justice Review Task Force - Street Crime Working Group

Penny Parry, former Child & Youth Advocate, City of Vancouver

Jane Hopkins, National Homelessness Initiative

Mark Gifford, West End resident

Michael Doucette, West End resident

Elyn Dobbs

The points raised by those in favour included:

- FSGV is creative and innovative and provides services that respond to extremely challenging social issues;
- FSGV voluntarily sought accreditation with the Commission on Accreditation for Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF);
- the safety concerns should not be minimized but the onus of responsibility should not be assigned to this service provider; it is not their role to maintain that safety but to deal with individuals and provide support and assistance;
- having one integrated youth centre will stop a lot of the current street traffic and it will help to get kids off the street;
- the proposed location is based on where the need is; if it is moved to an area where youth do not naturally congregate more youth will end up becoming street involved and entrenched;
- there is ample opportunity in this application to address neighbourhood concerns; there may be some risks but they are relatively easily managed;
- from a business perspective it makes sense to have these services in place;
- the youth are part of the community;

- the area is mixed, not just residential;
- it is not the presence of social services but their absence that causes problems;
- FSGV has an excellent track record;
- 24-hour operations strongly supported;
- the facility can be made to work for the neighbours;
- all street youth have the potential to be successful and to give back to their community;
- the facility has the potential for making the community a safer place for everyone;
- the key is not to overburden one area with social service facilities;
- it is important that this facility is in the heart of the gay and lesbian community;
- property values will decline if the homelessness problem is not solved;
- the 24/7 operation will improve the problems experienced in Nelson Park;
- the facility will add to the livability of the West End;
- the Justice Review Task Force has identified 500 adult repeat offenders and 25 youth offenders (under 19) in the Downtown; youth are not a statistically significant part of reported, investigated and prosecuted crime;
- St. Paul's Hospital, where the current Dusk to Dawn facility is located, is very supportive of the program;
- it is important to consider that this facility is one of several in the Lower Mainland and is unlikely to attract youth from outside the downtown;
- there is no evidence that the location of a social services centre will decrease property values.

The points raised by those in opposition included:

- the process has been flawed from the onset;
- the youth will congregate on the street;
- there will be a negative impact on tourism;
- the downtown streets are unsafe for the elderly;
- youth should be moved from the downtown core where they are easy prey for drug dealers and pimps;
- the project should be put on hold and genuine people appointed to the community advisory group;
- concerns about the administrative process undertaken so far, including serious concerns about the notification process;
- concerns about the public policy objectives of the centre;
- concerns about the ability of FSGV to properly manage and operate the facility;
- given the City's relationship to the applicant a formal request was made to have a neutral third party take on the role of the Development Permit Board, which has been denied;
- the advisory committee is made up primarily of project stakeholders who have a vested interest in the outcome;
- public order will be in jeopardy;
- crime statistics indicate this area is already suffering from street youth;
- the centre is part of a failed policy - it enables street life rather than decreases it;
- the location is unsuitable because it is a heavily residential area, with hotels and a park close by;
- FSGV is unable to address problems of loitering at its existing facility on Seymour Street;
- the facility will ruin the neighbourhood which is the gateway to Vancouver;
- the services are not helping people get off the street but are helping to keep them there;
- there are too many unknowns;
- there is a need to know what will happen to the people who are not accepted at the centre;
- the site meets only one of the criteria by which this building was selected;
- the most important needs of youth are housing and food;
- the existing Dusk to Dawn facility is constantly vandalized;

- there are many overhangs in neighbouring buildings where youth can congregate;
- a better location for this facility would be the currently undeveloped False Creek Flats;
- the facility is experimental and not appropriate in this neighbourhood.

Mr. Beasley sought clarification regarding crime statistics in the area. Inspector Harrison advised the statistics on the VPD's website are accurate but include figures not normally included in District 1 because the Central Business District straddles police boundaries. The crime statistics referenced at the November 22 meeting were the 46 incidents where youth were either charged, chargeable or suspect. 23 of these incidents involved street youth. There were over 10,000 incidents this year where adult offenders were involved. Crime statistics for this block of Burrard Street indicate there were over 400 calls for police service. Inspector Harrison stressed that most of the crime is adult driven.

In response to a question from Mr. Rudberg regarding the kitchen facilities, the FSGV team explained that breakfast and lunch is provided for youth enrolled in programs at the centre, noting that food is an important part of the support being provided. It is not a soup kitchen.

Mr. Rudberg sought clarification about the security provisions in the draft management plan. The FSGV team advised the building is designed with security cameras in the front and rear, monitored by a receptionist. Weekly security reports are received at the current Street Youth Services Facility and there have been no issues of risk to person or property, the problems mostly relating to loitering. \$30,000 is budgeted for a security company. Mr. Robinson advised that staff's intent is that FSGV respond to the kinds of issues already experienced and to be proactive about them. It is expected that the management plan will continue to be refined by FSGV, in consultation with the neighbours, and that attention will be paid to the neighbours' concerns. The security may be a combination of FSGV staff and security professionals.

Mr. Beasley questioned how the alcoves and weather protected areas on adjacent buildings are handled, noting that FSGV would not be expected to be responsible for security of other buildings. Ms. Aebi stressed they will be flexible and listen to the community. This includes working with the security companies in surrounding buildings. Similar liaison has already occurred at the Seymour Street facility.

In response to a question from Ms. Forbes-Roberts about the make-up of the CAC, Ms. Nichols noted this committee is now disbanded because it was struck for the purpose of identifying a suitable site. Membership in the committee was open to all community groups. Residents and businesses surrounding the building will be targeted for membership in the new CAC. FSGV regards the CAC as an asset to the facility. Mr. Beasley noted that condition 1.1 b) for the establishment of the CAC is to the satisfaction of City staff who will consider the make-up of the committee to ensure that broad interests are served. In response to a question from Mr. McLean about what recourse there would be in the event the CAC concludes the program is not successful, Cameron Gray, Director of the Housing Centre, explained there is a layer of responses in place to resolve problems. There will be clauses in the lease which require performance of the management plan, and the ultimate recourse would be to City Council as the lessor.

In response to a question from Mr. Haden as to what action would be taken if a client of the facility is causing a problem in a nearby building, Ms. Nichols confirmed they would be responsible for dealing with it. With respect to access at the rear of the property, Dane Jansen, Architect, confirmed that security at the lane will be improved, including a gate. Client access will be from Burrard Street only.

The Chair requested clarification from staff with respect to the public consultation process. Ms. Potter described the meetings held with the community between November 2003 and July 2004 when the development application was made. Public involvement through the CAC, a number of round table meetings and an open house in April was spearheaded by FCGV. There were two pre-application mail-drops to about 6,500 people but unfortunately many residents appear to have not received them. When the application was received by the City, staff met with some residents to review the development permit process. As well, the City sent its notification letter containing 13 pages of information to about 2,500 area residents. Ms. Potter added, the draft management plan submitted in July has since evolved in response to community input and many of the conditions contained in the report reflect what is now proposed. Two public meetings, jointly sponsored by the City and FSGV, were held in September 2004. These meetings were well attended but staff did not find them very productive in terms of exchanging ideas and generating solutions.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Haden said he believes all the speakers are genuinely interested in achieving effective solutions for the street youth and the neighbourhood. He noted there are some areas which are not within the Board's mandate. Firstly, in the absence of clear violation of City procedure and policy, the process of dealing with the stakeholders is not an issue provided it has been carried out in good faith, noting there will always been people who are missed in notifications. Mr. Haden said he believed the large turn-out of speakers today and on November 22 indicates that information on this project has been quite appropriately widely distributed. Second, it is not the role of the Board to suggest there may be a better site but it must consider the application before it. Unfortunately, this type of facility would meet opposition everywhere in the downtown. It is not the Board's role to determine whether this is the best use of public health money. The issue is whether the social benefit outweighs the risk to the neighbourhood. Mr. Haden said he believes the social benefit does outweigh the risk to the neighbourhood and recommended approval. He recommended some amendments to the conditions regarding representation on the CAC by the immediate neighbouring buildings, to add some screening between this facility and the neighbouring hotel lobby area, and to ensure there is no client access to and from the lane.

Mr. Mah said there will never be a perfect location for the facility. It will disrupt some of the neighbours, but the street youth are already part of this community and in need of the proposed services. He stressed that the recommended conditions address issues of security, drug use and loitering, and include involvement of the local residences and businesses. Mr. Mah said he was confident the process will work and that, overall, this centre will have a positive effect on the community. He recommended approval.

Mr. McLean noted there have been street kids in this area since the 1960s. He said he was particularly impressed by Mr. Leask's presentation on the findings of the Justice Reform Task Force and by the input provided by Inspector Harrison, both speakers providing very credible evidence to show that the street youth are not contributing significantly to crime committed in the downtown. Mr. McLean urged the neighbours to get involved in the CAC to make sure it works in the community. He recommended approval.

Mr. Chung thanked the delegations for their input, especially the former street youth who provided evidence that facilities such as this do work and will contribute to saving lives. He noted the funding is committed and should be taken advantage of. He suggested the CAC should have some guidelines for dealing with issues as soon as they occur. With respect to security, Mr. Chung said there should be a coordinated effort with other buildings in the block. He also suggested that performance results should be reported every six months for the first

year, noting also that these results would be useful for the Board and Panel in considering other similar applications. Mr. Chung agreed with Mr. Haden that security at the lane needs to be addressed. He recommended approval.

Mr. Henschel said he appreciated the thoughtful and informative comments provided by the delegations. He said there are youth at risk there now and there are more coming. If a facility such as this does not exist somewhere in the neighbourhood, the situation will worsen and crime will increase. Ultimately, this facility should decrease crime in the larger community. Mr. Henschel said the location is more appropriate than the previous Seymour Street application since this block of Burrard Street is not primarily residential. There will be some impacts, but they are manageable. Mr. Henschel added, he believes it is a life safety issue for the young people who are living on the street. If a facility like this cannot be located where it can be effective, young people will die. He supported the proposal and said he believed the conditions address the security concerns. He congratulated FSGV on the considerable efforts made to consult with the neighbourhood.

Ms. Chung said the facility will provide much needed services for homeless and at-risk youth. She agreed a strong facility management plan is needed as well as clarity on how and by whom the facility security will be monitored and how emergency alerts will be responded to. She expressed the hope that the loitering which already exists in the area is not simply displaced. In this regard she said it would be helpful to see local police and security officials play an active role in addressing the issue, perhaps by having representation on the CAC. Ms. Chung supported the application with the conditions, with amendments to 1.1 c).

Board Discussion

Mr. Beasley expressed appreciation for all the advice provided and he noted the majority of public delegations who spoke were in favour of the facility. With respect to the Board's decision-making authority on this application, Mr. Beasley said there is no question that the Board is mandated to make these kinds of decisions, including those involving City lands. He stressed he is not intimidated by politicians, as evidenced by the previous application for this facility which, although it was approved, such onerous conditions were applied that the applicant chose to withdraw.

With respect to the process, Mr. Beasley said the large attendance at this meeting indicates the process is working and he had no process concerns. The role of the applicants has also been commendable. While the Board is not a policy making body, City policy clearly supports facilities such as this in the inner city provided they fit, are done right, and the community impacts can be addressed. The real issues for the Board therefore are the fit and the community impacts and implications. It is clear from the advice of the professionals who addressed the Board that crime is on the rise in this community but it is a general crisis and not youth-based. Efforts are being made to improve the situation with the recently struck West End Coordinating Committee. Loitering and harassment need to be addressed with a good security response. Mr. Beasley agreed there should be no access to this facility from the lane, which should reduce problems. On the question of whether this facility will draw youth from outside the area, he noted this will not be the only facility like this in the city and it will serve primarily the youth already in the community. Many of the community organizations have indicated it is better to have the facility in the community than not.

Mr. Beasley stressed that the operating agreement is an essential part of the success of the facility, and he supported the staff recommendation that ongoing 24/7 hours of operation be a condition of the development permit. With respect to the CAC, Mr. Beasley said he believes membership should include several City senior officials as well as a 24-hour contact.

Mr. Beasley said the City's vision is to have a community of residents but a mixed and inclusive community with humanity. If these facilities did not exist it would be more likely to discourage people from living downtown because it is through them that the issues are dealt with. Mr. Beasley said he was convinced by the good intention expressed by the applicants who have shown awareness of all the issues, the need for cooperation and support and collaboration with their neighbours. FSGV also acknowledges it could do better at the existing facility on Seymour Street. Mr. Beasley moved approval of the application with a series of amendments to the conditions.

Ms. Forbes-Roberts seconded the motion and suggested some further minor amendments which were accepted by Mr. Beasley. She thanked all the delegations for their input and said it is a difficult application for the neighbourhood, the applicant and the Board. Ms. Forbes-Roberts said she supported the project because ultimately, on balance, it will make a difference that will improve the neighbourhood. There are safeguards in the conditions that will help deal with any incidents that develop. She stressed this is a better site than the previous Seymour Street location. The 24/7 operating hours will mean there will be fewer youth on the street and fewer problems encountered with youth on the street including loitering and littering. Monitoring will be provided for the facility as well as the neighbouring buildings which is clearly required. Ms. Forbes-Roberts said she was also impressed by the willingness of FSVG to proactively address the issues. She added, this project is part of the coherent approach the City has to take to deal with the problems of street youth and it is part of her vision that the City will reach out and not ignore the issues.

Mr. Rudberg stressed that the youth are already part of this community and the lack of social services is a problem. These facilities are important for community safety. The Board must consider whether this is the right location and whether it will be properly managed. The previous site on Seymour Street raised considerable concerns given the number of social services in the immediate vicinity and its proximity to residential uses. As a result, some fairly onerous conditions were applied to ensure it would work, and the application was subsequently withdrawn. The subject location is not perfect but is much better. Mr. Rudberg said he was satisfied that the management plan requirements, as amended, will appropriately address the issues and provide a mechanism to take corrective actions.

Mr. Rudberg noted this will be last Development Permit Board meeting as a Board member, after serving for about nineteen years. He said it gave him some personal satisfaction that the last application he has considered focuses on youth. Mr. Rudberg stressed that the Board deals with applications without political interference and its decisions are based on input received from staff, the Advisory Panel and members of the public. He supported approval of the application.

The Chair said he agreed there is a need for housing and food for the street youth, but to reject this application in the hope of ultimately satisfying the more general need for basic necessities is tantamount to admitting the problem will never be solved. He said he did not believe the facility is experimental, given it consolidates two existing facilities. The major advantage of the new facility is that it will operate 24/7 which is critical to it being able to fully serve the needs of the street youth. Mr. Scobie also agreed that this site is an improvement over the previous Seymour Street location, noting the Board had applied a time-limit for the previous proposal. The fact that the City owns this site adds another level of security to address any issues that arise.

Motion

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

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. 408648, in accordance with the Development Permit Staff Committee Report dated November 10, 2004, with the following amendments:

Amend 1.1 b) to read:

Establishment of a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) specifically for the facility comprised of stakeholders including Family Services of Greater Vancouver (FSGV), neighbouring business, property owners and residents, especially adjacent residents and businesses, as well as police, security personnel, service providers, City, funding agencies, community groups, and youth;

Add to the Note to Applicant in 1.1 b) *and Director of Planning*;

Amend 1.1 c) to read:

Protocols for security and monitoring of security issues related to the facility and neighbouring buildings;

Note to Applicant: This should include protocols for loitering and sidewalk congregation, littering, graffiti, building maintenance including the street frontage and rear lane, and key weather-protected public areas of nearby buildings. The applicant may wish to seek advice from a licensed security professional to assist them on:

- the frequency and duration of security patrols;
- the area to be serviced by monitored security and for which coordination with surrounding buildings' security staff will be arranged;
- any electronic surveillance and monitoring to support security personnel;
- coordination with other existing building security services in the area.

Amend 1.1 d) to read:

Hours of operation including details of programs available to youth by age;

Amend 1.1 g) to read:

Protocols for the regular (probably annual) monitoring and reporting of outcomes and performance results associated with the services FSGV provides to the satisfaction of the Director of Social Planning;

Amend the Note to Applicant in 1.2 to read:

Provide a coating on the façade brick to allow easy removal of graffiti. Consideration should be given to replacing the opaque glass in the entrance alcove to clear glass to improve surveillance of the alcove.

Amend 1.4 to read:

design development to improve the lanescape while maintaining perimeter security;

Note to Applicant:

This can be achieved by removing the existing dilapidated chain link enclosure fence and gate and replacing it with a more decorative fence enclosure. The garbage should be fully enclosed and located such that notches or alcoves are not created. The existing fencing should be upgraded to be unclimbable. There should not be a client facility entrance from the rear of the building (utility access only). An accurate plan of the rear surface parking area should be provided.

Add B.2.6:

Operate the facility on a 24 hour, 7 day a week basis.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Beasley added he believed staff did an exemplary job on this application and he commended Ms. Potter, Mr. Robinson and Ms. Rondeau for their efforts.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Scobie acknowledged Mr. Rudberg's departure from the Board and noted that his position will be filled by the new General Manager of Engineering Services, Tom Timm. Mr. Scobie also noted that Mr. Rudberg has been the longest-serving Board member and acknowledged his considerable contribution to the City's development in the last two decades.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7.30 p.m.

C. Hubbard
Clerk to the Board

F. Scobie
Chair