

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: July 13, 2016

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Russell Acton
Stefan Aepli (excused from item #1 & 3)
James Cheng
Roger Hughes
Neal LaMontagne
Muneesh Sharma
Veronica Gillies (excused from item #1)
Karen Spoelstra
Meredith Anderson (excused from item #2)

REGRETS: Meghan Cree-Smith
Ken Larsson
David Jerke
Kim Smith

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** Lidia McLeod

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1. | 8815-8827 Selkirk Street |
| 2. | 2106-2138 Main Street |
| 3. | 8570 Rivergrass Drive (EFL Parcel 20/21) |
| 4. | New St. Paul's Hospital + Health Campus |

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Hughes called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. After a brief business meeting the panel considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 8815-8827 Selkirk Street
DE: N/A
Description: The proposal is for a six-storey (18.6 m/61') mixed-use building with commercial at grade, and residential above (33 dwelling units) over one level of underground parking (including 36 underground parking spaces, and 42 bicycle spaces), with a floor space ratio (FSR) of 2.96. This application is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan.
Zoning: MC-1 to CD-1
Application Status: Rezoning Application
Review: First
Architect: Wilson Chang Architect (Peter Martin & Wilson Chang)
Owner: Selkirk Street Developments Ltd.
Delegation: Wilson Chang, Wilson Chang Architect
Caelan Griffiths, PMG Landscape Architects
Veronica Owens, Lighthouse
Staff: Rachel Harrison & Marie Linehan
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

- **Introduction:** Rachel Harrison, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a site which is two blocks west of Oak Street in Marpole. The lot is on the west side of Selkirk Street, just south of 72nd Avenue.

This rezoning proposal is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan, which was approved by Council in 2012. This entire block is zoned MC-1, and mostly consists of one and two-storey buildings with a mix of either office, service, manufacturing or institutional uses. There are a couple of newer residential developments on Selkirk including a three-storey residential building immediately north of the site with seven units, and a three-storey townhouse development with 23 units.

Across the street from the site is Ebisu Park. The area north of 72nd Avenue is zoned RM-3A, and for the most part includes three and four-storey purpose-built rental apartments. The site across the lane is zoned RM-4 and includes a four-storey housing co-op.

The Marpole Community Plan anticipates sites on this block could be developed into six-storey buildings. Exceptions to this include the church site (up to eight storeys), the Taiwanese Cultural Centre (up to 10 storeys), and the Scottish Cultural Centre (up to eight storeys).

The plan requires residential on the upper floors, with choice of use at grade. Choice of use includes retail, service, cultural and instructional uses, live-work, or office use. Maximum FSR for the site is 2.5.

The rezoning application proposes to rezone the site from MC-1 to CD-1 to allow the development of a six-storey mixed-use building, with retail at grade and 33 units of residential above. There is one level of underground parking and half a level of at-grade parking. The proposed FSR is 2.5.

Marie Linehan, Development Planner, continued the introduction by noting that the base zoning for this site is MC-1, which is a mixed use zoning that allows for residential, commercial and light industrial uses. It was small pocket of industrial zoning that was one of the 'let go' industrial areas from the mid-1990s when Council adopted the MC-1 zoning. This zoning introduced residential uses, and a wider range of commercial uses, in underutilised industrial areas in the city.

Under MC-1, the density is 2.5 FSR and the height limit is four storeys in a continuous street wall form with no front or side setbacks. Residential use is further limited to a maximum of 1.5 FSR. Residential-only buildings are typically three storeys due to the lower density, and have setbacks to address livability.

Under the Marpole Plan it is intended that south Lower Hudson will accommodate growth and be strengthened as a walkable area. The 'working village' feel will be supported by retaining a mix of uses at grade, with residential permitted at upper floors only. Emphasis is placed on building design which contributes to the character of the neighbourhood and provides pedestrian interest. The density has not changed from what is permitted under MC-1, but consideration will be given to a height of up to six storeys.

The Built Form Guidelines seek a continuous three-storey base. The upper massing should have a narrower frontage at approximately 65% of the width of the base. It is important to note that the location of the upper massing is not fixed and may occur anywhere along the frontage in the north-south direction. Upper storeys should be massed and set back to reduce shadow impacts and to emphasize the three-storey street wall. For the proposal, the upper mass is centrally located and setback from the front elevation by 12 feet, with setbacks to the upper massing of 25 to 30 feet at the rear. Commercial frontage widths should reinforce the scale of the local pedestrian shopping street.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

1. Overall form of development, height and density, relative to the Marpole Plan and existing context.
 2. Transition to townhouse building to the north - including setbacks to the upper massing and the north east corner (residential entry).
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team noted that there is a park across the street which they have tried to connect to the residential lobby. Box shapes have been used in the form to differentiate between the commercial and residential sections of the building.

Boston ivy is proposed along the entry wall to create a green signal to the park across the street, and a similar wall exists along the lane to break up the back elevation. The ivy also carries an attractive berry which is good for birds.

There is a child-friendly outdoor amenity at the podium at the laneway which gives a nod to the adjacent context.

The windows are primarily on the east and west elevations, and have significant overhangs to mitigate solar gain. The overall window to wall ratio is only 19%. As the site is quite tight, all the rain is being collected off the roof and then stored in the parkade. Other sustainable opportunities are also being explored.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - More refinement will be looked for at the next stage;
 - A clearer indication of the neighbourhood context is needed;
 - Reflect the smaller rhythm of the street and adjacent townhouses;
 - Adjust floor plans to provide views to the park and the mountains, and better connection to outdoor space;
 - Provide a wider canopy for pedestrian weather protection;
 - Design development to articulate the large blank wall adjacent to the townhouses;
 - Use masonry to add articulation to the commercial storefront;
- **Related Commentary:** The panel supported the overall height, density and form, and noted that the project could benefit from further refinement.

The rhythm of the street should be taken into account; the proposal should reflect the smaller industrial frontages of 50 feet and the narrow townhouse frontages. The proposal negates the native rhythm of the street. The masonry shown at the residential entry could be used to introduce a smaller scale at the commercial storefront.

It was suggested to flip the floor plans to relocate bedrooms inboard and living space adjacent patio space, as well as increasing windows at the north side, to provide an improved connection to outdoor space, the park, and better views.

One member suggested lowering the height by one storey adjacent the townhouses to improve the transition. Others felt the height was fine. It was noted that the proposal meets the Marpole Plan and provided 'good bones'.

It was noted that the architect's proposal to cut back the balcony at the north side will improve the transition to the townhouses as well. In turn, the upper 'box' volume may also be shifted to improve the composition.

The three bedroom units were seen as positive.

It was suggested to consider a device which provides daylight to the bike storage room and breaks down the mass of the entry wall to make it more attractive. A clerestory window might be provided.

Provide more of a response to the Marpole Plan at grade by adding a canopy to encourage people to hangout and foster community. The proposed weather protection at 3 ft. is insufficient.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their time. Further work and refinement will be done on the project at further stages.

2. Address:	2106-2138 Main Street
DE:	N/A
Description:	The proposal is for a six-storey (28.3 m/78') mixed-use building with commercial at grade and residential above (51 dwelling units), over three levels of underground parking (including 68 commercial parking spaces, 54 residential parking spaces, and 82 bicycle spaces), with a floor space ratio (FSR) of 3.0. This application is being considered under the Mount Pleasant Community Plan.
Zoning:	IC-2 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Proscenium Architecture (Hugh Cochlin)
Owner:	Chand Development Ltd.
Delegation:	Hugh Cochlin, Proscenium Architecture Bruce Gauthier, Enns Gauthier Dave Chand, Chand Development Ltd.
Staff:	Joyce Uyesugi & Allan Moorey

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (5-1)

- **Introduction:** Joyce Uyesugi, Rezoning Planner, introduced the project as a rezoning application, for a site in Mount Pleasant, in the Lower Main subarea. The site is located on the east side of Main Street between 5th and 6th Avenue and currently holds a mix of one- and two-storey buildings.

The adjacent zoning to the east is IC-3, which allows a maximum of 3.0 FSR and 60 ft. in height. On the rest of the block, at 6th Avenue, is the heritage Ashnola Apartments building. Between this building and the subject site is a one-storey building.

The proposal is to redevelop the site as a six-storey mixed-use building, with a commercial podium and five storeys of residential above. The unit mix would be one, two, and three-bedroom units, with a total of 51 units. The proposed density is 3.0 FSR, and the proposed height is approximately 70 ft. at either end. There are also 2½ levels of underground parking being proposed.

Applicable policies for this site are the Mount Pleasant Community Plan and the Lower Main Urban Design Framework. The Urban Design Framework anticipates mixed-use development of up to six-storeys, and 3.0 FSR for this site. That same policy guidance also applies to the west side of Main Street, between 3rd and 6th Avenue, with slightly higher provisions for height and density on the block between 6th and 7th Avenue.

One of the key principles in the Urban Design Framework is for buildings to respond to Mount Pleasant's Hilltown identity. This means that buildings should work with the natural slope along this section of Main Street to create a hilltown perspective as you move up the slope toward the heart of the community.

The site is located within a view cone, which starts at 6th Avenue. The view is northward toward the mountains, on the east side of Main Street. Of all the sites in Lower Main within the view cone this site is probably the most constrained, and has to limit heights fronting onto Main Street because of it.

Allan Moorey, Development Planner, continued by noting that the site slopes 12 ft. down towards Main Street, with an effective cross fall of 14 ft. The site is 23,000 sq. ft.

An 8 ft. setback with an enhanced sidewalk is proposed for Main Street. In the rear along the lane there is a 10 ft. setback.

There is an overhead transformer which affects the built form and orientation of fenestration and openings. The massing presents an oblique angle affording free air and further development opportunity. Per the plan the building terraces with the slopes, and echoes the Main Street image.

To the south the building presents at 68 ft. to the parapet, which is slightly more than is recommended in the Urban Design Framework. However, given the significant slope the height is supported by City staff.

There is a horizontal expression with a recessed corner on Main Street to express the commercial space, and two two-storey townhouse units are proposed for the corner. There are also 2 ½ levels of underground parking, with loading and utility in southeast corner.

Planters are proposed along the lane to enhance the pedestrian experience. Above is an expansive roof deck with an amenity room, common-access outdoor space, and patio space which is suitable for restaurant use is separated by a planting buffer.

The double-loaded slab form allows for good solar penetration.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

1. Could the panel comment on the interface between the proposed south building face and future development to the south?

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team introduced the project by noting that City staff have asked that the parkade have the ability to expand. The cues for the building massing were taken from the Urban Design Framework and trying to be a good neighbour, in conjunction with the view cone lines. Careful consideration was given to the shadow impacts on the neighbours. As well, to respect the fabric of the heritage building the massing was pulled back to create better daylighting between the buildings.

An opportunity to create a public space for the community was created by eroding the corner. To activate 5th Avenue two townhouses were brought in which open onto the lane. The lane is an important pedestrian route, so careful consideration was given to it. The transformer is part of the neighbourhood character, and so was taken into account with the form. The idea of the massing was to extend the cantilever over the retail podium, and to create an expression using a stepping and undulation pattern.

The idea of the landscape was to break up the massing and repetition of Main Street. Planters which people can sit on are used to animate the Main Street space and make it more friendly and attractive to the public.

Cast concrete is used for the paving at the street, and the applicants hope to be able to use a bold expression. The townhomes are used to create a front door/stoop effect on the quieter side of the street.

At the roof, by having the building on an angle there is space to let the planting grow up and blur the definition between the planters and the amenity.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - Design development to reduce ceiling heights to bring the building height down;
 - Design development to strengthen the juxtaposition of the geometries;
 - Explore using an unexpected top to add to the quirkiness of the building;

- Develop the angles at the north and south end of the bar to more strongly express the geometry;
 - Consider moving the bar slightly to the west to be more neighbourly to the east;
 - Add more solid wall and bring the geometry down to reinforce the streetscape; Recognize more flexible programming in the design of the townhouses on the lane to provide better animation;
 - Maximize landscape and minimize loading impacts in the lane;
- **Related Commentary:** The panel generally supported the density of the project. However, some panel members thought that the building was a bit too high and that it needs to be scaled down in order to be neighbourly. In addition, the 14 ft. cross-fall could be expressed with a stronger shift in the massing.

While the big moves of the building seem solid, the mass of the superstructure needs refinement. It is fine to hug the viewcone, but the form has not gone far enough. There are opportunities to strengthen and celebrate the opposing geometries. There is room for development when exploring how the two geometries work in the upper massing. At the north side the building disintegrates a bit, and there is an opportunity for the top units at the south end to open up into the patio space. This would allow the ceilings to be raised and create a better silhouette. Overall, more work needs to be done with the geometries to make something really wonderful.

There could be a wall to the north which would strengthen the streetwall. There might be a café up top, and a wall would also provide an acoustic buffer to the street.

Design development is needed to minimize the loading impacts and maximize the greenspace along the lane.

The townhouses to the north seem orphaned; the programming for these needs to be rethought and made more flexible. Additionally, the townhouses could do more to respect the really strong live/work character along 5th Avenue.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team noted that the comments were all very valid. The massing will be explored more, but it is important to think about how the density will be added back in if the north and south masses are played with.

3. Address: 8570 Rivergrass Drive (EFL Parcel 20/21)
DE: DP-2016-00090
Description: To construct two 16-storey residential buildings with a six-storey podium (376 dwelling units) over two levels of underground parking accessed off the mews.
- Zoning: CD-1
Application Status: Complete Development Application
Review: First
Architect: Yamamoto Architecture (Taizo Yamamoto)
Owner: Wesgroup
Delegation: Taizo Yamamoto, Yamamoto Architecture
Jennifer Stamp, Durante Kreuk
Brad Jones, Wesgroup
Beau Jarvis, Wesgroup
- Staff: Allan Moorey
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (7-0)

- **Introduction:** Allan Moorey, Development Planner, introduced the project as a DE application which is part of the build-out of the East Fraser Lands Site parcels 20 and 21. Consideration for this application should be given to the isometric 3D and storey height of the surrounding context.

Parcels 20 and 21 are located on the eastern edge of the River District. The site is bounded by Marine Way to the north, a future park (Avalon Park) to the east, Sawmill Crescent to the northwest and North Cape Avenue along the south.

The guidelines call for a high exposure on all frontages, and additional guidelines call for a dignified character appropriate to the site. Mr. Moorey went over additional aspects drawn from the guidelines including setback prescriptions, form, character, overlook and configuration. There was also a requirement called for a large courtyard with opportunities for planting.

During development a number of moves impacted the site boundaries. A greater radius was required along Sawmill Crescent which took a significant bite out of the site.

There is an allowance within the Official Development Plan (ODP) for density transfers between parcels, so 15,000 sq. ft. was transferred from parcel 43 to this site. That resulted in an additional storey in height being added to one of the buildings, and an additional six storeys being added to the tower.

On the site two 16-storey elements exist. The building adjacent to the park drops to a 14 ft. shoulder, which alleviates some of the shadow impact on the park, and a four-storey podium is between the two buildings.

The site is irregularly shaped with a 135 ft. frontage along the north edge, 225 ft. along the west edge, and 255 ft. along Kent Avenue. There are two-storey townhouse units along Kent Avenue, and single-storey unit access off a public walkway provided along the western edge of the water element for Avalon Park. On the western edge there is a 6 ½ ft. setback to allow for buffer planting. A more expansive setback of 16ft. is afforded along the eastern face.

The elevated courtyard at the centre allows for pedestrian and auto access off of Rivergrass Drive into an auto court below, which is hemmed by parking and townhouse units. An opening to the plaza at the elevated level allows sunlight into the courtyard and mews, and facilitates north to south movement across the elevated courtyard.

There is 90 ft. being provided between the two primary towers, and 35 ft. between buildings.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

1. Could the panel comment on the effectiveness of the proposed pedestrian link between Rivergrass Drive and Avalon Park?
 2. Could the panel comment on the relocations of the two residential towers from that illustrated in the ODP?
 3. Could the panel comment on the clarity of the onsite public access that provides unit entry along the western edge of the Avalon water feature?
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team started by highlighting the revisions to the plans with respect to the guidelines. After a section of the site was lost to the road a pinch point was created, so the tower was shifted towards the south moving the towers and apartments further away from the road. This created a more interesting relationship between the two towers. The height is largely a result of a density transfer, which was reduced.

Another change from the guidelines was the raised courtyard. It was supposed to be all at grade without covered, but the proposal is to create a decked level of parking which allows all of the units facing the court to look into a greenspace. It also allows for good solar penetration as the 'ground' is now higher relative to the enclosing walls.

There are very different frontages all the way around the site. The one to the east was an interesting opportunity for a large-scale element and gesture. On the west side there is more of an urban character to the streetwall, and to the south there is a linear series of open spaces which front towards a future development.

On the eastern frontage the approach was to do things which simple gestures at a larger scale which read well with the foreground of the park, with the buildings as a backdrop. Since the eastern frontage is a gateway to the site it attempts to refer to the heritage and history of the site through simple forms, punched windows and industrial materials. A grid of Glulam timbers is also being proposed which speak to the mill heritage of the site in a modern context. The west has a warmer material palate with brick, transitioning to a metal panel.

There are wood-frames, but only at the first level as they ties into the concrete.

On the south façade verticality and slenderness have been emphasized, and a small skyline has been created through staggered planes. Where the form ties into the ground it reads as strong and clear to further emphasize the verticality.

The mews was an interesting challenge due to the elevation changes. An approach was taken to create open space and planting which brings people's eyes up into the space connecting the upper and lower levels. The bridges which connect the internal courtyards are meant to connect the spaces and merge them all into one. Thus landscaping and amenity spaces are brought up into the tower to experience the views.

The window to wall ration on the tower has been brought down to 46%, and thermal bridging has been minimized. Large balconies are used to provide shading on the south and west sides.

On the interior of the towers the space is kept clean and uncluttered to keep it readable and singular.

With landscaping, the north and south corners of the park are being extended into the property to provide a 'public' feeling. A 5 ft. wide walkway provides access to the units which face the park, and a rain garden infiltration trench along the park property with a bridge connection through to the mews.

At the mews the paving pattern has been differentiated for pedestrians and cars, but at points they are combined in a Granville Island model with a pedestrian hierarchy. The landscape from the podium folds down into the mews to open up the mews and provide places for people to linger. A lot of amenities are tucked into the spaces around the mews to provide good oversight and glazing of the lobby.

The podium has all the amenities of a single family home, including a place to play and outdoor usage throughout the garden. A water feature has been introduced flowing down to the north as a way to deal with the parking garage and provide white noise. There is also another small water feature which pays homage to the infiltration trench.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

- **Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
 - The pedestrian link could have more definition between the car area; or maybe opened up on the park side with a wider bridge
 - The western towers does not express the shifting as well as the eastern one
 - The 5 f.t walkway would be better if it was wider, and have some stopping points; there could be conflicts between bikes and pedestrians
 - support for access to the raised courtyard (and also for it remaining secure); but it should be more kid-friendly
 - opinion was split on materiality; maybe make the materials less complex but maintain the diversity to consolidate this
 - Maybe reuse the water
- **Related Commentary:** The panel stated that since all of the big moves seem to be done right, the comments are really about the details of the project.

Everyone is fine with the location of the two residential towers. However, on Kent Avenue the two towers sandwich a mid-block building, and this lacks clarity in relation to everything else on the site. In addition, from the east and west the towers appear to be quite busy. Consider editing the finishing a bit to make the project stronger.

The upper level courtyard seems to do nothing in relation to all the other beautiful things, and should be made into another beautiful thing. Part of the courtyard is that it is meant to be intimate, so attention should be paid to ensuring that there is good lighting at night and that there is an intimate relationship with the water. There could also be an opportunity to make the courtyard more kid-friendly or add public art into it. While it would be nice if there were more access points into the courtyard, the panel understands that there may be security issues with this.

The pedestrian link could be a bit wider, and it would be nice if there were more places to stop on the pathway without blocking the flow of traffic. There should also be either another bridge or a bigger bridge.

The panel was split on the material palate. Some members thought that there were too many materials, and some thought that reducing the number of materials might cheapen the development.

One panel member hoped that some of the collected water could be reused.

- **Applicant's Response:** The applicant team noted that they appreciated the comments as they which will improve the project. Luckily they are also working on the park development together with the City.

4. Address:	New St. Paul's Hospital + Health Campus
DE:	N/A
Description:	Workshop to discuss the concept options for the New St. Paul's Hospital and Health Campus site.
Zoning:	I-2 and I-3
Application Status:	Workshop
Review:	First
Architect:	IBI Group (Gavin Blackstock), Perkins + Will (Nathaniel Nacionales)
Owner:	Providence Health Care
Delegation:	Nathaniel Nacionales, Perkins + Will David Thom, IBI Group Cindy Brooke, Providence Health Care Gavin Blackstock, IBI Group
Staff:	Hale Jones-Cox & Patricia St. Michel

EVALUATION: NON-VOTING WORKSHOP

- **Introduction:** Hale Jones-Cox, Policy Planner, and Patricia St. Michel, Development Planner, noted that, as part of the first phase of the policy work, guiding principles were created for the new St. Paul's Hospital. Staff highlighted a few principles that were most relevant to the workshop:
 - Connect the city fabric: Integrate the hospital and health campus into a city-serving street network connecting new and existing streets that form the backbone for development.
 - Integrate the health campus: Organize the new St. Paul's Hospital around well-connected public spaces that integrate into the city and adjacent neighbourhoods.
 - Create healthy open spaces and enhance the urban forest: Health centred approaches to open space design; a variety of public places that foster social interaction and promote wellness; Integrated Rainwater Management Strategy and Urban Forest Strategy.
 - Celebrate Local History and the original shoreline: original False Creek shoreline, First Nations history, nearby Hogan's Alley, industrial history and Great Northern Station that previously occupied the site (building placement and design, public space and public art).
 - Create a Wellness Link: connecting Thornton Park and Trillium as part of the Walk the Line walking and cycling route connecting the Flats with the seawall and False Creek. Walk the Line is emerging as a key organizing and placemaking principle in the Flats planning program. It is intended to link existing and future amenities and workplaces in the Flats and to provide the connections for pedestrians and cyclists currently lacking and is an opportunity to reference the historic shoreline and the role of water and rail on the Flats.
 - Transition in scale and form: Consider public views and respect view cones. Respond to the scale of Pacific Central Station and Main Street with edges that frame Thornton Park. Transition down in form and scale to the existing neighbourhoods to the north and Trillium Park to the east.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

1. Legibility of the front door of new St. Paul's Hospital on Thornton Park.
 2. Relationship of the building at the southwest corner to Pacific Central Station and to the park.
 3. Public realm and open space configurations, including access to sunlight on key streets and public spaces.
 4. East to West permeability and connectivity; accommodating 'Walk the Line' as key organizing and placemaking principle for the Flats.
 5. Scale and massing, including transitions of the western edge of the site in relation to the existing Main Street buildings and of the eastern edge to Trillium Park.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team gave a PowerPoint presentation and summarized the main concepts of that presentation to the panel. The main guiding principles and considerations for the project included community building and site planning, open spaces and public spaces, mobility and connections, and sustainability.

The applicant team presented two concept designs: Concept 1 - "Urban Court" and Concept 2 - "Pedestrian Spine."

The site itself is located in the heart of Vancouver in order to serve all of B.C. It is highly accessible and close to areas with increasing patient needs. It is also less than 3 km away from the current St. Paul's Hospital site on Burrard Street.

Station Street was chosen as it is one of the largest remaining undeveloped sites in Vancouver, and presents a great opportunity to develop a campus of care featuring new integrated care models. Currently the site is a large flat gravel lot with very few site features. Existing adjacent uses include residential, mixed-use and industrial. There are also adjacent parks and sports fields, and the Seawall is located 300 meters to the west.

To enhance mobility the site is well situated in a place with several active public transit connections. The 'Main Street - Science World' Skytrain Station is only a few blocks away, and multiple bus routes serve the area. Bike routes exist along Union and Adanac Streets which connect into Quebec Street going south, and the Seawall going further west. In addition, high pedestrian mobility is achieved through the existence of a myriad of local streets and park pathways, and the Pacific Central Station is nearby which acts as a regional transportation hub. The City of Vancouver requires that access be provided to National Avenue, Gore Avenue and Jackson Avenue, which are all to be redeveloped. The primary ambulance access will be along Malkin Avenue.

The new St. Paul's Hospital will need to adapt and expand into additional expansion space, so the expansion space must be able to accommodate and be adaptable to new care models. Expansion could occur vertically and horizontally. However, vertical expansion is currently limited by an existing view cone and a requirement to transition the height of the buildings to adjacent uses.

The campus will consist of four main blocks: Acute Care and Core Hospital, Ambulatory Care and Outpatient Centre, Mental Health, and Research, Teaching and Learning. Additional Considerations for the site include orchestrating traffic flows and safety, back of house functions, and supporting uses for the buildings.

The applicant team then took questions from the panel.

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

- N/A

- **Related Commentary:** The panel noted that it seems a bit too early to lock down decisions regarding the site configuration as the surrounding urban context seems unclear. Once the other planning uses for the area have been determined it will be easier to determine access points and develop a design around them. The synergy of the buildings and how they work together needs to be the primary design criteria, but it will be interesting to see how the blocks evolve when the building typologies take on further design criteria.

The legibility of the front door is not well dealt with in Concept 2 - "Pedestrian Spine." as elevating the corner building is not enough. There needs to be a strong connection to alternative modes of transit to reward those whom are biking or taking public transit to work. As well, the entry should be very warm and welcoming to Strathcona and the Downtown East-side. Re-arranging the front pavilion and creating more of a courtyard (as seen in Concept 1 - "Urban Court") would help to solve this issue. Getting the front door right is important. The scale of the entry court should be at a pedestrian urban scale (not too large) and consider walking, cycling and transit. Consider using the maximum height in this area to open up the ground plain and allow the front door arrival point to be seen. Consider how Pacific Central Station may also be framed by new development to its south.

There was interest from the panel to ensure public realm and open space configurations provide for adequate sunlight to enter the site and public spaces. Better setbacks and additional space is needed to more appropriately facilitate public realm passages.

The panel discussed the choice in Concept 2 - "Pedestrian Spine" for a main vehicle entry on National Avenue rather than the new arterial alignment of Malkin Avenue. Some members of the panel thought access off the arterial was preferable, while some felt an entry off minor streets preferable.

The panel fully supported the idea for a hotel as an interesting and appropriate use. Consider placing the hotel on the site immediately north of Pacific Central Station. They also noted that it is a lovely idea to have the hospital campus feel like part of the City and not a separated special use island in the city. Consider using public art to promote this feeling.

The composition of the buildings in Concept 1 - "Urban Court" seems to provide an opportunity for pedestrians to move through the site east to west, however the configuration in Concept 2 - "Pedestrian Spine" makes this connection difficult. Members of the panel appreciated the 'walk the line' concept but also noted it should be accommodated in a way that is not detrimental to the hospital's functionality.

Considering the single-family residential uses to the north, the site needs to be low-scale and intimate to reduce shadow impacts.

The site can be understood as three areas with their own design exercises: The inpatient tower and emergency department is most strongly determined by its technical program; the out-patient building, hub and research spaces have slightly more design flexibility; the areas (west of Gore) of office, retail and hotel have the most design flexibility.

Incorporate public art into any +15 connections over streets.

The design should not plan for vertical expansion on top of buildings, but should go to the end height at initial construction.

The design team could consider all of the new Gore Street to be the front door.

The in-patient tower orientation on “Concept 2 - Pedestrian Spine” presents large east and west faces. These will make LEED targets and solar control more challenging.

- **Applicant’s Response:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their commentary.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:21 p.m.