

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: Wednesday, January 20, 2021

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: WebEx

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Alan Davies

Brittany Coughlin (excused from second item)

Adrien Rahbar

Sydney Schwartz

Walter Francl

Jennifer Stamp (excused from first item)

Karenn Krangle

Angela Enman

Margot Long (excused from second item)

Michael Henderson (excused from second item)

REGRETS: Matt Younger
Marie-Odile Marceau
Muneesh Sharma

RECORDING SECRETARY: M.Sem

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 1317 Richards Street and 508 Drake Street
2. 480 Broughton Street

BUSINESS MEETING Following a presentation from Assistant Director, Jason Olinek, Mr. Henderson was elected as the new chair and Ms. Enman elected as vice-chair. The panel then considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address: 1317 Richards Street and 508 Drake Street
Permit No. RZ-2020-00057

Description: To develop a 39-storey mixed-use residential building with 198 social housing units, community space to include a place of worship, early childhood play space, social spaces and reading rooms; all over four levels of underground parking consisting of 53 vehicle spaces and 226 bicycle spaces. The proposed building height is 125.21 m (411 ft.), the total floor area is 16,024 sq. m (172,483 sq. ft.), and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 13.79. This application is being considered under the Affordable Housing Policies.

Application Status: Rezoning application (SHORT)
Review: First
Architect: DA Architects + Planners
Delegation: Zaylin Lalji
Mark Elham
Al Johnson
Peter Kreuk

Staff: Thien Phan & Derek Robinson

EVALUATION: SUPPORT with Recommendations (9 Support)

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Thien Phan, started the presentation of project with a summary of the rezoning proposal.

Staff are bringing forward a rezoning application for a site at 508 Drake and 1317 Richards Street. The application is from Larco on Behalf of MCYH Multigenerational Housing Society and DA Architects. The proposal is for a 39-storey building that contains 100% social housing with 198 units for the residential tower and a podium for community serving functions: including a place of worship and child-minding space. The housing affordability and community serving space is intended to advance city priorities

Senior Development Planner, Paul Cheng gave background information and context on project.

This is a social housing project and it's an example that the panel has seen recently where we've been breeding projects that are over form and height that are beyond what the neighborhood plan or the downtown ODP typically allows.

Our Planning departments have always been able to deliver a highly predictable urban form, and it has been able to do that last 20 or 30 years. Those urban forms are based on one form of development, which was condo development. Since then we have been discovering that condominium ownership is not solving the housing crisis that we have here in the city of Vancouver. We have been developing policies and administrative practices that look to incentivize the building of different tenures that would actually help the housing crisis.

This project represents a unique opportunity on a unique site for social housing. Although the downtown ODP would not consider this site large enough for a tower of condominiums staff are actually coming forward and saying that the site is suitable from a contextual point of view for a tower with social housing. During the inquiry phase, before an application was made staff and the applicant had a lot of discussions about how much of an incentive should staff be allowing for the social housing units - 198 housing units is a lot. There was the possibility of making further relaxations such as allowing the building to incur into one or two view cones, in order to deliver 400 housing units. When we deliberate on those things, the decision from staff's point of view was that the project you see before you was something that we were comfortable in considering with the assurance that it wasn't impending itself on to the public realm or the private realm, in an undue manner.

This is something that we would like UDP to review and see if we can confirm with staff on this, but you will see that that particular floor plate of this building is exceptionally slender, much more slender than what we usually see from a condominium project. For example, there is a little bit of leeway that staff has allowed with respect to allowing a certain amount of the building to go over the typical 12 foot setback, that is required in this particular area.

Rezoning Planner, Thien Phan presented the applicant's video fly through to understand the proposal in as much 3-D as possible in the absence of a physical model that the Panel is used to.

The site is located in Yaletown neighbourhood, at the corner of Drake and Richards streets. We can see the corner site located just off the north side of Granville Street Bridge and its adjacency to other existing development in the existing block and surrounding blocks.

Aerial view here shows the subject site in relation to its surrounding context. We know there are a number of lower buildings and taller towers, ranging from 5 to 43 storeys. Kindred Place, City owned social housing next door, along with Covenant House to the west and two residential strata towers across drake.

This image shows a number of existing projects next to the subject site. We have a five-storey building, covenant house, next to 43 storey strata building.

Currently occupying the site is:

- A two-storey 1972 building as a place of worship for the community next to surface parking.
- Frontage of 100 ft. on Richards.

This will be 100% social and 100% community serving spaces.

- The four-storey podium provides space for community use: a place of worship, a learning centre, early childhood development space, a social room and a café to serve the community.
- We have two outdoor amenity spaces.
- Above this is the social housing portion on levels 5-39 for 198 units of 100% social housing.
- Four levels of underground parking is proposed for 43 vehicle spaces, 209 Class A and 17 Class B bike spaces
- Floor area is 165,000 sq. ft. for an FSR of 13.79

This slide lists the relevant policies that guide this project. The enabling policy is the Downtown Official Development plan that sets out provisions for a rezoning.

Map shown here locates the site within the Plan in a sub-area referred to as New Yaletown.

Downtown South ODP identifies a number of small sites in DT South, this is one, given its site dimensions. These sites are considered opportunities for social housing. Small sites also have to meet a number of urban design and public realm requirements – for instance, to ensure privacy and livability in the proposal and for adjacent towers, along with preserving sunlight onto key open spaces, such as Emery Barnes Park.

- Site-specific rezoning can be considered in Downtown South up to view cones should the proposal offer public benefits
- Redevelopment of small sites in Downtown South can go beyond the base zoning if a min. 2/3 of the floor area is social housing.

That said, rezonings are allowed to proceed under the Affordable Housing Policies (1991), a policy set forth to expand housing opportunities for low and moderate-income households.

We also have view cones that intersect the site, limiting the tower to its existing proposal, and other built form considerations for livability and privacy for residents.

Site is a podium with a residential tower; slender tower of 3,600 sq. ft. which is much narrower than typical residential towers downtown or citywide. 8.5 ft. floor to floor.

- L1 Entry and Lobby with a café
- L2: Place of worship with higher ceilings and mezzanine with a reading room

- L3: social room for gathering
- L4: Library, early learning spaces
- Tower: Main entry off Drake and dedicated bike elevator
- L5-39: social housing with outdoor space
- L40: rooftop garden

Housing Mix and unit size:

Applicant has to work with a narrow, triangular shaped tower to generate 198 units of social housing. Majority of units are studios (48%) and 1-bed units (42%) with a range of unit sizes depending on the type of unit. The applicant has expressed the units will be geared towards seniors and people living with disabilities.

The ODP requires at least 2/3 of all units to be social housing. The applicant is exceeding that, providing 100% of the units to be social housing.

Development Planner, Derek Robinson, presented the expectations of the built-form guidelines. He then gave a brief description of the proposed project before concluding with staff questions for the Panel.

Under the existing ODP zoning, projects which include a two-thirds social housing component can be considered for a height up to 120 ft. and 5.5 FSR. In addition, we can see examples of this form on the adjacent site next door, known as Kindred place as well as across the lane at Karis Place.

The subject site is one of several remaining small sites within DT south, and has a frontage of 100 ft. with a depth of 120 ft. The site does not meet the frontage or area requirements for additional tower height and density under the ODP. Staff are considering a tower on this site only because the not-for-profit applicant is proposing a project that meets the City's definition of Social Housing.

I'll ask that the Panel consider whether the site can support a tower proposal up to 300 feet with additional height up to the underside of the Queen Elizabeth Park view cone, for a total proposed height of approximately 411 ft.

As mentioned, the site is further impeded by view cones B1/C1. This results in a tower massing made up of three distinct forms consisting of an 80 ft. podium with institutional and cultural uses, a lower tower cube which not impacted by view cones and the upper triangular tower expression.

This image shows the B1 view corridor from Charleston Park across False Creek to the north shore, including the top of the Lions.

Due to the view cone impacts on this small site, a number of relaxations are required in order to site a viable Social Housing tower at this location.

The average proposed tower floor plate is approximately 3800 sq. ft. The recommended tower floor plate in the Downtown South guidelines for sites with the minimum required tower frontage is a 3500 sq. ft. floor plate, when seeking the maximum permitted height. Regardless, the resultant triangular floor plate will read as having a slender profile, particularly when viewed from the south or west.

The proposed upper tower dimensions are approximately 72 ft. along Richards St and 90 ft. + balcony along Drake St. The guidelines outline a maximum linear tower dimension of 90 ft. and noting '*Where the maximum tower width is utilized, sculpting of the uppermost one third of the tower becomes even more important.*'

The proposal respects all three applicable view cones and provides a minimum tower separation from all existing adjacent towers, including approximately 84 ft. from the Oscar across Drake St and 80 to 84 ft. from the Peter Wall tower across Richards St.

The guidelines note, '*that on sites affected by approved view cones, variation from the setback guidelines may be considered subject to livability standards, with the exception of the 12 foot front yard setbacks in New Yaletown, which are dedicated to the public realm.*'

A rear setback of 10 ft. reduced from 30 ft. above the podium is proposed - this restricts the ability to provide 80 ft. separation from a future tower west across the lane, however a future tower across the lane is currently not possible, as the site is fully restricted by the B1 view cone.

With regard to the interface with adjacent development at Kindred Place, while no specific interior side yards are required up to 70 ft. in height, building massing is expected to maintain a neighbourly relationship to adjacent development sites, taking into account both the existing and potential future conditions. Above 70 ft. in height, a 40 ft. setback is expected, while a 32 ft. setback is provided.

This image shows the fold in the south podium facade of the Place of Worship space that is responding to the existing adjacent residential windows, intended to allow for additional light and air along with decorative privacy screening. Note this a residential to institutional interface and the proposed setback distance varies from approximately 8 to 20 ft. moving up the angled facade. Above the podium is a setback distance of approximately 40 ft. to the existing residential windows for the lower portion of the proposed tower, which sits beneath view cone B1/C1.

On the right of this slide is the floor plan for Kindred Place, which is a development of 87 Supportive Housing self-contained studio units. There is 1 unit per floor that has only a north aspect, looking towards the proposed angled podium facade.

The project provides balconies for approximately 62 of the 198 proposed units. These balconies are located at two points on the triangular tower plate serving mostly 1 and 2 bedroom units and they are used as an accent feature within the tower composition proposed to be shaded using vertical decorative screening.

There are ten 3-bedroom units facing the lane within the lower tower that are not provided private outdoor space. While Council has not recently approved any large towers in this area that are 100% Social Housing, recent nearby inclusionary tower projects do provide balconies for Social Housing units. In general, staff typically seek balconies for family units in social housing projects, with consideration for Juliet balconies on studios and 1 bedroom units, with an expectation of enhanced common amenity areas to be provided.

As noted previously, this subarea of downtown south requires 12 ft. public realm setbacks along Richards and Drake streets. The applicant is proposing to cantilever 6 ft. over the public realm for portions of the tower above 80 ft. in height along both street frontages. Staff are seeking the panel's input on any perceived impacts of this cantilevering and any possible mitigation strategies.

Shadow studies are provided on page 15 of the panel booklet, outlining equinox (and summer solstice) shadows between 10am and 4pm, as required in the guidelines.

Morning equinox shadows fall primarily on Drake St while afternoon shadows fall on the north side of the 1200 block of Richards St. Initial review of the shadow studies indicate that no net new shadow is cast on Emily Barnes Park during either equinox.

Amenity spaces for residents are provided both on level 10 including two indoor amenity rooms leading to a roof top terrace as well as a further roof top terrace on level 40.

The applicant team can outline the overall open space and public realm strategy, while I will just note at grade a second row of trees is proposed along the back Blvd. that is outlined in the guidelines.

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

Height and massing

In considering this site for a tower typology, staff note the following:

- 100% of the proposed residential space will meet the City's definition of Social Housing;
- The ODP does not typically permit a tower typology on small sites with a frontage of less than 175 ft. to ensure a 70 ft. street wall podium is also achieved;
- The adjacent Kindred Place developed social housing under the ODP at approximately 120 ft. height and 5.5 FSR;

- A 6 ft. cantilever into the required 12 ft. public realm setback is proposed (above 80 ft.) along both street frontages;
- 80 ft. tower separation from all existing towers is achieved;
- The resultant triangular floor plate presents a slender profile, despite being larger than the 3500 sq. ft. called for in the guidelines

Given these considerations, and with the understanding that the delivery of Social Housing may require some compromises to the urban forms intended in the ODP, please comment on:

The urban design response developed for this site and its relationship within the context of Downtown South.

How the proposal compares to the more typical tower/podium strata residential typology that underlies the original intent of the ODP.

Neighbourliness/livability

Does the panel support the proposed response with regard to livability, in particular the interface with Kindred Place, the proposed reduced rear setback and limited provision of balconies?

Public realm, open space and landscape strategies

Does the panel support the proposed public realm interface, including the tower cantilever over Drake and Richards streets?

Does the proposal achieve adequate legibility, permeability and porosity at grade?

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Zaylin Lalji presented on behalf of Larco.

Larco is a representative agent and project manager for MCYH and MCYH is the developer and a registered charitable organization that plans to operate low market residential accommodation support residential facilities to seniors, families, adult individuals who are of low income or in need in Canada. We are excited about this project and hope that it will serve as a model for delivering housing to those in need, in urban areas around the globe. The project offers an opportunity to deliver substantial scale of social housing quickly in line with the City of Vancouver's objectives, leveraging our experience for this 100% nonprofit project development will provide a variety of options for families and individuals, as well as cultural, social and educational spaces for the community. We hope that it will be a best in class, urban mixed-use project where people can convene in a number of ways, including socializing learning, praying, living and supporting each other. It will also facilitate a multi-generational context, allowing for young professionals, families, parents and grandparents, to have a better quality of life through close proximity of habitation and activities. We have worked closely with staff, over the past few years to prepare an application package, that is in line with the

city's policies regulations and below market housing guidance, we would really like to express our gratitude to staff for their involvement and support as we together create a purposeful unique viable and beautiful project for your consideration.

Al Johnson, Partner at DA Architects + Planners presented.

Thanks very much for a very detailed presentation from the city.

The driving force behind the development of the form really has to do with the site influences. It was mentioned that the view coming from the south side of False Creek, really did start to affect the site. In addition, with that, started to dictate what the height of the podium would be adjacent to the tower itself.

The setback along both Richards and Drake, being the 12 foot setback. And it was mentioned by Derek, that we are encroaching into that setback by about six feet, and you can see just generally looking at the plan, This six feet is very important for the viability of what is incredibly small floorplate about 3500 square feet. So this area is important to the viability of the, of the plants themselves.

Regarding, the podium scale and the relationship with the surrounding buildings. This is the conventional tower and podium topology. We want you to recognize that it is surrounded by a series of low and mid-rise buildings. So for example, this is a corner of Richardson Drake, you can see the relationship of the, of the multi mixed use development on the lower portion of the project, and then the tower up above. What we've done as we set up this this podium is a strong relationship to the adjacent Covenant House, moving towards Granville Street. As a form of massing, deliberately trying to break down the scale of the development at a pedestrian scale but relating to this corner height, which ties the project into the surrounding neighborhood.

At Drake Street, the sculpting of the tower, what became evident was the importance of this mixed-use development at the ground plane and the relationship to Kindred Place to the west. There is an approach to stepping the building back and providing terracing, which works with both the height constraint of the view cone and illustrates the six-foot cantilever into the 12-foot setback. While we do cantilever into this setback, we fully acknowledge the fact that we do have a 12-foot setback for the lower portions of the building. In addition, this dimension from streetscape up to the underside of the soffit is between 70 and 80 feet so depending on the slope of the site; And so there is no impact on the pedestrian experience or the viability of providing planting on those lower levels. This section shows the significance of an interconnected stair on the corner, which is kind of the public face of the mixed-use facility itself, which ties in with the amenity on the upper floors.

This is a brief analysis that we did with Kindred Place. We did meet with the executives of the, of the development right next door because we knew that there would be some concerns, potentially with the interface with our building and in the Kindred Place itself. Therefore, this essentially illustrates the amenity, which is located on level three. In addition, as you move up

the plan is a series of units of which one unit per floor on levels 3-7. There is an interface there with, with the living room of the adjacent unit; otherwise North and South do have living spaces that front on to the other the lane or the street. We did work closely with the neighbors, and they did provide a letter of support for this project based on the design and this did allow us to rather develop the design in more detail.

Lastly, really the character and materials, and what became apparent when we were looking at was the viability and the detail of the ground plane and its relationship to the lower levels of the development. We have used devices to create depths and interest to the facade. This represents the six-foot overhang. Therefore, what we've done is we've broken down the elevation to a series of solids and voids. We accentuated the glass façade. The mixed use development is the entry into the residential and then because of the location of the elevator core itself we've worked with structural and created a series of glass openings in this staircase, which creates a little bit of a again pattern of lantern at night when viewed from outside.

We have used a series of screens - punched metal screen device, which does create an anchor of the main public facade on the corner, it does create levels of privacy as one moves through the building depending on the interior spaces. We have deliberately pulled back the screens to allow accentuating the depth between what are the solid elements and thinner screen elements.

The tower itself is a very simple repetitive vertically- series of vertical metal panels spandrel glass. We have used these screened devices as a kind of a layering effect, which would be at the corner balconies or recessed Juliet balconies on each end. . We are envisioning a stone like material, potential limestone.

Peter Kreuk presented on the landscape for this project.

From a landscape perspective, we are still at the zoning stage. Therefore, the ground plane primarily is responding to the downtown south guidelines and that involves the street trees. The site plan here shows how that works with the bike storage the various entrances and exits and the lobby entrance off Richards and Drake St frontage. The building has a series of roof decks. As the building steps back on each one of those, we're going to be working as we go through the process with the user groups to program those spaces. We have a combination of an outdoor play space for early learning contemplated garden, which is on the podium. Then on the next step back, we will have some further amenity for the residences and that includes kid's outdoor play. There will be probably an outdoor harvest table, barbecue area for socialization. Then on the very top of the building, we're going to have some urban agriculture and a place for gathering. We are going to be working through with our user groups to program all those spaces as we go through the DP process.

The staff and 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. ENMAN** and seconded by **MR. FRANCL** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **Support with Recommendations** the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- Further development of the urban realm, particularly decreasing the formalness and looking for additional ways to provide porosity into the building from the streetscape
- Further develop the west façade where directly adjacent to Kindred Place to develop screening or approach
- consider additional balconies or shading measures to provide increased livability
- Consider additional amenity space on level 10
- Further develop and define livability of the suites

Related Commentary:

- Panel noted the language of this building speaks in terms of the podium, the sort of the super subtle references on that podium level to the screening are appropriate given, given the uses behind it.
- Panel noted the porosity of the podium, as seen from the street is relatively poor. The stair core and elevator core which is the seismic mass that this whole building is tied to comes down right on to the Drake St facade, would welcome if there was another opportunity to, add a feature to it that that was glazed display or something that gave a sense of porosity along that landscaped facade.
- Panel suggest getting the café to have more of a presence on the street to help with more activation.
- Panel member noted given it is a place of worship would have expected to see a little bit more of a sort of spillover space outside of the lobby.
- Panel noted the encumbering of the central suite that has nothing but a north exposure but acknowledged applicant has done a good job of mitigating the impact on that neighbour.
- Panel suggested on the west façade to add some solar screening or something to enliven that façade to mitigate the solar gain on that side.

- Panel noted it is important to provide cooling from a livability standpoint to these suites given the small size there.
- Panel suggested having some bigger operable windows or at least Juliet balconies or to have access to the outside. In addition, along the same lanes Panel suggest incorporating some shading, to help control solar gains there.
- Panel supports the amenity spaces.
- Panel in general supports height and massing
- Panel member suggest exploring an alternate façade on the podium adjacent to Kindred Place, possibly integrate a vertical landscape or something to help soften that façade to make for a nice view from those units that are compromised.
- Panel member suggested in terms of livability to consider providing some larger units that can be made livable rather than all tiny studios that have a two-meter corridor for the entire unit.
- Panel member suggest looking at incorporating some shading to reduce solar heat gain and risk of overheating in the units particularly Southwest facing units
- Panel suggests relocating the building entrance on the corner of Drake and Richards, to be more of a dialogue with the other buildings at that intersection and to help provide more activation there.
- Regarding livability of suites, Panel suggest further develop and define livability of the suites.
- Some Panel members suggest Juliet balconies for units.
- Some Panel members noted with so many units on the site it would be nice to have more amenity, suggest making the entire 10th floor all amenity space.
- Some Panel members suggesting adding an additional second row of street trees adjacent to the lane so that there is some green supporting the environment.
- Panel members suggest at the next phase to reflect the culture of the worship centre because the legibility important to a significant landmark building.
- Panel noted there seems to be very challenging corner problems and narrow spaces.
- Regarding the west façade, Panel encourage the applicant to look at the screens of those balconies. Panel noted, the balconies provide a great opportunity to open up views and reduce the mass, and the screens may both impede views out from the balconies and just extend the massing impact of that facade.
- Panel supports the cantilever.
- Panel noted the transition from the tower forum to the base could be handled better. Panel encourage the applicant to look at ways to bring that cantilever down, or to mitigate the impact of this very strong datum where the tower ends and then the social programming very quickly begins.
- Regarding the core, Panel member noted the parking limits many architectural possibilities. Panel suggest that if the core were rotated slightly to the angle façade, there would not be any parking restrictions down below if the parking was eased up and will liberate the suites and potentially give more moves to those plans.
- Panel member on the public realm, appreciates the wide sidewalk on Drake Street.

- Panel member encourage the design team to look at the landscape to play a more active role with benches and seating areas and to make it more of a gathering area. Currently it looks too formal.
- Panel member noted on the public realm there could be more formality change in grade and more seating area. The entry compressed landing that's on Richard St and the stairs leading up to it could be reduced down to grade and provide a more inviting entrance at grade which would be more sympathetic to the building to the south.
- Panel member suggested adding balconies to the lane side.

Applicant Response: The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.

2. Address: 480 Broughton Street
Permit No. DP-2020-00849
Description: To develop the site with an 11-storey mixed-use building containing 60 social housing units, a 340-student elementary school, and a 65-space childcare centre. The proposed building will be connected to the Coal Harbour Community Centre and open space, which are retained. Parking to be provided in the existing parkade, supplemented by an underground level for building services and bicycle storage in the proposed building. The proposed building height is 38.86 m (127.9 ft.), the proposed floor area is 10,645 sq. m (114,582 sq. ft.), and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 0.89. The building is designed for certification under the Passive House and LEED Gold standards.
- Application Status: Complete Development Application (SHORT)
Review: First
Architect: Henriquez Partners Architects
Delegation: Richard Henriquez
Stuart Hood, Integral – Mechanical Engineer
Neal Peacocke, Bunt – Traffic Engineer
Shawn Lapointe, Henriquez Partners Architects
Robyn Gibson, PFS Landscape Architects
- Staff: Sailen Black
-

EVALUATION: Support with No Recommendations: (7 Support)**• Introduction:**

Development Planner, Sailen Black introduced the proposal as a complete development permit application for an 11-storey, mixed-use building, which includes:

- 60 social housing units, a 340-student elementary school and a 65-space childcare centre
- A proposed height of 38.86 m (127.49 ft.)
- A floor space ratio of 0.89 (10,645 m² / 114,582 ft.)
- Parking in the existing Coal Harbour Community Centre
- A design for certification under the Passive House and LEED Gold standards

The immediate context to the east, south and west has all been rezoned for high density residential towers, with the exception of the Waterfall building to the southeast which remains in the Downtown zoning. Coal Harbour Marina, also a rezoned site, is to the north.

The proposed uses are allowed under the site's existing zoning, CD-1 (365). The development was generally anticipated in the Master Plan for the site, which was a part of the Preliminary Development Permit issued in 1998, and in the Marina guidelines that were amended in 2000. That Preliminary Development Plan or PDP, and its Master Plan, covers the area between Hastings, Jarvis and Broughton. The mix of uses established in the PDP was comprised of the Community Centre, the Park and underground parking in Phase 1, and the Elementary School, Childcare and Non-market Housing in Phase 2. The proposed building is intended to complete Phase 2.

In terms of the City process, the design of the building is a part of a complete permit application that requires a decision of the Development Permit Board, which will include consideration of Panel comments. A separate amendment to the CD-1 zoning for the regulatory changes will require a decision by Council. The main regulatory differences from 1998 to the current proposal are increases in the number of Dwelling Units from 40 to 60 units, the residential floor area from 4,170 m² to 5,472.7 m², and the maximum height from 30 m to 38.86 m.

The proposed increase in height is the result of both physical changes and calculation methods compared to the original permit. Adding 20 units of Social Housing is the main driver of the proposed increase in floor area and height. The project has also been designed for Passive House and LEED Gold Certification, and achieving these targets adds some floor area and height to the building, primarily for additional insulation and mechanical ducting. The previous Pre-DP included building services and program areas below the flood plain level. All essential building services and program areas, including the gym, are now required to be above the

flood plain level. The height of the building and elevation of Level 1 has been raised slightly in response to flood plain and sea level changes, increasing the elevation of Level 1 from 4.5 m to 4.8 m.

The City's method for calculating Building Height has also changed from the original development permit, and the new methodology results in a sloped Base Plane elevation that is lower at the critical point. In addition, the top level now includes amenity space next to the original mechanical room, which must be included in the technical calculation of height, where the original mechanical room was not.

The net result of all these changes to the design and calculation methods is that while the by-law or technical height has increased by 8.86 m compared to the current by-law, the physical height of the structure is has increased by 4.09 m. In other words, the proposed structure is about 13.4 feet higher than the original development permit.

In terms of nearby buildings, the proposed height is approximately half the height of the four nearest residential buildings. The top of the amenity room comes to somewhere between level 12 and 14 in these neighbours, which range in height from 20 to 30 floors. The wider built context in this part of the downtown is predominately residential towers. Immediately to the north of the site are the seawall and marina, with Coal Harbour beyond. The site is currently a surface parking lot at the foot of Broughton Street.

The proposed design is an interlocking combination of school, childcare and housing uses. The access points shown on the building's program diagram are for pedestrians. Vehicle access to the parkade remains from Jervis Street, and there is no vehicle entry into the building from Broughton. The parkade contains a loading dock for the school; garbage and recycling rooms; and childcare drop off.

The first three levels at the podium include a 340-student, 14-classroom Elementary School with associated Gymnasium, Library and Multi-Purpose Room. The main entrances to the school and residential areas are at Level 1, providing pedestrian access from Broughton Street. A second access at Level 2 connects the school directly to Coal Harbour Park on the roof of the existing Community Centre, which will function as the school's play area while remaining accessible to the public as part of Coal Harbour Park. Access to the Community Centre from the seawall is maintained.

These two levels have a relatively complex set of connections, which must successfully mediate between institutional and residential uses, while maintaining the amenity and quality of the public realm. Classrooms on level 3 also have access to park level via an outdoor deck. Six levels of Social Housing will be provided from Levels 5 to 10, with a focus on larger units for families with children. Direct access roof decks are provided for the accessible dwelling units at Level 5.

The rooftop provides views of the park, water and mountains, and a shared amenity room for social interaction for the building residents, both of which help contribute to the livability of the proposed design for its future residents. The applicants also note that a key decision that

has informed the design approach is the decision to provide Juliette Balconies and generous shared open space in lieu of traditional type private balconies.

The applicant has provided shadow studies for standard hours in this area. At the Autumn equinox the most significant incremental impact is to the seawall. Due to existing towers to the south, there is no incremental impact to the green space of Coal Harbour Park on this day. Due to its height, the proposal does not affect Council approved view cones. The form of development is intended to maintain the public view from the end of Broughton Street to Coal Harbour and the North Shore beyond.

The building will affect some private views depending on their location and height. It is not expected to affect private views above 43.6 m in geodetic elevation.

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

1. Is the built form in general, including the proposed height increase, compatible with its unique surroundings:
 - a. the residential context of towers to the south, west and east
 - b. the civic context of the seawall, community centre and park space?
2. Does the design of the lower levels create a successful interface to the public realm at grade along Broughton Street, the seawall and park?
3. Is the design successful in terms of amenity, functionality and livability for its different users?

Comments on other aspects of the architectural and landscape design were also welcomed.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Applicant noted the following:

- This is a very challenging site
- Part of the volume is buried in the ground because the park on the east side is a couple of floors, one large floor above the level on Brown Street. There's a challenge of getting a light down into the east side of the main floor that that can be accommodated by a small atrium right at the entrance.
- The podium contains the school daycare, and the slab building custom residential is located 90 degrees to the water for minimizing the view impact. The actual location of that residential tower is a result of trying to get it to not come down on top of the gymnasium. Putting a tower on top of a space below with a large span is extremely difficult structurally, and that is the thing that sets the location of the residential section
- The building will be precast concrete sandwich panel with insulation in between. In addition, that same treatment occurs in both the tower on the podium.

The staff and 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. Davies** and seconded by **Mr. Francl** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel SUPPORTS the project with no recommendations.

Panel Commentary:

- No issues of increase in height.
- The panel supports the massing and finds the form striking and contrasting to the existing adjacent buildings.
- The low-rise form of the building successfully lifts off the base. The at grade presence amplifies the civic context.
- compatible with the context of the residential towers, and with the Civic and amenities nearby
- The interface with the public realm is very successful. It's been seamlessly integrated into the context.
- In terms of the livability, Panel is supportive of the Juliette balconies and recognizing that there's a high level of amenity space provided for the project.
- Panel commends applicant on the pursuit of passive house
- Panel suggests more can be done on Broughton in terms of seating and waiting area.
- Residential, units looks good, every unit will have good view
- Panel noted Residential, units looks good, every unit will have good view
- Regarding the daycare, Panel noted it is a bit of a hike to get to the elevator.
- Panel appreciates the landscaping on all building frontages
- Panel suggest articulating or differentiating more strongly the school entrance and prime residential entrance on the Broughton façade
- Panel is supportive of the school being built at this location
- Panel noted the project enhances the community centre, blends with park and the school will enliven the area
- Panel commended applicant for a social, sustainable and community services that are provided.
- Panel noted the form is striking, and thoughtful contrast to the context of the tall buildings
- Panel noted the true compatibility lies in the community services and programming provided, which I think will be a great asset to this area
- Regarding the civic context, Panel noted the presence enhances and amplifies the civic context and provides a very gracious face to the public space at ground level.

- Panel noted the project is exemplary in its scope of amenities and provision of the linkages within the building and to the larger community context
- The materiality of the building is evocative.

Applicant Response: The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.