

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: Wednesday June 23, 2021

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: WebEx

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Jennifer Stamp
Brittany Coughlin
Marie-Odile Marceau
Margo Long
Walter Francl
Angela Enman
Michael Henderson

REGRETS: Adrien Rahbar
Karenn Krangle
Marie-Odile Marceau

RECORDING SECRETARY: K. Cermeno

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 901-909 West Broadway
2. 8804 Osler Street
3. 1002 Station Street (New St. Paul's Hospital)

1. Address:	901-909 West Broadway
Permit No.	RZ-2020-00076
Description:	To develop a 12-storey hotel with restaurant use at grade. The hotel includes 147 suites over three levels of underground parking consisting of 62 vehicle spaces and 18 bicycle spaces. The proposed building height is 40.5 m (133 ft.), the floor area is 8,629 sq.m, and floor space ratio is (FSR) 7.95. This application is being considered under the Metro Core Jobs and Economy Land Use Plan.
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Zeidler Architecture
Staff:	Leifka Vissers & Kevin Spaans

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (8/0)

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Leifka Vissers, provided an introduction to the site and the proposal, as follows:

- The subject site is located on the northwest corner of Laurel St and W Broadway with a site area of approximately 1,086 sq.m. The site is currently zoned C-3A;
- A two-storey commercial building currently occupies the site, with a restaurant and a gym as existing commercial tenants;
- Vancouver General Hospital and a number of supporting medical facilities are located to the south;
- The application is for a 12-storey hotel with restaurant at grade, 147 rooms, and a total floor area of 801.5 sq.m. The proposed FSR is 7.95 and the proposed height is 40.5m.

Ms. Vissers then provide the following overview of the regulatory framework governing this proposal:

- The proposal qualifies for consideration under the *Metro Core Jobs and Economy Land Use Plan*;
- The site is also subject to the *Central Area Plan: C-3A Central Broadway Goals and Land Use Policy* designated as "Uptown";
- The surrounding properties are also zones C-3A with FM-1 zoning to the north, and a single RM-3A zoned site nearby.

Senior Development Planner, Kevin Spaans, presented a brief overview of the proposed form of development, first reminding the Panel of the immediate built form context, as follows:

- The Fairview Slopes neighbourhood to the north is primarily defined by 2 to 6 storey commercial and residential buildings;
- Buildings both east and west on W Broadway range from 9 storeys up to the 20 storey Stanzi Building, dating from the early 1960s up to as recent as 2018;
- A rezoning application to replace the existing Park Inn building with two towers at 11 and 13 storeys was approved in January 2020, and;
- The Oak-VGH Millennium Line subway station is located across the street.

Mr. Spaans noted that the Vancouver General Hospital flight path extends across the site, and governs maximum heights in the immediate context. He then explained that the building generally complies with the provision for form and massing in the *C-3A Design Guidelines*, with discretionary variation sought to the westernmost side of the site, where the applicant is proposing a 3 storey interface with the adjacent property rather than the anticipated 2 storeys. As demonstrated in the elevations and perspective renderings, Mr. Spaans noted that the building takes on a simple rectilinear massing which steps to the west when viewed from Broadway, but maintains a more abrupt interface with the properties across the lane to the north. Articulation is provided by way of a basket weave-like modulating panels extending up the façades of the main tower mass above the second level.

Regarding the interface with the public realm, Mr. Spaans noted that the significant grade change from W. Broadway to the lane, coupled with the proposed at-grade parking and loading layout at the rear of the building, results in an inactive façade adjacent the Laurel St. sidewalk. To compensate, the applicant is proposing improvements to the public realm in the form of landscape features and benches, much of which falls outside of the property line. Facing W. Broadway, the applicant is proposing a hotel entry, landscape features, and patio seating intended to contribute to the activity of the street.

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

1. Does the overall form and massing sufficiently respond to the existing context while anticipating upcoming changes to the urban fabric of W Broadway?
2. Does the proposal, including preliminary arrangement of at-grade uses, sufficiently anticipate the changing nature of W Broadway as a high-performing pedestrian-friendly street?
3. Please provide any feedback as it relates to preliminary materiality and architectural expression to inform the Development Permit approvals process.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The applicant team presented the architectural intent of the project, starting by reminding the Panel of the near-compliance with existing policy and that height is impacted significantly by the VGH helicopter flight path. The applicant noted that the objective in the expression of the building is to strongly mark the corner of Laurel St and W Broadway with a pronounced height and presence. Woodgrain panelling is intended to be used in order to give the building a distinctive and recognizable appearance, which masonry is proposed at the ground levels to make for a warm, textural interface with the pedestrian realm.

The applicant noted that the restaurant, café, and hotel-related uses at grade will enhance the energy of the corner, with large windows intended to provide for a high level of visual access from the street. Landscape features are proposed to enhance these interfaces, with a water feature proposed along Laurel St.

As demonstrated by perspectives presented by the applicant team, the backside of the building is intended to be used as a drop off area for hotel guests, as well as a loading area for commercial use. Some upper levels oriented to the lane have limited fenestration because of the presence of mechanical equipment, and brick is proposed to provide for visual interest and warmth. At level 4

there is an outdoor amenity space with views of the downtown skyline and the mountains to the north.

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. FRANCL** and seconded by **MS. STAMP** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORTS** the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City staff:

- Ensure the intent of the public realm along W Broadway St and Laurel St is maintained through the development permit process;
- Consider providing rooftop amenity access or planted roof to the top of the building and level 8;
- Consider alternate location for the level 4 mechanical to provide and enhance amenity space;
- Review the cladding narrative and engage on the cultural references;
- Design Development to reduce the monolithic nature of the west elevation.

Related Commentary:

There was support for the height, density and massing and appreciation for its approach to the public realm, and many panelists noted the form works well and the pattern of the building's architectural expression is warm. Some panelists noted they recognize the limitation imposed by the helicopter flight path.

A consistent concern noted was the Laurel St public realm which, though an appealing prospect as proposed, is at significant risk moving forward because of City of Vancouver Engineering's typical practices regarding improvements to the public realm. Panelists recommended exploring ways to safeguard the intent of these improvements along Laurel St.

The level of intent such as the texture, spaces for breaks, and level of amenities was appreciated.

The panel supported the landscape design as proposed and the recognized the visual openness of the hotel lobby spaces.

There was appreciation for the lane and materiality and openness to the public realm

There was unanimous questioning of the roof deck and rooftop. Many panelists noted that the level 4 amenity rooftop area could be significantly improved with a more intensive program, and that the mechanical units proposed should be reconsidered in order to improve the usability of the space. Panelists further noted that the level 8 rooftop area, which is not proposed to be accessible, is another missed opportunity.

Many panelists felt it is critical that the applicant engage more in the narrative of the façade, and recognize that some indigenous peoples may see the basket-weave expression proposed as being indicative of an indigenous design typology. Some panelists recommended engaging with the local host nations as part of design development.

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

2. Address:	8804 Osler Street
Permit No.	RZ-2021-00007
Description:	To develop a six-storey mixed-used building with 38 strata-titled residential units and commercial uses at grade; all over two levels of underground parking consisting of 59 vehicle parking spaces and 91 bicycle parking spaces. The building height is 24.4 m (80 ft.), the floor area is 4,569 sq. m (49,183 sq. ft.), and the floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.05. This application is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan.
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	DA Architects + Planners
Staff:	Tess Munro & Karen Kallweit-Graham

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations (8/0)

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner Tess Munro, began by noting that this is a rezoning application for one lot at 8804 Osler Street, shown outlined in red. The site is currently zoned MC-1 and occupied by a 2-storey commercial development and surface parking lot. To the south and east of the site is the Coast Vancouver hotel development and to the west is Ebisu Park.

Policy

This application is being considered under the Marpole Community Plan. In this location, the Plan anticipates six-storey buildings, with a mix of uses required at grade, which may include retail, service, cultural and institutional, live-work, or office. The upper stories are to be set back and public realm improvements are expected.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing a six-storey mixed-use building, with 38 strata residential units and commercial space on the ground floor. Indoor/outdoor amenities on located on Levels 2 and 5 and private terraces are on the roof. An FSR of 3.05 is proposed.

Marpole Plan Updates

While staff typically do not bring six-storey buildings to the Panel, the applicant has proposed an FSR of 3.05 to better respond to the form of development guidelines in the Marpole Plan, which exceeds the cap of 2.5 FSR suggested for the choice-of-use areas. As part of the review for this application, Staff are considering increasing the FSR cap in certain choice-of-use areas in the Plan to allow for this increase for other sites with a similar condition. A companion report will be brought to Council for approval prior to this rezoning application going to Public Hearing.

Development Planner, Karen Kallweit-Graham began by noting that the proposal is located in the Lower Hudson neighbourhood of the Marpole Community Plan. She continued by describing the overall vision of the Plan for this neighbourhood as a residential, commercial and cultural centre. She then described the urban design principles for the area, which include enhancements to the public realm and architectural massing such as step backs above the 4th floor, strong continuous street wall and small commercial frontages. Karen then highlighted that the Marpole Plan guidelines consider an FSR up to 2.5 for mixed-use developments in this area, and that Staff are considering additional density to strengthen the commercial space and allow the building to

effectively turn the corner to address both streets. The proposal was then specifically described relative to the Plan's direction.

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

1. The proposed height, density and massing in response to the Marpole Plan built-form guidelines and noting the evolving directions for mixed-use sites in Choice-of-Use areas.
2. Any preliminary advice for consideration at the Development Permit stage. Please consider factors such as building elevations, materiality, quality of public spaces, and sustainability strategies.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The site is in an area that is evolving quite quickly and creating a commercial core.

There is a community park to the east and redevelopment to the south.

The massing is prescriptive. There is a 65 percent setback on the upper floors. The applicant noted they wanted to optimize the amount of open space.

The site is south facing; there is ability to open up large roof terraces to the south.

The residential lobby is on the northeast corner, which a building overhang provided.

There is an outdoor play space at the podium level.

The upper floors have a fitness area and recreation area that spill out to the outdoor open spaces. On Level 5, south facing there are community garden plots and outdoor accessible seating area.

The majority of the units in the building are family oriented; for the most part it is an overall family friendly building.

There are penthouse units that have balconies and private use of the roof terrace with a series of planters and screens.

The material palette is a combination of metal pickets, clear glass; metal panel cladding that is off white and charcoal grey, corrugated metal on back and surface spine to create contrast and some wood panel accents are being used as well.

Access to parking garage to provided from the lane with two levels of underground parking.

On the lane side there is access to outdoor shared amenity spaces.

Commercial uses are provided at grade.

Landscape includes a series of benches at the residential entry, with terrace planting along Osler Street. Level 5 has garden plots and rooftop gardens

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. LONG** and seconded by **MS. ENMAN** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORTS** the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City staff:

- Design development to the building elevations materiality and expression to reflect neighborhood and residential character;
- Consider stepping the floor elevation of CRU 1 so that it removes stair barrier to the sidewalk and to improve access and visual and physical permeability at the public realm;
- Consider improvements to the public realm to improve relationship to Øsler Ebisu Park;
- Improve legibility of the residential lobby;
- Consider public art opportunity at the south property line at the interim condition;
- Improve barrier free access to all areas, specifically the children's play area.

Related Commentary:

The panel noted their support for the massing height and density of the project.

The panel appreciated the quantity and quality of amenity spaces, recognizing that some development of those spaces will be required at development permit stage.

Consider simplification in the architectural language.

A panelist noted that the architectural expression is unfriendly and neighbourliness could be improved.

The massing of the two-story penthouse feels awkward to the street proportionally.

Design development to improve the residential character of the middle of the building would be beneficial.

The panel noted to look at the materiality and some of the texture and layout.

Look at the interim condition of neighbors to the south activating what is a fairly-a blank wall.

Safeguard the quality and exposure of the roof deck from potential neighbors to the south.

The panel suggested further design development of the residential entry to enhance its legibility and presence on the street, needs more clarity.

There were a number of comments of the stepping of the CRUS especially the CRU on Osler Street, recommend looking at opportunities to step that increasing permeability from the sidewalk to the CRU.

There were a number of comments regarding the relationship of building to EbisuPark across the street, look to improve this relationship at the sidewalk level, softening of the building along that edge.

A panelist noted the main elevation would benefit from some greenery.

Consider barrier free access to the children's area and eliminate the high raised planters.

The panel appreciated the materials as presented since this is still at a rezoning level but noted the two principle materials could be warmed up a bit, consider a more accessible character to the neighborhood.

Consider if there is an opportunity to acquire higher sustainability performances for some density, pursue some good sustainability strategies.

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

3. Address: 1002 Station Street (New St. Paul's Hospital)
Permit No. DP-2021-00085
Description: To develop an 11-storey hospital with 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. All over four levels of underground parking consisting of a total of 1,170 parking spaces. The maximum building geodetic building height is 61.31 m (201.1 ft.), the total floor space ratio (FSR) is 3.45 (approximately 119,807 sq. m). The application is being considered under the St. Paul's Hospital and Health Campus Policy Statement and the Rezoning Policy for Sustainable Large Developments.
- Application Status: Complete Development Application
Review: Fifth
Architect: Stantec
Staff: Kevin Spaans & Derek Robinson
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6/0)

- **Introduction:**

Derek Robinson, Development Planner, began by noting this is a resubmission of the first Development Permit (DP) application, referred to as Phase 1a, of the New St Paul's Health Campus (NSPHC). This first DP includes the primary hospital building, Healthcare Boulevard, the majority of the central plaza, and the majority of the Wellness Walk.

A brief background and context was then presented, including the 2017 Policy Statement, the 2019 rezoning approval and the site specific design guidelines for the Campus, intended to serve as a guide for subsequent development permit applications. A brief overview of the proposal was presented, including the hospital building proposed to be approximately 63 m or 206 ft. in height, which is driven by protected public view 22, which covers the majority of the site.

The Panel reviewed the updated masterplan and this original DP submission on April 21, 2021. At that time, staff asked the Panel to provide comments on five topic areas each pertaining to different sections in the Council-approved CD-1 Design Guidelines. Those five topic areas were Architectural Expression, Materiality, Interface with the Public Realm, Circulation and Sustainability. The Panel's consensus summary comments from the minutes of the April 21 meeting were then presented.

It was noted that the scope of this review is to assess the applicant's response to those previous panel comments directly related to the area of Phase 1a only, and the intent is not to introduce new items for revision that were not previously captured in the original review. This is outlined in AIBC Bulletin 65 which notes that discussion and comments should be limited to the items in question from the previous submission. It was also noted that the intent today is not to review any other parcels within the overall NSPHC area. The masterplan and comprehensive public realm plan will be updated in the future and subsequently brought back to the Panel for discussion with the next phase of development.

With that it was noted then that staff had only one question for the Panel's consideration this evening.

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

Has the applicant responded successfully to the panels previous consensus advice related to Phase 1a?

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The applicant noted they completed a series of design workshops with the owner and city staff in order to advance the project.

One of the improvements of the project is the development of the interface with the public realm. The applicant noted they have gone through a series of planning and updates in order to enhance the porosity at grade and successful distribution of different program access points through the site. There are additional access points through the garden and atrium spaces that are open to the public during daylight operation hours.

The real gem of the public realm is the wellness walk. The public realm takes advantage of its adjacent context and it connects to the park. They applicant noted they are working with interpretative and signage planners to activate nodes and points of interests.

The project has added close to 335 trees to the onsite and offsite public realm and the amount of extensive green roofs has also increased.

The project did a total relook at the entrance and its connection to the plaza and public realm and looked at making it more inclusive, considering the narrative of all under one roof.

Elements of house posts and welcome figures were added to the entrances. Wood grain elements were added to all the secondary entrances to create visual markers, create warmth, and contrast. The owners and user engagement groups the applicant is working with have supported the present scale and dominance of the entries.

The applicant noted they have worked to address concerns of the planer nature of the elevations and the dominance of the louvres along the elevations, in addition to the comments of the proposed roofline and how massing was stepping and articulating.

All the elements are reading as volumetric rather than planer. There is a better separation between the tower and podium elements and materiality around the base was adjusted so there is an entirely composite façade, this allowed for more flexibility with the solid wood panel expression.

The applicant noted they are expressing their weave themes more three dimensionally , taking advantage of shade and light reflection. This move simplifies the façade and removes the dominance of the louvres, allowing for variation of the louvres to not come across so monolithic.

The applicant noted they are working with the owner to go through a consultation process with the colour palette, trying to pull on the key themes of the guidelines. They are looking to bring the opportunities for colour and variation to both the base and tower components of the building.

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. MARCEAU** and seconded by **MS. STAMP** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project with the following commentary to be reviewed by City staff.

Related Commentary:

There was appreciation from the panel for the human response of the project.

The panel appreciated the improvements in terms of transparency and legibility that have made the project more successful.

The panel noted their appreciation for the design development around the wellness walk. The wellness walk is a lively feature with its own character but could be pushed further. Explore additional changes in grade.

The panel supported and appreciated the development and legibility of the entrances, especially on the west elevation, including the development of the canopies. Further development of the post and the columns at the base is needed.

The panel noted the attention to sensitivities and toning down of cultural references as the right move.

Several panel members suggested an increase in the amount of glazing, particularly on the west elevation which is still challenging. Develop the expression of the corners so the elevations better relate to one another.

The materiality of the expression of the middle band has improved, however still feels high and long and can be made more friendly.

Materiality could be further simplified and there were concerns noted around metal being the only cladding material used.

The panel noted concerns regarding the roof lines, there is more opportunity that has not been explored.

Suggest revisiting the roof decks to provide substantially more planting that can be seen from patient rooms.

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