

Date: Monday, June 1, 2015
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

J. Pickering Deputy Director of Planning, (Chair)
B. Jackson General Manager of Planning and Development
L. LaClaire Acting Director, Transportation Division
S. Johnston Deputy City Manager

Advisory Panel

R. Hughes Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
H. Ahmadian Representative of the Development Industry
J. Denis-Jacob Representative of the General Public
J. Ross Representative of the General Public

Regrets

P. Sanderson Representative of the Design Professions
S. Chandler Representative of the Development Industry
S. Atkinson Representative of the General Public (excused)
R. Chaster Representative of the General Public
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

J. Greer Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
M. Holm Engineering Services - Projects Branch
T. Potter Development Planner
T. Tenney Project Facilitator

520 EAST 1ST AVENUE - DE418832 - ZONE CD-1

D. Schmitt Diamond Schmitt Architects
B. Blair EllisDon Corporation
G. Eckford ETA Landscape Architecture
R. Burnett Emily Carr University of Art & Design

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Jackson, seconded by Mr. Johnson, and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on May 4, 2015.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 520 EAST 1ST AVENUE - DE418832 - ZONE CD-1
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: EllisDon Corporation

Request: To develop this site with a four-storey institutional building of approximately 26,000 m² for the Emily Carr University of Art and Design located on the Great Northern Way Campus. Integral to the design of the institutional building are key public realm deliverables of the Structure Plan for the Great Northern Way Campus (Structure Plan) including: St. George Plaza, the pedestrian spine, the bikeway that is part of the Central Valley Greenway. The site will be graded to meet the interim grades in the Structure Plan. The Emily Carr University of Art and Design provides facilities for 1800 students, 101 faculty, 151 support staff and 155 continuing studies staff. No on-site parking is provided; instead, surface parking is proposed through a series of off-site parking agreements.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Mr. Potter, Development Planner, presented the proposal and summarized the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report. The recommendation was for support of the application, subject to the conditions noted.

Mr. Potter took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Schmitt, Architect, gave a Power Point presentation and mentioned that they are in complete agreement with the 5% ramp that connects the level change between St. George Plaza and the Arts Plaza level. He said they understood the concern that there should be no stairs and no guard rails. However they have a concern that if they build the ramp in a straight line, there is at its highest point a 26 foot high level change. He said the University is concerned that the building doesn't end up at a lower level along that edge in terms of natural light and view. He said they have located the learning commons and double storey library overlooking the space and animates the public space. They have looked at a series of options that can be barrier and guard rail free. He noted that the three principle entries into the building are first at St. George Plaza, secondly on the north side and thirdly from the east Art Plaza. The concern is because of the scale of the building, if they add an elevator core to the assembly/auditorium on the west side, it would mean that students would be further away from the vertical circulation. The vertical circulation was placed in the middle of the core to be equal distance and accessible to loading facilities which in an arts university is extremely important. Mr. Schmitt mentioned that there was a concern with Condition 1.3. He noted that in an amendment last July, the building height was raised to 22.89 meters. There may be an issue of how the heights were measured but they believe they are in compliance with that

height issue. He pointed out that the development of the design has been worked on with the University and they have been able to bring lots of light into the studios. Mr. Schmitt explained that the end of journey bicycle parking is assessable at grade. If they move the bike parking away from the entry they would have to put them on the second floor level and the difficulty is that it would disrupt other uses in the building. Mr. Schmitt mentioned that they are able to work with staff regarding the conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

The applicant team took questions from the Board and Panel members.

Comments from other Speakers

One speaker noted that the campus has a very large cycling catchment area and thought the bikes needed protection from the weather as well as from thieves. He was concerned that the northwest corner wouldn't get a lot of pedestrian traffic and therefore there was little protection for the bikes.

Panel Opinion

Panel members offered a range of comments on the proposal, including:

- The Urban Design Panel supported the application but had some concerns regarding the exterior spaces and how they were connected to the interior;
- There was recognition for the challenge of the grade for a barrier free space;
- All though the Urban Design Panel was split on the expression of the roof line there was a strong case to be made for axis to be divided by light;
- The application could have had more of a relationship to the Master Plan or a Vision for the campus;
- Some concern that the application was a little incomplete considering there was little mention of the colour palette for the exterior expression;
- Having the elevator at the core has good merits but there needs to be proper wayfinding to make it workable;
- Liked the plan for a provision of enclosed bike parking;
- There are some technical challenges with the spine, roof line and elevation and would like to see staff and the applicant find a solution that is flexible;
- The application is consistent with the City's long term vision for the area;
- There are good sustainability features in the project and going for LEED™ Gold is positive;
- The Panel was in support of the application.

Board Discussion

Mr. Jackson thanked the applicant and staff for their hard work on the application and mentioned that this was an important new facility that had come a long way in a relatively short period of time. He noted the concern from the speaker regarding bike parking and thought that the note to applicant in the condition was clear in terms of the recommendation to make sure it was well lit, protected and in an appropriate location. Mr. Jackson made a couple of minor amendments to the conditions in the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. Johnston thanked the speaker and thought that staff would be working with the applicant to overcome any challenges regarding the bike parking. He mentioned that he thought it was going to be an amazing campus for the students and a real addition to the community. He thanked staff for their work on a complicated set of dynamics. Mr. Johnston supported the amendments to the Staff Committee Report.

Mr. LaClaire mentioned that with respect to the architecture and the roof line he didn't have anything to add. Regarding the elevator, he said he was sensitive to the competing demands of the elevator needs. He added that it is a large floor plate so if an addition elevator could be

provided that would be a good idea. In terms of the bike connection through the plaza, he thought the applicant had come up with an option that worked well. The issue of the pedestrian spine was his biggest concern. He added that universities are places where people are naturally milling about and he hoped that the applicant could make the pedestrian spine feel more like a natural flowing space. Mr. Johnston supported the amendments to the Staff Committee Report.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Jackson and seconded by Mr. Johnston, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE418832, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated May 20, 2015, with the following amendments:

Amend Condition 1.2, iv to read as follows:

design development to *explore* an elevator core in closer proximity to assembly spaces.

Amend Condition 1.4 to read as follows:

explore design development to the roof edges on the south and north elevations. . .

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:34 PM.