

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: July 24, 2019

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Jim Huffman	Excused item 2
Amela Brudar	Chair Item 2
Helen Avini Besharat	
Susan Ockwell	
Jennifer Stamp	
Derek Neale	Excused item 1
Yinjin Wen	
Karenn Krangle	
Muneesh Sharma	
Adrian Rahbar	

REGRETS:

Grant Newfield
Matt Younger
Colette Parsons

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** K. Cermeno

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1. | 500 W 57th Avenue (Pearson Dogwood Parcel D) |
| 2. | 1002 Station Street & 250-310 Prior Street (New St. Paul's Hospital and Health Campus) |
| 3. | 4175 W 29th Avenue (St. George's School) |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Jim Huffman called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. The panel then considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 500 W 57th Avenue (Pearson Dogwood Parcel D)
Permit No. DP-2019-00390
Description: To develop the site with two 28-storey and one 24-storey mixed-use buildings consisting of: commercial at grade, 30 Pearson supportive units, 223 secured nonmarket rental units and 488 market dwelling units; all over 5 levels of underground parking accessed from the extension of 58th Avenue. The proposed floor area is approximately 66,914 sq. m (720,264 sq.ft.) and the proposed building height is approximately 87.2 m (286 ft.).
- Zoning: CD-1
Application Status: Complete Development Application
Review: Second (First as DP)
Architect: IBI Group
Owner: Court Brown, Onni
Jason Newton, Onni
Delegation: M. Bruckner, Architect, IBI
J. Christianson, Architect, IBI
Keegan Kent, Landscape Architect, Enns Gauthier
Jason Pauler, LEED Consultant, Recollective
Eoshan Hayes, Edge Consulting
Staff: Janet Digby

EVALUATION: (7 support, 1 against)**• Introduction:**

Development planner, Janet Digby, began by noting the Pearson Dogwood or Cambie Gardens site is bounded by Cambie, 57th, Heather and 59th. It is subject to a Policy Statement, approved in 2014, that established the general planning, engineering and urban design objectives for the site. It is also subject to a Rezoning, approved in 2017. The RZ further developed the Policy Statement objectives. The UDP reviewed the overall development at the PS and RZ stages.

The 11x17 master plan map in the applicant booklet shows the general site layout - the previous minutes in the agenda include information on the planning principles.

The master plan combines mixed use areas, residential use areas and significant open spaces.

It includes a substantial amount of new housing, 20% of which will be social housing and 100 units of which will replace existing Pearson units.

DP Applications for Phase 1 - Parcels A, C and E have been approved. Phase 1 - Parcel B is under review. The subject application is for Phase 2 - Parcel D. Parcel D is located in the northeast corner of site at Cambie and 57th. It is bounded by these streets as well as two new streets - W 58th Ave and Paulsen Street. The highest density and height buildings on the Pearson Dogwood site are planned to be concentrated here due to proximity to the two arterials and the Canada Line.

Surrounding context includes Langara Gardens to the north across W 57th and Langara Golf Course to the east across Cambie. Langara Gardens is subject to a policy planning process to increase density and height.

To the south across the new W 58th Ave is Parcel A which has been approved with 22 and 26 storey mixed-use buildings including retail uses on the ground floors and a total of 489 residential units.

To the west, across the new Paulson Street, is Parcel C which has been approved with a 27 storey mixed-use building including retail, regional health care, child care and other community uses on the lower levels and 177 residential units on the upper levels.

The proposed development on Parcel D includes approx. 720,000 sf of retail and residential uses. The proposal includes 488 market units, 223 affordable units and 30 Pearson replacement units.

The site is designed with two massing components divided by a publically accessible pedestrian mews that leads from the Cambie and 57th intersection to the Pearson Plaza and City Park located in the centre of the overall site.

The proposed northerly component has a total height of 28 storeys. It includes a combination of a 1 storey retail podium base (L1 Upper), a 6 storey midrise element on top of the podium (L2 -L7) and an additional 21 storeys in a tower (L8-28). The mid-rise houses a combination of Pearson units and market strata units. The tower houses market units.

The proposed southerly component has a total height of 28 storeys. It includes a 2 storey retail podium base (L1 Lower and Upper), an 8 storey midrise element on top of the podium (L2-L9) and two towers - one with an additional 20 storeys (L9-L28) and the other with an additional 16 storeys (L9- L24). The mid-rise houses affordable housing units and the two towers house market strata units. The retail podiums include a combination of large, medium and small format commercial spaces with frontages on the streets and pedestrian mews.

The massing of the proposal is generally consistent with the approved rezoning except that the 8 storey midrise element between Towers D2 and D3 has not been provided with the north-south massing break anticipated in the rezoning.

Advice from the Panel is sought on the following:

1. Form
 - a. The basic massing as well as the more detailed articulation of the massing with particular reference to:
 - i. vertical and horizontal modulation of the facades along Cambie, W 57th and W 58th;
 - ii. expression of the different massing components spatially; and
 - iii. expression of the different massing components through the façade design.
2. Character
 - a. The proposed character with particular reference to:
 - i. creation a unique identity for this location (e.g. neighbourhood node);
 - ii. response to the evolving character context (e.g. Cambie Corridor and Marpole Neighbourhood);
 - iii. balance of similarity and variety in the expression of individual buildings at both the development scale and the neighbourhood scale.
3. Public Interfaces
 - a. The definition and animation of the ground level frontages on the streets and the pedestrian mews with particular reference to:
 - i. the intersections of Towers D2 and D3 with the ground plane;
 - ii. the lengths of glass facades;
 - iii. the grain of retail frontages;
 - iv. the articulation of commercial and residential entries; and
 - v. the treatment of retail frontages along W 58th?
4. Amenities:
 - a. The amount of open space provided to the pedestrian mews at its west end.
 - b. The quality of the affordable housing common outdoor amenity space on L2.
 - c. The quality of the market strata common outdoor amenity on L2.

5. Landscape
 - a. The balance of hard and soft landscape material in the ground level plan.
 - b. The configuration of the hard and soft landscape elements in the pedestrian mews with respect to its public and semi-public roles (e.g. a through-site public connector, an access route to commercial uses and as spill out space for the commercial uses).
 - c. The potential for functional use of the podium "hillock" on the south side of the pedestrian mews and the opportunity to add a similar feature on the north side.
6. Sustainability
 - a. Are there more opportunities to address sustainability objectives, for example, vis a vis solar orientation and facade design?

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

We were involved with the master plan from the rezoning of this site

The ideas of sustainability, the health community, and sustainability underline the thinking for this site.

Currently on the site there are facilities for disabled individuals and will be replaced with facilities for people of physical disability and paralyzed of sound mind.

What informs the accessibility we are using a diagonal method as this reduces the slope.

The idea is from each corner of the whole Person Dogwood site you can see diagonally to the park or to a public space that is in the middle, (i.e. Pearson Plaza).

The central idea for this site is an introduction of a larger rezoning site down into the plaza.

At the rezoning stage there was wider spaces, we have created some compression to focus the attention visually to certain spaces. There is a place holder for transit station access.

The 8 storey street wall on Cambie and 58th is for non-market residential use, and there floors go all the way through to the base of the tower and they have their own entrance to Cambie St. The one storey commercial podium has been broken by a small commercial unit on the upper floor, this allowed us to create a hillock in order to introduce some greenery and animate the pedestrian pathway with carried heights and density.

There is a variation of sizes of commercial spaces.

There is a large commercial unit that has the potential to connect to the mezzanine.

Coming from the inside the forms of the D2 and D3 towers are mirrored, so that there is similar massing coming down to the street on 58th and internally.

The non-market podium has been cut back to provide an indoor and outdoor amenity on two levels.

The amenity space at level 9 for the market is large.

The materiality at grade is a combination of metal, panel and glazing.

The landscape helps connect Parcel C. There is a park and city urban farm. There are many edible fruit trees throughout the site. There are these natural islands to bring greenery to the individual for health and wellness. Additionally there are many open areas to accommodate high foot traffic.

There are many seating opportunities throughout and the building entrances.

There is a location for a bike share.

All the buildings will meet the older LEED Gold Certified to Version 4 and will meet the greenhouse targets per the new policy.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Ms. Avini-Besharat and seconded by Mr. Sharma and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel SUPPORT the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Design Development of the solid wall along 58th avenue;
- Design Development of the hillock to support the curvilinear image;
- Design Development of the pedestrian walkway to minimize the slope issues;
- Design Development of the plaza to accept a station (interim idea);
- Design Development to entries to enhance the residential lobbies;
- Design Development of relentless canopy and retail glazing;
- Design Development to the curvilinear character of the building.

- **Related Commentary:**

There was general support by the panel. However, there was concern that the scheme had not advanced from a rezoning level of resolution.

Form:

The basic form and massing is carried over from the rezoning. There is a strong parti. It is successful; however, the detail designed has not evolved to carry the concepts presented at rezoning. The forms can be lost in the façade design. The buildings lack strong identity and concept. The vertical and horizontal articulation is tentative and not committed. There is not enough difference. .

Character:

Nothing unique in terms of character. Some renderings are different from each other. The modulation of the façade, prioritization should be less decorative and more on sustainable supportive elements. Despite difference in form and rotation of one of the towers, towers still seem similar. Materiality in façade, walls, window glazing makes it all seem similar were as the presentation implied a desire to differentiate each tower.

Public Interfaces:

The length of façades should have more articulation such as fine tuning, canopy development.

Along west 58th there is a significant amount of solid wall which is imposing and unfriendly and needs more penetrations and overlook opportunities.

The 28 storey D1 tower can improve its form to the ground; this improvement will help the diversification of the street. The D1 east façade and corner should be developed to encourage pedestrian connections. D1 has a compressed commercial façade. Tower to grade interface of D2 and D3 are the most successful. Do same for D1
Suggest adding some curved canopy at D2.

The interfaces are the most important part of the building, each entrance to each lobby needs to be more identifiable, and this will help with marketability. Right now they are lost with retail facades.

The edge of the curved hillock curvy at the two ends is not similar. One is over welcoming and one is not welcoming enough.

The canopy on the north side of the walkway is small and should be enlarged.

The retail facades are relentless with few access points. The retail floorplates are quite large that it's causing these relentless facades, would like to see smaller CRU units. The commercial space feels there is no design development there is just a continuous glass wall.

Amenities:

Roof amenities are nice but could benefit from rain screening and common access to the roof. Development of the landing on top needs refinement presently does not read well.

The plaza level where the restaurant is could use some rain protection.

The amenities on level 2 of the affordable housing may be dark in the winter, encourage putting a play area in there. If the shadow pockets could be avoided at the amenities would be helpful.

By removing the break in the podium, the light into the amenities and public realm at grade is limited.

Landscape:

The wayfinding appears clear and seems to work.

This is a very important corner on Cambie Street. There are quite a few building towers around the site; therefore, it is important for this site to have its own character, such as the curb character displayed on the design booklets. The corner should invite people into the site and form a gathering space with rain protection. The potential transit station may not be constructed for some time. In the meantime the plaza area should still be a great social place. The curvilinear forms on the north east corner that faces out to Cambie are interesting. It was suggested to take it out further. Look to your paving pattern to reinforce the curvilinear forms.

The pedestrian walkway and the slope across the walkway needs development, and should be developed to be user friendly and accessible to those with mobility issues. Consider putting some stairs that are parallel with your walkway through the center. Could create distinct levels. Consider canopies to make it more usable year round.

The landscape features are generally effective and draws the attention of public. There is a good balance between soft and hard elements, however hard elements could be better integrated. Landscape can benefit from further definition and fine grain resolution; approach could be several distinct levels with distinct characters. There could be more planting around the retail frontages and diagonal pathways inside. A panelist suggested working with City to use some Dogwood Trees.

If the trellis will be orange maybe there is a blend landscape and architecture colour.

On Paulson street, the walkway across could be pavers and not asphalt.

Sustainability:

Sustainability appears to meet the minimum requirement. There is no real commitment to solar orientations of the building, encourage revisiting these measures.

Building appears quite glassy, but there is room for improvement with the performance of the glass and control percentage of window openings.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.

2. Address:	1002 Station Street & 250-310 Prior Street (New St. Paul's Hospital And Health Campus
Permit No.	RZ-2018-00025
Description:	To develop the 18.4 acre site with a new hospital and integrated health care campus, including a mix of commercial, hotel, office, institutional and limited residential uses with two child care facilities and a new road network throughout the site that would connect to existing adjacent streets. The proposed floor area is approximately 51,280 sq. m (551,970 sq.ft) of development and the proposed building heights range from approximately 20 m (66 ft.) to 60 m (197 ft.). The application is being considered under the St. Paul's Hospital and Health Campus Policy Statement and the Rezoning Policy for Sustainable Large Developments.
Zoning:	I-3 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	Third (Second as RZ)
Architect:	IBI Group
Owner:	Rhonda Lui, Providence Healthcare
Delegation:	Tony Gil, Architect, IBI Group Kate Lambert, Planning, IBI Group Marc Dragneau, PHC
Staff:	Kevin Spaans

EVALUATION: SUPPORT the response of the UDP Recommendations as presented and support additional height at the SOUTH EAST CORNER (8/0)

- **Introduction:**

Development planner, Kevin Spaans, began by noting the Policy Statement for the rezoning of the St. Paul's Hospital was developed in consultation with the public, stakeholder groups, and city staff from all departments.

The Policy Statement sets the general framework for the form of development on the new St. Paul's site including:

- The infrastructural network;
- General directives on land use and built form including supportable massing and building heights;
- The parcelization of the site into the four precincts;
- Guidance on the variety of open space and general directives on the performance of these places.

The Policy Statement was subsequently reviewed and approved by City Council in June 2017. The rezoning submission was made in August of last year with an Open House and UDP workshop following shortly thereafter. The first UDP voting session was in May of this year and the Panel provided a series of directives for today's follow up presentation.

The Panel has two roles at this stage. First, because direction was given to the applicant at the meeting on May 1, the Panel must review the rezoning application as it is being presented in terms of the applicants' responses to this direction. As far as voting for support or non-support, the Panel should focus its assessment on these specific responses. Second, additional feedback and input is also sought from the Panel for the purposes of informing the Design Guidelines which are in development and will act as the "performance manual" for future development permit applications on the site.

What is under review at this UDP session is at a lower level of resolution than has been seen for rezoning applications recently. The reason being, this master plan is intended to act as an indicative framework for the future design development of the campus. All campus buildings will be returning to the Urban Design Panel as part of their individual Development Permit applications, where staff will seek more nuanced direction on matters related to architectural expression, materiality, and the qualities of the public realm design strategies, and fit within the overall Master Plan.

For context, both of the other projects under review today followed a similar process, wherein a massing conceptualization was developed to a Master Plan level of resolution, with the Development Permit applications applying a greater level of design rigor.

The infrastructural framework presented in the Policy Statement was approved by Council in June of 2017, this matter is not under review and evaluation of the NSPHC as presented must be considered within the limitations of the road network shown. Additionally, the high-level form of development shown in the approved Policy Statement limits building heights to those permitted within the view cones and there are no mechanisms by which we can relax these view cones at this stage of the application. The Panel is asked, by way of input on the applicants' responses to the consensus items, to vote on the supportability of the proposal as a general framework for design development;

The feedback Staff received from the Panel in May can generally be boiled down into the following five consensus items:

- **Site Planning** - the Panel noted a higher level of rigour was required with regard to the cohesiveness of the site planning strategy;
- **Open Space** - the Panel recommended more and higher-performing open space, and noted that legibility and wayfinding was a paramount concern, especially related to the relationship between the St. Paul's Plaza, Thornton Park, and the anticipated path of travel from Main Street-Science World Station. The Panel made the following notes about the three principal public open spaces:
 - **Wellness Walk** - the applicant has been asked to provide further consideration on the performance of the Wellness Walk with particular regard given to the interface between the public realm and service areas;
 - **St. Paul's Plaza** - the Panel recommended design development to improve the size and performance of the Plaza;
 - **Healthcare Boulevard** - the Panel recommended additional design development to improve the performance of the Healthcare Boulevard;
- **Massing** - the Panel recommended design development to improve the overall massing of the campus buildings with particular consideration given to:
 - Relocating massing to provide for an improved St. Paul's Plaza;
 - Other general massing moves to improve the expression of the campus buildings;
- **Height** - the Panel recommended modulation of building heights to provide for a more interesting skyline;
- **Uses** - the Panel noted that retail appeared spread out in the last iteration and recommended concentration of retail uses to define and activate the New High Street.

The applicant has provided responses to the five consensus items in the form of material changes and clarifications on design strategies which they are referring to as the "Six Big Moves". By way of presentation to the Panel, the applicant has been asked to outline their responses in greater detail, but the Panel was directed by City staff to the most significant moves: the deletion of the medical office building formerly at the corner of the New High Street and the Healthcare Boulevard, and redistribution of massing to provide for a larger plaza; increases in the spaces between the office buildings on the south side of the Health Campus Precinct to increase light penetration into the

Healthcare Blvd; and exploration of additional height at the southeastern-most corner of the site and the related impacts on Trillium Park.

The following advice is sought from the Panel on the application as presented:

1. Please provide feedback as to the St. Paul's Health Campus Master Plan massing conceptualization, with particular regard given to the following:
 - a. the reallocation of massing to provide for a larger St. Paul's Plaza, and;
 - b. the potential for additional building height at the southeastern-most corner of the site.
2. Please provide feedback to inform the design development of the St. Paul's Health Campus Master Plan during future Development Permit phase(s)

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The applicant, Tony Gill, AIBC (IBI Group) presented on behalf of Providence Health Group, reiterating are 6 "Big Moves" that have been made since the proposal was last reviewed by the Panel. Those moves are in respect to the plaza, Health Care Boulevard, the north face of the hospital, they wellness walkway, massing, and the activities around high street. The main focus was to balance the needs of the hospital and those of the community.

There is a lot of networking occurring around the site, there is a 5 minute walk that exists around the site. The intent is for the St. Paul's Plaza to sit within the zones of this networking. It is an active plaza made for individuals coming for care and respite. The plaza was also deigned to create public awareness type programs. There is an east west linkage with a road and bike network. The North-South vehicle and pedestrian connection goes through the site adjacent to the Plaza. Overall, the applicant is looking to make the plaza a bigger, broader civic experience.

The plaza has been increased in size up to 21,000 sf, but when considered as part of a network of open spaces and interconnected circulation paths, it appears bigger. Further, by growing the Plaza and reallocating some of the density off of the plaza site, the enclosed portion of the Healthcare Boulevard is shortened and does not have a rough cut off point. The plaza connects to all the parks with civic type hard areas. There is an increase in solar gain.

The Healthcare Boulevard widens out at the West. There is rain protection and coverage, but the full length glass canopy that had been shown extending across the full width of Boulevard has been removed. The buildings at the south side of the Boulevard have been further divided to provide for increased sunlight into this space. The Healthcare Boulevard acts as a connection to Trillium Park in the east and Creekside Park to the west.

Pedestrian circulation extends into the interior of the hospital as well, wherever programming allows, and the main hospital building has multiple entry points and doorways. These points of entry will provide for activity at grade but will also provide natural areas of respite for pedestrians walking within and around the site. From the north, these entries will also be expressed as architectural modulations to reduce the apparent massing of the hospital building when viewed from Strathcona.

The intent is to have the Healthcare Boulevard along with the Plaza connect to the main building entry points. The hospital will have a bigger and grander entry centered off of the Boulevard, but a secondary important entry will be provided off the Plaza as well. There are pick up and drop off zones

fairly close to the entry points which will be highly accessible to visitors and patients with mobility issues.

In regards to the hospital north face the Wellness Walkway extends from the northwest corner to the southwest corner. It is a 7m wide walkway which allows for a variety of active programming while breaking down the scale of the building and giving a character to this side of the campus. The applicant is looking to bring in additional glazing on this side to improve the interface with neighboring developments. Where large areas of glazing can't be added, clerestory windows will be explored. There will be some play with windows and with solid material to respect privacy of programming such as exam rooms etc.

The Wellness Walk is intended to be a bigger and broader experience. It can create multiple loops so there is always a circular direction and connects to some of the parks. This makes for a rich experience for hospital visitors and patients. A smaller loop is also created on the more secure interior part of the site, for those with mobility issues or those with cognitive issues.

The hospital has many areas that are intended for public access for the benefit of the overall community. Emergency zones which will have controlled access to daylight for practical and privacy reasons, are located with easy access to these brighter non-emergency areas. Technical requirements, including operating rooms, are accommodated within the technical platforms. The upper floors in the patient towers break up the massing a bit, but the practical requirements of the facility limits the flexibility of the form.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Sharma and seconded by Mr. Neale and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel SUPPORT the response of the UDP Recommendations as presented and support additional height at the SOUTH EAST CORNER.

- **Related Commentary:**

There was general support by the panel.

The panel noted better description of what the vision is would be beneficial, information is incomplete, consideration of how it will tie to adjacent community is important, project needs to greatly improve at DP.

Considerations as identified in previous sessions have been addressed and explained.

The biggest improvement was the plaza. This is an important big move that was captured. There is more openness to the main street increasing the sunlight which is beneficial to recovery and wellness walks.

There was unanimous support regarding the height increase on the buildings that is not restricted by view cone, however this buildings needs to be very identifiable by the campus. The relocating of the massing is a positive. . Support increasing the height at the southwest corner building, if this improves the experience and light into the plaza. The renderings have good detail; these are more informative opposed to block massing.

Design development around the edges is and urban fabric connection is key.

There was a lot of commentary regarding the public realm; the success of the campus relies on the public realm. The pedestrian experience, due to the amount of public transportation, a lot of people

will walk around; elements that are important to the pedestrian experience include the wayfinding, the pedestrian crossings, and the relationship with the vehicles, the landscaping and the public art.

Achieve a variety of open spaces, not just size and activity, but focus on who they are for, there can be isolated areas as well. Also there should be a location on the campus that is for the smallest of children, can occur with the main plaza space accessed by the public realm.

Increase the weather protection, consider beautiful soffits and transparency.

There needs to be more pockets of greenery, can be small but defined at north edges of the hospital, this may help with the massing. At the base there should be significant green to visually soften the space and this will help with the acoustics.

The panel summarized the following items for further design development in relation to the guidelines:

- The pedestrian realm design;
- The pedestrian experience including for children and people with pets;
- Public art and how it is executed / interpreted will be very important;
- Designs must provide for a variety of open spaces and hierarchy of public spaces;
- The North edge public realm of the campus must include variety and modulation, and must be permeable;
- Explore providing places of respite in the public realm;
- Façades at the North side of the campus must be modulated;
- The treatment of the ground plane is critical to the 'High Street' concept;
- Explore opportunities to improve the permeability of the campus and how this permeability relates to the massing.

It is important to acknowledge the hospital will be robust and overall massing needs further design development. Break up the vertical massing of all the buildings with architectural design, pedestrian, mid portions and higher elements. If the taller building is deemed supportable by City and Parks Board staff, and City Council, it should be distinctively designed and should act as an architectural beacon for the health campus.

The world class building equals world class sustainability, adopt a holistic approach rather than chasing the point (LEED GOLD). Consider all the energy that will be used by hospital can be harvested to help with costs.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.

3. Address:	4175 W 29 th Avenue (St. George's School)
Permit No.	DP-2018-01146
Description:	To develop phase 1 for St. George's Senior School, including two 4-storey academic buildings, one dining hall and one level of underground parking accessed from Camosun Street. The total FSR is 0.52.
Zoning:	Approved CD-1, pending for enactment
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Third (Second as DP)
Architect:	IBI Group
Owner	Alex Page, Core PM
Delegation:	David Thom, Architect, IBI Group Catherine Offenberg, Landscape Architect, IBI Group
Staff:	Kevin Spaans

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (9/0)

- **Introduction:**

Development planner, Kevin Spaans, began by noting this is the second time this proposal is appearing at UDP at the Development Permit stage. It has been previously reviewed by the Panel on May 29 and failed to gain the support of the Panel.

The Panel provided the following recommendations to be integrated by the applicant prior to resubmission:

- Further development of the landscape elements of the development;
- Further development to the character of the buildings;
- Further development to the character and programming of the open spaces;
- Further design development of the usability and viability of the rooftops;
- Greater understanding of the overall circulation strategy and relationship to the intent of the Master Plan;

The proposal is comprised of two 52' tall academic buildings with 10' tall architectural appurtenances, and a great hall building at two storeys. The buildings and their related outdoor spaces represent phase 1 of a 4 phase redevelopment of the St. George's Senior School campus. Phase 2 of the redevelopment is located directly north of the academic west wing and includes a new performing arts center. To the west is the existing senior school which is anticipated to be replaced by student and staff residences as part of Phase 4.

The footprints and general expression of the buildings have remained largely the same as was presented previously with some changes made to suit the Panel's comments. The applicant is asked to detail their specific responses to each of the Panel's recommendations in their presentation, but staff note that operable windows have been added to the academic wings. Further, additional solar shading has also been provided at the east elevation of the East Academic wing and to the west elevation of the West Academic wing.

More noteworthy changes have been made to the design of the outdoor spaces. The arrangement of the buildings, being unchanged, continues to provide for a traditional campus quadrangle and entrance courtyard expression of the outdoor spaces. Walking paths have been revised to follow a more natural path-of-travel and anticipate future desire lines. An outdoor performance and study area is provided in the northwest corner of the quadrangle, and the east side of the quad has an informal gathering and study area with rain gardens. The entrance courtyard has been revised to include a pollinator garden and a bosque with seating. A fire lane bifurcates this space. Additional paths have been provided to

link the bus drop off / pick up zone to the south with the rest of the campus, and to provide with a more direct link to Pacific Spirit Park.

Green roofs have been added or improved as follows:

- Green roofs are being provided on both the upper Great Hall roof, and on the lower Great Hall roof adjacent a rooftop garden area;
- The roof terraces on both academic wings have been revised to show and increased amount of vegetation. These spaces are located outside of the Faculty Lounge at the west and the Board Room at the east.

The upper roofs of the academic wings have been revised to include photovoltaic panels.

Advice from the Panel is sought on the following:

3. Please provide feedback on the performance of the revised outdoor space / public realm design strategy
4. Please provide feedback on the applicant's response to the Panel's recommendation for design development to the overall architectural character of all buildings.
5. Please provide feedback on the applicant's response to the Panel's recommendation for design development to the usability and viability of the rooftops of all buildings.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

The approach to our rethought design was based on the 5 specific recommendations given at the previous UDP, which were clarification of the Master Plan, landscaping, character landscape, elements of the buildings, and sustainability.

The site sits at an interesting intersection in the city; there is a connection of city and nature. The Master Plan follows an urban pattern in respect to streets and block. We looked at changing the way the school has been perceived, going from traditional school to campus environment. A future change includes a performance center and student housing.

We revisited and clarified the arrival experience, and looked at how to better express by adding a new walkway that connects to the entrance and adding trees that reflect this area. The circulation consists of desire lines - it does not follow a rigid geometry. The strongest desire lines are to the corner opening up and making a circulation core.

Social engagement is a core principle of the campus design: this is a neighborhood destination. The quad is not just a green space but has programmed spaces around the edges to create strong adjacencies with interior spaces. Further, the rooftops have program spaces and there is a neighborhood corner park. The intent is to draw into the campus from many directions.

There is a pollinator garden, a space that school teachers can bring students into. We added additional doors. The goals and opportunities are celebrating the natural setting through a diverse array of natural outdoor spaces. Materials include wood and stone. The great hall has a green roof; additionally there are terraces with roof and garden.

Improvements to the sustainability strategy include reducing solar heat gain and increasing opportunities for storm water management. Further, the great hall kitchen is being provided with

clerestory lighting to reduce the need for electricity and provide for a more welcoming work environment for kitchen staff. There are operable windows now throughout the building. Photovoltaics on the roof are intended to provide solar powering of electric car chargers and computers. Overall there is a link of the sustainability to the building architecture and landscaping and academic ventures of the school that reflects a key education principle at the school.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**

Having reviewed the project it was moved by Mr. Wen and seconded by Mrs. Besharat and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel SUPPORT the project.

- **Related Commentary:**

There was strong support by the panel. The application has vastly improved: it is now a defined program that brought life to the outdoor spaces. Rather than forcing students out there is a story and it is much more welcoming.

The circulation and wayfinding have improved. Minor recommendation, the flooring and paving can help with the wayfinding. The walking paths through the courtyard are nice and encourage social interaction. The added doors and enhanced seating are great, especially the seating at the entry ways. The uses of wood and planting are welcoming.

The north façade still reads a little flat at base to top three floors. It still not clear how the grand hall relates to the Master Plan. There needs to be more of a focal point - a bit of a lost opportunity here. The west facing and south facing top floor canopy can be more robust.

Be aware of the low February sun and make sure that roof spaces intended for student use are usable year-round.

Regarding the mechanical on the roof, if there is a way to organize the top shafts away from neighborly view would be beneficial.

The drop off at Camosun Boulevard can still be improved. The rain protection is still lacking, increase the rain protection at the entry so students can see their ride while under rain protection.

There is an underdeveloped pocket of landscape at the northwest and northeast corners.

The incorporated necessary sustainable features are a vast improvement. The operable windows and photovoltaic panels are all desirable

The additional solar powers and windows and green roofs are nice.

Recommend pushing the energy responses at all the façade further.

Consider both permanent and temporary bike storages.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.