

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: November 10, 2021

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Joe Wai Meeting Room, Main Floor - City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Michael Henderson (Chair)
Clinton Cuddington (excused from item # 2 and # 3)
Sydney Schwartz
Margot Long
Jesse Gregson
Angela Enman (excused from item # 1)

REGRETS:

Reza Mousakhani
Adrien Rahbar

RECORDING SECRETARY: M.Sem

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 1406-1410 E King Edward Ave
 2. 2086-2098 W 7th Ave, 2091 W 8th Ave
 3. 855-865 W 10th Ave
-

BUSINESS MEETING Chair, MR. HENDERSON, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum.

1. **Address:** 1406-1410 E King Edward Ave.
Permit No.: RZ-2021-00060
Description: To develop a 14-storey residential building with 109 social housing units through the Permanent Modular Supportive Housing Initiative (PMSHI). The proposed FSR is 11.73, and the net floor area is 7,183 sq. m (77,313 sq. ft.). The proposed building height is 56.4 m (185 ft.). The project includes 3 visitor and 1 accessible parking spaces in one underground level, accessed from the lane. The application is being considered under the Kensington-Cedar Cottage Community Vision.
- Zoning:** RM-1N to CD-1
Application Status: Rezoning
Review: First
Architect: Stantec
Delegation: Colleen Dickson, Stantec Architecture
 Jody Bielun, Stantec Architecture
 Elaine Zhang, Stantec Architecture
- Staff:** Chee Chan, Rezoning Planner and Ji-Taek Park, Development Planner

EVALUATION: Support with recommendations (5/0)

Planner's Introduction:

Chee Chan, Rezoning Planner began by noting the proposed project is developed under the Permanent Modular Supportive Housing Initiative, referred to as PMSHI. The PMSHI program is a collaborative partnership between BC Housing, CMHC, and the City of Vancouver to deliver 350 social housing units with support services built using modular construction techniques. Supportive housing is targeted at people at risk of, or are experiencing homelessness.

Mr. Chan then gave an overview of the context noting, the City has already seen the construction of 1,700 permanent supportive housing units since 2010 and over 700 supportive housing units through the temporary modular housing program. The 1,700 permanent supportive housing units were built using conventional construction techniques. Through the PMSHI program, units are built using modular construction in order to reduce construction time. For the urban design panel, these buildings should be viewed as permanent rental housing, where 100% of the self-contained studio units are rented out at income assistance rates.

Paul Cheng, Senior Planner of Housing Priority Urban Design group provided a preamble on how staff review these types of projects. He noted that there is a need to evaluate these projects through the lens of social housing, not through the lens of a for-profit condo building. Mr. Cheng noted that many policy and review processes at the City over the last few decades have been tailored to the review of condos, built by for-profit market developers, because of several decades of disinvestment in social housing from senior levels of government. These review processes were based on a very smooth physical transition between neighbouring properties, and a permit review process that allowed the

incremental reduction of a proposal's overall built form if it was deemed too large by staff, the public and Council. The loss in floor space and dwelling units only represented a reduction in developer profits. However, we are now experiencing the negative effects of condo-focused housing policy, with a severe housing affordability crisis and record homeless.

Mr. Cheng said that, with the recent change in senior government funding in much needed housing, there is a need to try to maximize public investment. However, in trying to land social housing, we are conflicted by the previous policy culture of delivering a singular form and density based on for-profit development. In response, new tiers of allowable forms based on tenure are being considered, such as in C-2 zones, where four storeys are allowed for condos, six storeys for market rental housing, and up to 14 storeys for moderate income rental projects. In existing RM-4 zoning, three storeys are permitted for condos and six storeys for social housing. When there is an opportunity for more affordable tenures, and deeper affordability on social housing sites, more height and density can be considered. Sometimes the transitions will appear abrupt.

Mr. Cheng concluded his introduction by highlighting the PMSHI guiding principles which staff are considering in the review of these PMSHI projects.

Mr. Chan then gave a brief explanation on modular construction. A module is constituted by a double loaded corridor or an elevator, utility room and corridor. These modules are pre-fabricated off-site and brought to site for assembly to reduce transportation needs and speeds up on-site installation. While there can be different module configurations, the more configurations there are, the greater the costs.

The rezoning enabling policy for this social housing project is the Kensington-Cedar Cottage Community Vision, where non-market and social housing projects may proceed through site-specific rezonings. Under the Vision, staff would look not only at the needs of a project, but also how it relates to existing and future contexts.

In 2004, the Kingsway Knight Neighbourhood Centre Housing Plan was adopted as a follow-up implementation of the KCC vision, for improving Kingsway and Knight as an important community heart, with housing clustered around it. The Plan's implementation was to pre-zone much of the surrounding areas to RM-1, and RT-10 low scale developments of low-rise apartments, rowhouses, and courtyard style housing.

The King Ed PMSHI site is located on two lots at the intersection of King Edward and Knight Street. This rectangular site has a frontage of 67 ft. along King Edward, and about 99 ft. along Knight Street., and is 6,588 sq. ft. in size. There is a lane to the east. There are C-2 commercial/mixed use areas along Kingsway and Knight. Just behind these areas are lower density RT-10 zones. There is a CD-1 zone to the north. To the south is Kingcrest Park. Despite the pre-zoning of the area under the Kingsway Knight Neighbourhood Centre Housing Plan, there has not necessarily been much uptake, and a lot of the surrounding area remains largely single-detached housing.

This application proposes to rezone the site from RM-1N to CD-1 to permit a fourteen-storey residential building with 109 social housing units. All units are studios, and rented at the shelter component of income assistance. An FSR of 11.73 and a height of 56.4 m (185 ft.) are proposed. The project includes four parking spaces in one underground level. The project is targeting a Passive House level of sustainability performance.

Ji-Taek Park, Development Planner began by noting the proposed site is located at the intersection of East King Edward Avenue and Knight Street. This intersection represents a major shopping and services destination for the neighborhood, with further mixed-use developments along Kingsway and wrapping down Knight Street.

To the north of the site, King Edward Village development (CD-1) which varies in height from 6 to 17 storeys with multifamily residential and commercial uses at grade with an anchor grocery store and Vancouver public library. Knight Street is a major arterial, a main trucking access into the city. It also presents a desire line for access to Kingcrest Park from the neighbourhood.

Existing RM-1N zones (to the east and west of site) allows two-storey developments with Director of Planning discretion, with the rezoning potential for six-storey rental buildings under the Secured Rental Policy along arterial roads should Council adopt amendments to the Policy.

Proposed project is 14 storeys in height, with program spaces for residents on ground and second level, 11 storeys of residential units (109 units total), and indoor and outdoor amenity spaces located on the rooftop (14th floor). Proposal provides volumetric relief and articulation by removing the corner modules and providing large, common amenity balconies on the northwest corner (up to level eight) and southwest corner (level 12 and 13).

Given the size of the site, it presents challenges for at-grade public realm.

The proposal does provide setbacks (SRW) along Knight and King Edward. The sidewalk width is limited along Knight Street. The building also provides an overhang at the second level over the SRW and public realm along the King Edward. There is a double height volume at entry.

Due to the limited size of the site and limited capacity underground, it also presents at-grade uses that typically would be located underground such as a transformer room and water/sprinkler in-take along the street frontages. This can be more challenging for providing pedestrian interest along the street frontages for a well-used public realm, in terms of the transit stop and a desire line to Kingcrest Park.

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

1. a) Does the panel support the proposed massing, height and density?
- b) Does the proposal successfully respond to the project principles, including?
 - a. Design within Neighbourhood Context;
 - b. Design for architectural appeal mitigating larger forms, massings and excessive repetition in context of modular construction.
- c) Does the proposed building interface at-grade provide sufficient pedestrian interest for public realm?
- d) Please provide preliminary comment on the architectural expression, materiality, and landscape design to further guide the design development of the project at DP stage.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The project architect began by acknowledging project partners – BC Housing, Vancouver Aboriginal Friendship Centre Society, Vancouver Native Housing Society, Vancouver Affordable Housing Agency (VAHA), Bird Construction, WSP, M'akola Development Services, Stack Modular, Stantec.

Key focus – urban indigenous supportive housing

- Fostering a strong social ecosystem
- Urban and public realm integration
- Modular innovation
- Focus on energy conservation

Site context – Kingsway, King Edward, site on NW corner of Kingcrest Park.

Design Process – Through workshops and site visits, the team gained great insight into the day to day life of these projects. It was noted indigeneity should be present and indigenous spaces should be prominent. The team heard that the Building is an expression of community, pride, and resilience with spaces designed specifically for the needs of Urban Indigenous tenants and operators.

One of the biggest advantages of using volumetric modular construction is schedule quality control. This project can achieve a 6- month faster delivery time.

The project architect noted the sustainability rationale for this project, Path A of the Green Buildings Policy for Rezonings and the specific metrics it entails.

She then presented the four major components of the proposed development:

- 1) The housing component
- 2) Resident Base building services on L1 and L2
- 3) Urban Indigenous focus spaces on the roof deck
- 4) "4-Direction" amenity space on the roof and amenity decks

The architect presented the universal (accessible) units, the tenant supports spaces and common amenity spaces situated on L1, and L2. The indoor cultural amenity space is dedicated space for the indigenous community, and the flexibility of this space is important. It is the heart of the project, serving as a place of ceremony, drum circles, smudging, and drumming. It is a discrete pavilion and provides views of the mountains and city.

The outdoor amenity space is designed to create multiple scales of social encounters and choices for residents for quiet reflection, meeting with neighbours, small group gatherings and cultural activities. The rooftop outdoor cultural spaces contain a community dining table, urban agriculture with food and indigenous plants, with views in all four directions.

On the south side of the rooftop outdoor amenity space is a covered ceremonial space with an open seating area. There is a community garden at the south corner, which provides opportunities for urban agriculture with indigenous fruits and plants fostering a sense of community. The side of the roof deck is inspired by the history of indigenous culture of the residents with a different paving treatment for the roof deck.

Next, the project architect presented the public realm integration, form and massing. All existing trees will be retained on Knight Street. Sidewalks are widened along King Edward and Knight Street. The building's design is inspired by tree trunks and bark, modules and beads, and Coast Salish blankets and patterning. The project architect then presented the building within the surrounding context.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MS. LONG** and seconded by **MR. GREGSON** 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:

- 1) Improve the response to the public realm at grade by considering strategies to relocate service off of grade.
- 2) Consider strategies to increase permeability and engagement with program spaces at grade.
- 3) Consider amenity spaces at each floor level and to consider views and orientation for maximum user benefit.
- 4) Design development to project expression to the east and south to the park.

Panel Commentary

General support for the direction of the project.

Mixed support on the height and density.

Further explore density and height around surrounding sites.

Concerns were noted with the density, having 109 units is a lot given the zoning for the adjacent sites.

The loading and garbage removal will affect the park. A panel member suggested changing the laneway from residential to urban.

Some concerns from panel members on the nature of the ground plane, in particular placing back-of-house infrastructure along the street frontages, and the relationship to the park. A panel member suggest drawing the amenity in the direction of park.

Further exploration of programming elements at the ground plane and opening up the podium for greater engagement with the street.

A panel member suggested erosion is needed to break up the series to create more porosity at grade.

Encourage further exploration of infrastructure below grade or relocating the parking stalls and eliminating the ramp.

Some suggestions on relocating the amenity spaces down to grade or at podium level rather than putting them on the rooftop.

General appreciation from panel on the architectural expression and design.

A Panel member noted concerns with the massing to the lower RM-1 zoning as well as to the park.

Appreciation for the motif was noted.

Support for the character of the project.

Further explore other ways to use the common spaces.

A panel member suggested having equal amounts of amenity space on each floor.

Encourage more connections to outdoor space on all floors.

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

2. Address:	2086-2098 W 7th, 2091 W 8th Ave.
Permit No.:	RZ-2021-00058
Description:	To develop a 13-storey residential building with 140 social housing units through the Permanent Modular Supportive Housing Initiative (PMSHI). The FSR is 4.42, and the net floor area is 7,948 sq. m (85,551 sq. ft.). The proposed building height is 50 m (164 ft.). The project includes 3 visitor and 2 accessible parking spaces at grade, accessed from Arbutus Street.
Zoning:	RM-4 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Review:	First
Architect:	Bruce Haydyn and Heidi Nesbitt, Human Studio Joseph Fry, Hapa Collaborative
Staff:	Chee Chan, Rezoning Planner and Derek Robinson, Development Planner

EVALUATION: Support with recommendations (5/0)

Planner's Introduction

The Arbutus site is located on Arbutus Street, between West 7th and West 8th Avenues, one block north of Broadway. This trapezoidal site has a frontage of approximately 191 ft. along Arbutus, is about 75 ft. wide, and is approximately 19,300 sq. ft. in size. The site is bound by the future Arbutus SkyTrain station and bus loop to the south, St. Augustine's elementary school to the west, Delamont Park to the north, and the Arbutus Greenway to the east. There is no lane serving this site.

It is zoned and surrounded by RM-4 zoning, while C-3A zones follow Broadway.

The policy context was then outlined, including noting the site is located within the Broadway Plan Area. While plan work is underway, with a target to get the plan in front of Council by Spring 2022, an Interim Rezoning Policy is in place. The IRP generally limits the consideration of new rezoning applications, but allows for 100% social and supportive housing projects to go ahead of the Plan's adoption, in recognition of the continuing need for non-market housing in Vancouver for people experiencing homelessness and low-income households.

The current publicly available emerging directions for the Broadway Plan were then briefly outlined. It was noted that the current proposal is not bound by the Broadway Plan's emerging directions, as it is permitted to come in under the IRP, and that the draft Broadway Plan has yet to be approved by Council.

This application proposes to rezone the site from RM-4 to CD-1 to permit a 13-storey residential building with 140 social housing units. All units are studios, and rented at the shelter component of income assistance. An FSR of 4.42 and a height of 50 m (164 ft.) are proposed. The project includes 5 parking spaces and 2 loading spaces, enclosed within the building at grade, and accessed off Arbutus Street. The project is seeking Passive House certification.

Derek Robinson, Development Planner, began by noting the specific urban design considerations that incorporated into the PMSHI projects early on through the project principles, including designing within the neighbourhood context, designing for beauty and simplicity, striving for façade customization, and providing site specific landscaping signifying permanence.

The site, context and existing zoning were then outlined, noting the site presents some design challenges as it is relatively narrow at the south end and vehicle access is limited due to the greenway and possible future streetcar alignments. As such, on-site parking is proposed at-grade accessed off of Arbutus Street.

The proposal was then outlined, noting the floor plate of the residential levels is approximately 125 ft. by 60 ft. with an area of around 7,200 sq. ft. It was noted that within the context of the proposed modular construction and passive house certification, there is still an expectation for a level of building articulation to be achieved.

The overall building height was then outlined, noting that the total number of residential storeys proposed has not changed since the initial pre-application public outreach undertaken by the applicant. The ground level is double height to accommodate loading and service vehicles and so a modest mezzanine level was slipped into the podium which is why staff are referring to the building as 13 storeys high.

The floor-to-floor height proposed is approximately 11.4 feet, which provides a clear ceiling height of approximately 9' 10" with portions of the units being lower at 8' 6" to accommodate mechanical runs. It was noted that the modular construction technology adds approximately one foot of additional height between floors.

An overview of the proposed shadow diagrams was then provided, noting that updated images were provided to the panel prior to the meeting which take into account daylight savings time. These updated images have also been posted to the project website.

The overall public realm interface was then outlined, noting the building has important adjacencies on all sides. The proposal appears to be relying on public property and SRWs to achieve its landscape strategy, with minimal building setbacks. It was also noted that the trees and the bench shown in public property within the back boulevard on 7th and 8th avenues may not be supported by Planning and Engineering.

Lastly, it was noted that there will be an interim and a long term condition along the interface with the greenway. For the interim condition, Engineering has indicated they can consider the applicants proposal to utilize the SRW space for temporary landscape features. In the long term, it is anticipated that if streetcar infrastructure is developed along the greenway, this SRW space will be utilized for public cycling and walking paths.

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

In the context of BC Housing and City of Vancouver's Permanent Modular Supportive Housing Initiative, please comment on the following:

Does the panel support the proposed height and density?

Project Principles

Does the proposal successfully respond to the project principles?

Neighbourhood Fit + Transition

Does the proposal successfully respond to the existing and future anticipated neighbourhood context?

Public Realm Interface

Does the proposal provide a strong public realm interface?

Tower Expression

Please comment on the proposed architectural expression of the residential tower.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The applicant began by noting four Major Architecture and Urban Design Goals:

Project Objective 1:

Create high quality, durable and dignified homes that create a precedent for future supportive housing projects.

Project Objective 2

Demonstrate excellence in sustainability by being the first modular steel tall building to be Passive House Certified.

Project Objective 3

Design a contextually relevant building that respects the unique neighbourhood character and creates dignified homes.

Project Objective 4

Provide a wide spectrum of amenity spaces, from highly social to very quiet, so that residents and staff have a variety of spaces to relax and connect.

It was noted that the primary consideration for residents in the building is privacy. On the ground plane there are different scales of gathering spaces and an open air courtyard. Proposed for residential is 300 sq. ft. of enclosed lounge space on every floor with amenity.

The proposed modular unit layouts were then presented.

The location of the building footprint requires removal of several on site trees. Several trees along the greenway SRW will be retained and 19 trees will be added at smaller scale. Trees on W 7th avenue and Arbutus Street will be retained as required.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MS. ENMAN** and seconded by **MS. SCHWARTZ** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

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

- 1) Design development to the activation of the podium to improve transparency where appropriate.
- 2) Design development to the east facade to provide interest and engagement with the greenway.
- 3) Consider the extent of the visual screen concealing the rooftop mechanical.

Panel Commentary

The Panel acknowledged the importance of targeting Passive House, bringing with it many great benefits.

General support from panel for the height, density and massing.

Some panel members noted concern with the third objective of the project principles, acknowledging that the expression is taking cues from the context, but that it feels disjointed.

A panel member noted appreciation for the brick at grade but there needs to be something else to break up the long blank facades at grade. Another panel member noted the brick component reads like a commercial facade and could use some design development.

A panel member noted design development to the east façade is needed and this façade is looking for a more impactful treatment.

Some panel members noted a key concern is the public realm interface and the lack of ground plane activation on the east, west and south. They encouraged more connection and permeability to the Arbutus greenway beyond just signage. They suggested more glazing, reviewing the height and

proportions to maintain the privacy for residents, and using lighting and public art to celebrate the Arbutus Greenway.

A panel member encouraged opportunities to maintain more interface with the greenway by softening it up and make it more porous for more public interaction at grade.

One panel member noted that the neighbourhood fit has been considered, especially with respect to the massing to avoid shadowing the park on the north side.

Some panel members noted concern with shadowing on the St. Augustine School's yard.

A panel member supported the height and density but noted questions around the site with regards to usability and proximity to the school.

Panel noted design development to the tower expression, as the east and west sides are not unified. Panel noted articulation of the window placement, suggesting it may be a good opportunity to provide some colour.

A panel member noted the west and south tower façade cladding makes the tower feel taller than it is. The panel member suggested design development of the cladding and reducing its height to mitigate the perceived height of the tower.

A panel member noted appreciation of the judicious glazing for this project bringing solar access to the upper levels.

A panel member noted that the internal courtyard will be in shadow most of the time.

A panel member encouraged additional communal outdoor amenity spaces.

One Panel member noted it is a question of height vs. width but extending the width may result in losing the courtyard and that if there was a desire to reduce the perceived height, the visual screening on the rooftop could be lowered.

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

3. Address:	855-865 W10th Ave.
Permit No.:	RZ-2021-00040
Description:	To develop a 12-storey office building with commercial retail at grade; all over four levels of underground parking including 82 underground parking spaces and 60 bicycle spaces. The floor space ratio (FSR) is 6.12, and the floor area is 7,365.8 sq. m (79,287.7 sq. ft.), including 6723 sq. m (72,366.1 sq. ft.) of office space. Maximum building height is 44.8 m (146'10"). The application is being considered under the Metro Core Jobs and Economy Land Use Plan.
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning
Review:	First
Architect:	WT Leung Architects & Glotman Simpson

Delegation: WT Leung Architects
Staff: Leifka Vissers and Carl Stanford

EVALUATION: Support with recommendations (4/1)

Planner's Introduction:

Leifka Vissers, Rezoning Planner, began by noting this application proposes to rezone a site at 855-865 West 10th Avenue from CD-1 (137) to a new CD-1 to construct a midrise office development at 12 stories high measuring approximately 47.6m/ 156 feet and with a density of 6.12 FSR or 7,114.3m²/ 76,580.0 sf. The current CD-1 137 allows for an FSR of 1.7 and a height of 10.7m or 35 feet. The site falls within the *Metro Core Jobs and Economy Land Use Plan*, the policy under which this application is being considered. And also the Central Area Plan: C-3A Central Broadway Goals and Land Use Policy (designated as "Uptown")

The site at ,162.7 m²/ 12,516.0 sq.ft area comprises two lots midblock on 10th Avenue with approximately 100 feet of frontage and 125 feet of depth. It is located mid-block on the north side of West 10th across the street from the Vancouver General Hospital and in close proximity to the future Oak-VVGH SkyTrain Station. The site is currently occupied by two, three-storey office buildings.

The site is currently zoned CD-1 (137) (i) which allows for medical office, dental office, and related laboratory facilities. The immediate surrounding area to the north are zoned C-3A and CD-1 for a variety of commercial uses. The surrounding properties to the south are zoned CD-1 (59) for the hospital and supportive medical and office facilities. There is one residential lot to the east of the side, zoned RM-3A for apartment use. Directly north of the site (across the 20' lane), is the "Uptown" area of the Broadway corridor (C-3A zoning), which is the city's defacto second downtown. The new building is designed to accommodate both medical and general office use.

The site is located in the heart of the VGH precinct on the north side of W. 10th Ave between Laurel St and Willow St. It is less than 200m from the future Oak-VGH Station of the new Broadway Subway Line that is now under construction. It is well-served by the existing public transportation infrastructure of buses along Oak and Broadway, the Canada-Line at Cambie, and a major east-west bike route along W.10th Ave for cyclists. It is in close proximity to the Vancouver General Hospital, shops, drug stores and cafes. It will also be across the street from a future skytrain station. Unique considerations include the nearby VGH and supporting facilities and required helicopter flight path. As with other applications that fall in or near the flight path, the applicant was required to provide a third-party consultant report, complete with commentary from VGH and the helicopter provider.

Generally new rezoning applications are not being considered in the Broadway Plan Study area while the Broadway Plan process is underway. This is in order to not negatively impact the Plan which is underway. However there are exceptions, where a recent application for rezoning advice has been received prior to this embargo, and the applicant has received a written response stating that a rezoning application would be considered (within the past three years), the application will be considered.

The 855 W 10th office proposal aligns with the Refined Directions for the Uptown area to intensify for job space as the heart of our second downtown, with additional height and density for commercial development, such as medical office, and the expansion of VGH Campus etc. Uptown is

highly constrained by various view cones/flight paths, so achievable heights and densities will vary throughout the area. For 855 W 10th the heights for the Uptown Office District would inform the heights for that site (6-20 storeys, depending on view cones, flight paths etc.). We are reviewing the view cones through Broadway Plan, with the goal of enabling additional height for job space close to rapid transit.

On a side note, for the draft plan the land use policy along W 10th will differentiate between the larger VGH CD-1, the other smaller CD-1s, RM-3, and the adjacent C-3A area.

In discussions with VGH the flight path will remain as is for the foreseeable future, likely decades. If the emergency department relocates in the future, the helipad may as well, allowing for additional height in that area. However that is all subject to future planning for the VGH campus lands, and no decisions/directions about that have been made at this time.

Development Planner, Carl Stanford then began discussing the form of development by noting the applicable form of development policy governing the site which included:

- CD-1 (137) District Schedule
- C-3A District Schedule, Fairview Slopes sub-area
- Central Broadway C-3A Urban Design Guidelines (1976, amended July 2004)
- Central Area Plan: Goals and Land Use Policy C-3A- Central Broadway (1991)
- *Metropolitan Core Jobs & Economy Land Use Plan (2007)*
- *Community Amenity Contributions - Through Rezoning (1999, last amendments 2013).*
- *Green Buildings Policy for Rezonings (2012)*
- *VGH Masterplan*

The CD-1 zoning requires a minimum 6m/ 20' front yard setback, a 1.5m/5ft side yard setback and a height of 6m/ 20'. The C-3A District Schedule allows for 3.0 FSR (102,687 sq. ft.) No height limit is specified in Fairview Slopes sub-area. The Central Broadway C-3A Urban Design Guidelines that building height maximums are to be 120 feet subject to urban design analysis. The C-3A guidelines C recommends new podium streetwall height to match existing building streetwall height. There is a view cone over the site (view cone 3.1) but it does not interact with the building.

As stated the proposed project is a 12-storey office building located opposite the Vancouver General Hospital to the south and needs to facilitate the flight path of the hospital in the consideration of its maximum height. To the north directly cross the lane at 888 W Broadway is a proposed long and short term stay hotel which has a large green amenity areas between the two branching towers. At grade there are three small commercial retail units off West 8th Avenue with a 27' setback from the property line and large green planted area directly along the boulevard. The parkade and loading are accessed from the rear lane. A number of mechanical spaces are also located at grade to the rear. The main office entry is located at the centre of the frontage similar in design to the retail entries accessing a small lobby and the primary vertical circulation core. A large grassy area and a planter with a small tree is placed off the sidewalk with bicycle parking behind the planter. The soft cover is intended to provide rain infiltration for the large tree #101 located on the sidewalk.

The podium office floor plans at level 02 and 03 are subdivided into smaller units located off the central core corridor in an orthogonal plan. Level 3 repeats this layout with slight alterations of the

subdivision. There is glazing throughout the floors on the east / west elevations as well as the north / south. The podium steps in at level 4 from a square plan to a slimmer rectangular form inset on both sides by approximately 15' whose pure geometry is largely unarticulated as it rises to level 11. The vertical circulation core projects slightly on the eastern edge and is solidly clad in contrast to the curtain wall glazing on either side. At level 12 the north edge steps back from the lane edge by 10' with a terrace for the office users that is looking towards 888 W Broadway. At roof level there is a simple overrun with mechanical access only.

The application is somewhat conceptual in detail. It does not indicate continuous glazed rain cover in the visualizations at grade and appears to utilize the overhang of the building to address inclement weather. The retail entries are shown as simple portal doors as part of a glazing system. The material treatment is not precisely defined in the drawings but appears to be a mix of solid grey metal cladding panels, spandrel panels and curtain wall glazing. The applicant will expand more on this area. The primary core is located on the western edge and appears to be clad in stone or metal cladding.

Just reviewing the context again and prior to examining shadow impact we can see Shadows studies on the March & June 21st Equinoxes reveal no major negative impacts on the adjoining neighbors to the east, west and south of the site however the amenity area to the north for the hotel long stay units will be impacted particularly at noon. The least sever impact is during June. It should be noted that the building to the north is a commercial hotel building however the long stay units in the east tower are considered quasi residential. The impact on their outdoor amenity space should be considered but not to the same severity as a pure residential amenity. The applicant should demonstrate that shaping of the building has made reasonable efforts to mitigate the impact on the amenity with some shaping and stepping in line with common best practice. In terms of sustainability the applicant aims to achieve LEED gold and will expand further on this topic in their presentation.

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

Does the Panel support the density, massing, and height, of the building with consideration of?

- a) Does the proposal demonstrate adequate treatment of factors including contextual fit, transition of form, and building orientation, in its architectural expression and articulation?
- b) Does the proposal provide sufficient shaping of its massing to adequately consider the functionality, and interface with the surrounding area?

Please comment on the impact on the public realm and success of the public realm interface with consideration of:

- a) Is the buildings shaping, placement and proximity ensuring satisfactory sun access to the adjacent amenity space for the proposed long stay units at 888 W Broadway across the lane?
- b) Does the proposal succeed in enhancing and effectively integrating with the ground plane, supporting its success as a pedestrian thoroughfare?
- c) Does the landscape at grade maximize the transparency, accessibility and activation of the retail units?

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The applicant began by discussing neighbourhood context, and in particular the interaction with 888 W Broadway to the north. The applicant had discussions with their neighbor when designing the building so as to shape the form to minimize impact on the outdoor amenity used by the long stay hotel units to the north east. In addition the design rationale incorporated sculpting of the building for how it responds to the helicopter flight path. The applicant then presented the shadow diagrams when shadowing affects the outdoor amenity of 888 W Broadway and explaining their attempt to minimise it. They noted from 1pm onwards in summer on the June equinox when outdoor spaces are more heavily utilized the amenity is not as impacted as on the March and September equinox.

The building is set back approximately 20 ft. from W. 10th Avenue which is a highly travelled pedestrian pathway with a bike lane. The proposal enhances the public realm on the north side of the street providing sunlight into the new front courtyard with outdoor seating and landscaping. The retail units that front onto the courtyard would be well suited for small retail uses such as coffee shops etc. The root zones of the elm tree in front of the site were mapped out and the parking garage sculpted accordingly to provide space to retain the tree. The applicant then reiterated for clarity the intended landscape strategies for this project.

The Building will achieve Leed Gold, is pursuing the step code, and the design will have open windows, bringing fresh air into the building. The structural design of the building has an efficient structure so it constitutes a lesser carbon imprint. They will also be examining the incorporating triple glazing for greater energy efficiency. With regard to the material treatment of the building, the proposal include curtain wall, spandrel panels and fiber cement Swiss pro panels on a 5 x 5 modular grid. The structure of the building is simplistic in form but the intents is that high quality detailing of the skin will enhance it.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by MS. LONG and seconded by MS. 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:

- 1) Continue design development to the building articulation for improved shadowing mitigation and for further development of the podium and tower expression.
- 2) Consider incorporating a green roof.
- 3) Design development to the architectural expression at the ground plane to provide a clearer expression and character for the retail.

Panel Commentary

There was general support from the panel on the height and density. The panel appreciated the concision of the applicant's presentation.

The Panel noted the building is overall a good fit for the site.

One panel member noted the building appears out of context with existing buildings but perhaps appropriate for future context notwithstanding the consideration of shadowing issues.

Some panel members noted that the parkade structure stepping to respect the tree roots is laudable.

Most panel members noted it would be a positive addition to have green roof.

The Panel appreciated the project is pursuing step code and step 4.

Most panel members noted it is a generally well handled public realm interface and the additional commercial units are welcome. However the panel suggested more animation, more definition to the entrance and further exploring improving the connections between the retail units and the street.

Some panel members noted concern with the 888 W Broadway outdoor amenity impact. These people need outdoor amenity. Why is the shaping of the tower so central? Why not offset? If the tower could be shifted east then that would be preferable and should be examined.

Some panel members noted design development for the retail units for greater differentiation was needed as well as an improved connection to the street.

One panel member noted that the renderings don't have the pop of color, extensive planting and furnishing shown in video. These additional items should be incorporated.

Some panel members noted the podium and tower look very similar. The applicant should re-examine this approach. What would happen if they were different languages?

Some panel members appreciate the concise nature of the application but noted it is a little less defined than typical. A lot of these details should be addressed via design development.

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