

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: January 23, 2019
TIME: 3:00 pm
PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall
PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Amela Brudar
Helen Avini Besharat
Colette Parsons
Derek Neale
Jim Huffman
Jennifer Stamp
Matt Younger
Grant Newfield
Susan Ockwell
Yinjin Wen
Jennifer Marshall Items 3 & 4

REGRETS:
Derek Neale
Muneesh Sharma

**RECORDING
SECRETARY:** K. Cermeno

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1. | 1619-1651 E Broadway |
| 2. | 582-588 W King Edward Avenue |
| 3. | 3591 W 19th Avenue |
| 4. | 1002 Station Street & 250-310 Prior Street |
-

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Amela Brudar called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum. Mr. Jim Huffman was elected as the new chair and Ms. Collette Parsons elected as vice-chair. The panel then considered applications as scheduled for presentation.

1. Address:	1619-1651 E Broadway
Permit No.	DP-2018-00984
Description:	To develop a 10-storey mixed use building consisting of commercial uses at grade and 85 residential with a mixed-tenure of secured market rental and strata-titled housing above; all over two levels of underground parking accessed from the lane
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	Second (First as DP)
Architect:	IBI Group
Owner:	Tom Pappajohn, Jameson Development Corp
Delegation:	M. Bruckner, Architect, IBI Tony Wan, Architect, IBI Dan Yang, Landscape Architect, IBI Group
Staff:	Ji-Taek Park

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations

- **Introduction:**

Development planner, Ji-Taek Park, introduced the project as a Development Permit application, following rezoning under the Grandview Woodland Community Plan. This is second time being presented at UDP (previously as a Rezoning Application).

The site is located at 1619-1651 E Broadway; in 'Station Mixed-Use and Employment' sub area of Commercial-Broadway Station Precinct, near Commercial-Broadway Skytrain station. Urban design principles for the area includes, providing mixed tenure higher-density building forms appropriate for a transit oriented neighbourhood.

Proposed development is to allow secured rental and strata residential units, with commercial use at grade. The proposal includes approx. 5,200 s.f. of commercial use at grade, and 45 secured rental units from Level 2-5, and 40 strata residential units from Level 6-10. Proposed FSR is at 4.0, as outlined in the Grandview Woodland Plan.

The setbacks for ground lower levels are provided as per existing RM-4N zoning to ensure minimal impact on the existing 4 storey residential development on western neighbouring property.

Underground parkade access, loading, and building services are being proposed from the lane. Amenity space is provided on the roof top area above second floor, facing the lane, screened from Broadway. The proposal also includes enclosed balconies for units facing the Broadway, to mitigate the noise impact from Broadway, a major vehicle corridor.

Previous UDP panel commentary during rezoning included concerns regarding the following areas:

- Improve the residential character of the lane;
- Re-examination of Residential entry location;
- Quality & size of amenity space;
- Livability of units;

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

1. Has the revised application sufficiently addressed the panel's previously noted concerns?
2. Please provide comments on architectural and landscape composition and expression, building material and character.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

There has been little change from the previous version presented at rezoning. The rezoning application predated a new building policy from the end of May 2017 but this plan was elected to have the new requirements of envelope design.

There is a strong focus on window area to control heat loss. The buildings can be heated electrically to fit in with the green house emission limits requirements. The full brick exterior has been maintained for insulation.

The commercial parking has been moved underground, closed the loading and placed planters where possible without interfering with the fence or needed materials.

The residential lobby is now setback in line with the existing building to the east. Wood panels have been introduced on either side of the closed balconies to tie the project together. The amenity has been kept on the north side as it is where it could benefit from the most space, and protected from the vehicular traffic of Broadway, along with contiguous interior amenity space which has been enlarged from the rezoning application.

Overall unit count has been reduced to enlarge the unit sizes to address the unit livability concerns from previous panel.

Improvements have been made on level 2, the amenity level, including continuous planters. The upper levels, where possible, there are extensive green roofs for storm water management, and the excessive water from the upper levels will go to the level 2 planters.

There are three new street trees along with existing street trees. The Grandview Woodland Plan does not specify a required pattern therefore followed the existing paving pattern.

This project meets all the sustainability requirements.

The 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. Brudar and seconded by Ms. Parsons 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:

- Further development of the lane texture, materials and safety issues;
- Further development of exterior materials used for the overall building, review of the white cladding zone;
- Further design development of the retail public realm.

- **Related Commentary:**

Generally the panel supported the project. The panel noted overall the project has improved and applicant did their best to address previous comments, however there is still room for some improvements.

There is a clear parti and which has its own clear identity. Some panelists noted the livability of the units has improved but still small in size. The combination of market and rental units was well received. A panelist noted the south elevation has been well articulated.

In regards to the residential entry location, further exploration on how the CRU space can be highlighted would be beneficial. You do not see the elevator as you enter the residential lobby and it's a long pathway. The lobby/residential entry location presently appears convoluted to enter the elevator core. Consider another location for the entry as this will affect the marketability of the rental units.

The panel agreed the materiality could improve from simplifying and providing better transitions. The renderings display an upper and lower that is quite different. Some panelists felt the white metal material was not needed. Use one material when dealing with the transitions. A panelist noted materials could be different but more complementing of each other.

The lane was confusing; the elevation could use refinement regarding the scale as it is a residential area. The residential character of the lane could improve with texture from materiality, presently there is nothing residential about the lane.

It was noted that it would be beneficial if there could be a less shaded amenity deck with more solar access. However, some felt the explanation of the location for the amenity is convincing. A panelist noted the amenity does receive some natural light and penetration from the west side.

The panel agreed there was a missed opportunity with a rooftop amenity space, the present one will be in shadow a lot. A panelist noted there may be ways to roof top amenity space above 10 storey height under the Grandview woodland Plan, as the current amenity space may not be utilized much due to how much of it is shaded. There are also opportunities for massing and modeling and creating a few bays within the amenity area.

The main entry residential canopy is a bit neglected and should be a beautiful piece of architecture. The composition of the enclosed balconies welcomes a relief from the disciplined building. Further design development is needed to the glass canopy over the commercial space. The glazing over the canopy is not convincing.

The retail frontage and overall building has a lot of texture, however the ground floor appears harsh and uninviting. Consider looking at window variation and indentation shown on the renderings. The retail public realm appeared generic. Further design development to improve the public realm is recommended.

Additional comments included consider a direct exit for bikes, consider if the angled loading is needed, and considering extending the matt of the play area if it is too close to the guarded rail.

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

2. Address: 582-588 W King Edward Avenue

Permit No.	RZ-2018-00036
Description:	To develop a 4-storey residential building and 2.5-storey townhouses at the lane, with of 36 market residential units in total; all over underground parking. The proposed floor area is 3,250 sq.m (34,932 sq.ft.), the floor space ratio (FSR) is 1.95 and the maximum building height is 18.6 m (61 ft). The application is under Cambie Corridor Plan.
Zoning:	RS-1 to CD-1
Application Status:	Rezoning Application
Review:	First
Architect:	RWA Architects
Owner:	Luke Ramsay, Aragon Development
Delegation:	Doug Ramsay, Architect, RWA Architects Kelly Gartner, Architect, RWA Architects
Staff:	Scott Erdman, Grace Jiang

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning Planner, Scott Erdman, introduced the project as an application to rezone 2 parcels under the Cambie Corridor Plan. The site is located on the southeast corner of King Edward Ave & Ash St, one block west of the Canada Line's King Edward Station. The site is zoned RS-1, currently developed with 2 single family dwellings. Together the 2 parcels measure approx. 120 feet wide and 150 feet deep. The site area is approximately 18,000 square feet.

The Cambie Corridor Plan anticipates residential buildings in this location, up to 4-storeys, with a density range between 1.25 and 1.75 FSR. This range is an estimate based on intended urban design performance. Development potential may fall within, above, or below this FSR range. Above 3 storeys, the upper floor should be stepped back from King Edward. Buildings should include front doors onto the street and should seek to activate and enhance the adjacent lane by providing townhouses up to 2.5 storeys on the rear.

An additional partial 5th storey may be considered for common rooftop amenity spaces, if continuous with common outdoor amenity space. Additional height should be stepped back from all building edges to minimize the appearance from ground level. Townhouses (RM-8A zoning) up to 3-storeys are anticipated south of this site, as permitted in the Cambie Corridor Plan. The proposal is to build a 4-storey residential building with a partial 5th floor amenity room, and outdoor contiguous rooftop amenity space, and 2.5 storey townhouses at the lane, with a total of 36 market units, and a density of 1.95 FSR.

Development Planner, Grace Jiang, noted there have been quite a few rezoning applications approved in this area under Cambie Corridor Plan Phase 2. To the east towards Cambie, an 8 storey mixed use development is approved at the northwest corner; two 6-storey developments at the southwest corner. Around the intersection of King Edwards and Ash, two north corner sites are rezoned to 3 to 4 storey apartment development. Under the CCP 3, the area to the south cross the lane is pre-zoned to townhouse.

The site is 120 ft wide by 150 ft deep with approximately 11 ft cross drop from southwest corner to north east corner. The plan anticipates a courtyard typology for this deep site. A 4-storey primary front building defines the street, a maximum 2 1/2 storey townhouse at rear activates the lane, and they are separated by a minimum of 24 ft wide courtyard.

For the front building, a partial 5th floor may be permitted for a common amenity room provided it is continuous with a common outdoor amenity space on the rooftop. The massing of the rooftop amenity room should be modest and stepped back from all building edges to minimize the appearance from

ground level. The plan also calls for a 3-storey street wall expression and a 10 to 15 ft front setback along t King Edward Ave.

For the rear building, it should reflect an intimate scale of lane with a minimum of 6 ft rear setback and a maximum 80 ft "building width" appearance.

The Plan emphasizes an optimal performance for the courtyard. No encroachment is allowed into the minimum 24 ft separation. The massing and height of southern buildings should be managed to maximize the solar access to courtyard.

The proposal contains one 4 and partial 5 storey apartment building fronting the King Edward Ave and one 2 1/2 storey townhouse building along the lane. The building height is approximately 62 ft measured to the highest point of roof. The site setbacks are 12.5 ft at front, 5 ft at rear, 10 ft on both sides.

The apartment building is generally complaint with the Plan, the proposed rooftop common amenity room located centrally adjoining with rooftop common outdoor amenity space. Two private patios are also proposed on the rooftop. The roof is designed as a green roof. At ground level, all dwelling units are ground-oriented with entry doors and private patios fronting onto sidewalks and courtyard. The communal residential entrance is on Ash St fronting the courtyard.

For the lane building, the overall length is approx. 100 ft containing 5 townhouse units. The scale of the long frontage is handled by stepping form and vertical breaks. The underground parking access is from the lane under the east end unit. The partial 3rd floor is concentrated on the north, and the resulting height on the courtyard side is more than 3 storeys. It casts shadow onto the full width of the courtyard during most of daytime on equinox.

The courtyard is 24 ft wide with private patios, pedestrian path, and a public open space at the entrance of Ash St in front of the residential lobby. The courtyard space is encroached by some projections such as bay windows and balconies.

Advice from the Panel is sought on the following:

1. Does the design of the townhouse, particularly the height and length, meet the intent of the Plan "to reinforce the intimate scale and character of the lane"?
 2. Does the design of the partial 5th floor meet the intent of the Plan? Please consider the height, massing, placement, and impact to neighbors..
 3. Please provide commentary on the performance of the courtyard in terms of the solar access, openness, and social opportunities.
 4. Please provide preliminary advice on proposed architectural expression and materials for the development permit application.
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**
There are only a handful of sites built on a two lot. This site is unique that it's got a 12 foot crossfall, which allows opportunity to develop some nice features. Early on the developer went with a concrete frame which we were able to do some nice studio lot units.

By making the frame concrete we were able to take more of the spaces on the ground plain and create more yards. All the buildings are 4 stories.

The 4th floor setbacks come out to about 12.5 ft. We recessed the ground floors to 3 ft on the King Edward side. The elevation matches well to the building to the east. The windows were articulated and slit along the elevation to highlight the corners.

The entrance to the apartment buildings is off the courtyard. There are entrances to both the townhouses and lower level apartments, all the units that hit the ground plain have front doors.

Due to the massing and townhouses, the courtyard is adequate in size. The town houses on the east have stepped in the back a bit and in the Far East have been stepped down.

Concrete buildings allow for scissor stairs. At the back facing south, wanted to give it a view, we gave it a scissor stair attached in the roof form, to allow for some view aspect.

The 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. Avini-Besharat and seconded by Ms. Ockwell and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:
- THAT the Panel **SUPPORT** the project with the following recommendation to be reviewed by City Staff:
 - No need to return to Urban Design Panel.

- **Related Commentary:**

The panel supported this project. The massing was well handled and the concrete buildings are a nice feature. It is an elegant well-proportioned building that fully complies with the Cambie Corridor plan. The project overall has a nice balance of privacy and social interaction.

The framework to the apartment buildings is a bit popped out in front and with the extensions of the balconies appears there is a lot going on.

The panel agreed the partial 5th floor is a successful and welcome addition to the building and will benefit from great views. There is enough space to expand and still maintain privacy.

A panelist noted the project could have gone one storey higher. The town houses would benefit from another door to ease transition (i.e. groceries, strollers), and the roof meeting the vertical wall needs a bit of design development.

A panelist noted the stepping to match the lane and trying to get more sun in the courtyard is understandable however a bit contradictory in that it is not stepping on the apartment side.

The space between the two buildings doesn't have a lot of sunlight. The guard on the 5th floor and the roof edge comes out which inhibits the amount of light. A panelist noted when a 4 and 6 storey building are beside each other the shadowing can be hard to get rid of.

The panel liked how the lobby opened up to the side. There is a glimpse to the courtyard which adds interest. Additionally the lounge area is successful as an amenity it is a very social space.

The rooftop amenity room is an excellent feature, very usable and sunny.

The performance of the courtyard appears to be the best it can get. A panelist noted the courtyard will be shady but the amenity space has a lot of sun therefore there is a nice balance.

There is a generous public realm, feels like a nice access point with the landscaping. Additionally providing the undercut to create the public realm was great. The panel commended the applicant for providing extra landscaping.

Additional comments included refinement in materials and color choices, the middle band are a bit busy, and consider a kitchen for the amenity room for social interaction and entertainment.

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

3. Address:	3591 W 19 th Avenue
Permit No.	DP-2018-00329
Description:	To develop a 4-storey mixed-use building consisting of 6 retail spaces at grade and 28 dwelling units from ground floor to level four; all over two levels of parking accessed from the lane.
Zoning:	C-2
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First
Architect:	Andrew Cheung Architects Inc.
Delegation:	Andrew Cheung, Architect, Andrew Cheung Architects Inc. Cat Kuang, Architect, Andrew Cheung Architects Inc. Meredith Mitchell, Landscape Architect, M2 Landscape Architecture
Staff:	Grace Jiang

EVALUATION: Support with Recommendations

- **Introduction:**

Development Planner, Grace Jiang, introduced the project as a DP application under zoning bylaw C2. The project is located at the Northeast corner of the intersection of Dunbar St and W 19th Ave. The site has a 132 ft frontage along Dunbar St and 100 ft along W 19th Ave, taking up one half of the block. The site has a cross drop of 12.9 ft from Southwest to Northeast corner. The lane is approximately 8 ft lower than the street.

The site is currently occupied by one and two storey retails. The area from the 19th Ave to the 16th Ave along Dunbar Street is zoned C2 as a local shopping area with low-scale commercial buildings and three 4 storey mixed use developments. The properties to the east cross the lane and to the south cross the 19th Ave are single family dwellings in RS zone.

The allowable density under C2 is up to 2.5 FSR. The allowable maximum building height is 45 ft on the street side and steps down towards the lane to 15 ft. The C2 zoning bylaw and design guidelines also emphasize on providing viable commercial space, pedestrian-oriented streetscape, and mitigating the impacts to neighbors.

The proposal is for a mixed-use building with 4 storeys viewed from the street and 5 storeys measured from the lane. The proposed FSR is 2.5. The overall building height and the stepping form are generally compliant with the requirements set out in district schedule. A 2 ft height relaxation is sought due to the site slope along the Dunbar St.

There is a large chestnut street tree along the south property line. As required by the Park board, the proposal sets the south side of the parkade and ground floor 25 ft from the trunk of the tree for the root protection. The canopy and two limbs of the tree extend into the site. It may require further setbacks of the upper floors on the south side of the building subject to the pruning requirement from Park board.

At ground floor, there are 6 commercial units fronting Dunbar Street. Each of the units has small frontage and at-grade entrance. Three ground-oriented townhouses are placed at rear with individual entry door and private patio facing the lane. Communal residential entrance is along W 19th Ave and the two levels UG parking is accessed from the lane. Two amenity rooms are located on the ground floor. A sizable outdoor amenity space is provided on the main roof deck in conjunction with the provision of a green roof.

The exterior finishes are featured by natural stone and long board cedar siding. The party wall exposing to the north is concrete with ribbed texture.

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

1. Is the 2 ft building height relaxation supportable?
2. Does the design of ground level elevations meet the C-2 design guidelines “to relate to pedestrian scale and enhance the close-up view of the pedestrian”?
3. Does the design successfully mitigate the privacy and visual impacts on adjacent residential?
4. Please provide commentary on the overall architectural expression and materiality of the building elevations.

The planning team then took questions from the panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:**

The building is concrete construction. The site slope is quite steep from one end to the other, about 13ft.

The façade is a 3 storey expression with a 4 ft. setback, wanted to have a banding that creates movement addressing the corner. The material is a lime stone spandrel and the vertical elements are long boards which are cedar metal looking.

The intention is for the townhouses to compliment the residential one story neighborhood. There are building examples nearby with a 5 storey expression on the lane.

There are about 28 units, including the townhouses; all have balconies facing the lane. The goal is having full glass and large patio spaces to bring in the sunlight.

The lane was animated with landscape terraces and patios facing the neighborhood. The lane area has an asphalt sidewalk to provide a separation of material and an understanding for the pedestrian of the walking surface.

There are two amenity spaces one is intended as a party room and the other is at the end of the hallway on top of the parking.

The ground floor retail spaces are divided into smaller retail shops. The elevation’s rhythm is of a smaller scale. The parking entrance and loading area are at the end of the site where the lane intersects and the garages are.

The street frontage has existing street trees and is complaint with the city for commercial. A substantial amount of soil volume is being provided for the trees. The patios have been stepped back to provide a fair amount of landscape along with the white porcelain tiles.

There are veggie garden areas, larger trees and different color trees, sitting areas with a fire pit, and additional areas. There will also be a natural play children’s area.

The 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. Brudar and seconded by Mr. Newfield 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:

- Minimizing the wall at the north edge of the site;
- Look at detailing the ground plain along the lane;
- Minimize height of planters along the lane;
- Review the viability of the planters on upper floors;
- Review materiality of the lane;
- Develop the corner at Dunbar with user friendly elements;
- Further the residential quality of the lane, review height of the loading;
- Consider context in developing overall architectural expression

- **Related Commentary:**

The panel noted it is a difficult zoning and site due to the steep slope. The grade change with the townhomes on the lanes was well done.

It was noted the two feet building height relaxation was acceptable as it is hardly noticeable due to the slope of the land, other panelists noted the reasoning behind the two feet relaxation was not clear.

The architectural expression appears more commercial than residential, would be beneficial to have more of a residential expression.

There were a number of comments regarding the volume of the building. It was suggested to minimize the floor to floor height or minimize that north wall and improve the over shadowing of the backyards especially in the summer months.

Review the exit stairs which is pulling the wall out to clean up the north corner. The buildings could benefit from refinement of the upper floors. Look to see if the window frames can be simplified. The loading is well handled given the grade change. The pedestrian view could use some fine tuning in details. Keep in mind the firewall on the interior property line.

Some panelists questioned if the livability, image, and sustainability is in fitting with the Dunbar context, others noted given the new context of Dunbar the project fits right in.

The horizontal banding at Ash street side appears weighty. The type of glass being utilized creates a lot of reflectivity be wary if this is what is wanted. The limestone comes across heavy. There are colour differences between the renderings. A panelist noted the material sample color is quite subdued and the renderings may appear peachy in color due to the sunlight.

A panelist suggested reviewing accessibility to the balconies.

There were mixed opinions in regards to the rooftop. Some found the rooftop amenity to be successful; others suggested the rooftop would benefit from calming down, lots going on with lots of program areas.

The ground plain has lots of store frontages trying to work with the grade which is a positive. The fine grain of storefronts could translate to the façade above.

The concrete planters on the ground plain along the lane are quite tall they could recess and still have good soil depth. Project would benefit from design development at the ground plain with the canopies.

The material at the lane is not clear, lane could benefit from more texture and materiality to help create a residential feel.

A panelist noted the depths of the planters are quite deep in space, it is possible to take two feet off the planters and give back to the lane.

The landscape shown on the renderings of the exterior façade could be difficult to access and maintain in the long run. The Dunbar corner could be strengthened with seating or public art. Look at reflecting the grain of Dunbar with a fairly robust image. Consider screening the front of the PMT.

There was insufficient information about the sustainability and would have been nice to have more details. It was noted this is a straight DP; therefore the applicant only needs to comply with present codes and is not required to go the extra step.

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

4. Address:	1002 Station Street and 250-310 Prior Street (New St. Paul's Hospital and Health Campus)
Description:	To develop the 18.4 acre site with a new hospital and integrated health care campus, including a mix of commercial, 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. The proposed floor area is approximately 310,000 sq.m (3.34 million sq.ft) of development and the proposed building heights range from approximately 20 m (66 ft.) to 60 m (197 ft.). The application is being considered under the New St. Paul's Hospital and Health Campus Policy Statement.
Zoning:	I-3 to CD-1
Application Status:	Workshop
Review:	First
Architect:	IBI Group
Delegation:	Tony Gill, Architect, IBI Group Rhonda Lui, Owner/Developer, PHC Marc Dagneau, PHC
Staff:	Rachel Harrison & Miguel Castillo Urena

EVALUATION: WORKSHOP - NON-VOTING

- **Introduction:**

Rezoning planner, Rachael Harrison, introduced the project as over the last several years, staff worked on a high-level policy statement for the new St. Paul's Hospital. During that stage, the enquiry came to the panel, and in June 2017, the Policy Statement was approved by City Council. In September 2018, a rezoning application was submitted to the city. It's anticipated that there will be an additional UDP session, prior to taking this proposal to public hearing.

This is a rezoning application for the new St. Paul's Hospital, located on an 18.4 acre site within the False Creek Flats area, and bordered by Station Street (to the west), National Avenue (to the south), Trillium Park (to the east) and by Prior Street and adjacent properties (to the north).

The site is currently zoned I-3 and sites as an undeveloped, vacant lot. Zoning in the area is complex and varied. To the west, the area along Main Street is zoned FC-1 and CD-1. Buildings here are a mix of midrise and highrise, including the Citygate towers (approx. 25 storeys).

To the northwest, is the Georgia Viaduct (zoned M-1) and beyond that, Chinatown. North of Union, is zoned HA-1A, and developed with a mixture of uses and building heights, generally up to 9 storeys. A few recent buildings reach 15 storeys.

To the north and northeast, Strathcona is primarily composed of RT-3 zoning, with a number of CD-1 zoned sites. Buildings are primarily houses and low-rise buildings, with a few towers up to 12 storeys.

To the south and southeast are Pacific Central Station (FC-1), Trillium Park and Thornton Park. Beyond, the zoning is a mix of predominantly I-2 and I-3 sites.

There are also a number of approved policy areas around the subject site. False Creek Flats Plan applies to sites to the south and the intent is to allow higher-density buildings for numerous job-generating uses, including innovation economy, health science and medical service sectors. Buildings are generally limited to conditional density of 5.0 FSR and building heights up to 150 ft.

To the north and west is the Downtown East Side Local Area Plan. The plan, in Thornton Park, Chinatown, and Strathcona, generally reinforces the existing character of each area, with rezoning an option only on sites that increase the supply of affordable housing.

The Georgia Viaducts are part of the Northeast False Creek (NEFC) Plan, which anticipates removal of the viaducts and redevelopment of these lands. This would include heights up to 90 ft. for buildings fronting Main St. up to 150 ft. for buildings fronting Prior St. transitioning down to 60/65 ft. for buildings fronting Gore.

The proposal is for a new hospital and health care campus, as well as commercial, office, hotel, institutional, limited residential uses, and a 49 and 69-space childcare facilities. The hospital will be the tallest building on the site at 62 m or 203 ft. (3.3 million sq. ft.), which is driven by view cone 22, which covers most of the site.

The new St. Paul's site is structured around 4 parcels (health campus, north, west and south). These parcels are formed by the dedication of new streets on the site, with the goal of maximizing a contiguous area for the Health Campus Parcel. Both Malkin and Prior are still being considered for an east-west arterial route, and as you can see, the applicant is showing the Malkin option. Build out of the proposal will occur in three phases, with Phase I being the development of the hospital and health care campus.

The rezoning application includes significant public realm additions. These include two plazas as well as a Wellness Walk.

As I mentioned before, the proposal is being considered under the New St. Paul's Hospital and Health Campus Policy Statement, approved by Council in 2017. There are 18 guiding principles to be considered for the development of the new hospital. The policy statement also includes policies which provide further guidance on land use, density, height, open space, transportation, sustainability and public benefits.

In terms of transition and scale, the policy statement states that the proposal should consider public views and respect the view cones. The proposal should also respond to the scale of Pacific Central Station, Main Street and with edges that frame Thornton Park, and transition in form and scale to the existing neighborhoods to the north and Trillium Park to the east.

This proposal will also need to meet the Rezoning Policy for Sustainable Large Developments in which there are 8 requirements. The applicant intends to meet these requirements and is working with a consultant to develop strategies in each area.

Development planner, Miguel Castillo-Urena, introduced the project as the purpose of this non-voting workshop session is to gain initial advice from the panel about the general intents of the draft guidelines. We would also like to gain feedback on how the general approaches shown in the indicative design relate to these.

Advice from the Panel is sought on the following:

Site

1. Building siting (orientation and separation) and the distribution of uses within site based on the general approach of the indicative design.

Please consider: Contextual response to adjacent neighborhoods (low-scale development to the north, mixed-use to the west, parks or heritage context to the south), including integration with existing urban fabric, solar access and pedestrian flows across (and access to) site, including from transit.

Building Form & Massing

2. Does the Panel support the proposed density, massing, and height approaches included in the indicative design?

Please consider: building typology, scale, context, view cones & amount and quality of open space

Open Space

3. Variety, nature and relationship of the proposed open space to built form as per the strategies indicated in the indicative design.

Please consider: solar access, shadowing, place-making, universal & accessible access, associated ground floor uses or nature.

Guidelines

4. Please comment in general of each one of the intent statements of the NSPHC guidelines.

- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:**

With respect to the policy statements, it set some of the roads, connections and links through so we are left with a certain parcel of land on both sides, west and to the east. Presently we are at phase one.

This truly is a medical research campus. What make this site unique from other hospitals are the research elements. What is unique to this land is it once had a flood plain to it therefore; one element that is very important is setting the core of the hospital. We wanted to set the hospital on the highest point of the land where it is the safest.

The research component has a bridge link as they work together hand in hand with the office space. There is also additional opportunity for the research component at the development to the West. The building itself has a technical platform which has all the main operating rooms, diagnostics, imaging, all the heavy technical pieces. At the top we are looking to have our inpatient units.

There is a portion for the main out-patient services. We are also planning the emergency component at an easy accessible space; especially for the emergency vehicles we have provided two paths to provide efficient navigating. As you drive in there is a ramp to facilitate pick-ups and drop offs. The intent is to move the majority of the movement a health care campus has (i.e. pick up/drop offs) away from the high street closer to a more controlled area.

We are trying to connect a pedestrian street experience of both sides of the main north/south connection street. The bulk of the massing when you start to look at the streets themselves pedestrians can go through the grand plaza into the facility. There is a wellness walk that connects around the site. There are additional medical office buildings. The townhouses are fronting to the side to the north of the main health care buildings. There is lots of commercial retail and residential component on the edge.

- **Related Commentary of the Proposed Intents of the Guidelines by Urban Design Panel Members:**

Intent Statement #1: Application and Intent

The intent of these Design Guidelines is to support the design development of the New St. Paul's Hospital and Health Campus (NSPHC), to achieve innovative, high-quality and green building design, vibrant public realm, and appropriate relationship in form and use to the existing (and future) context.

Panel Comments:

- How does it relate and build city?
- Blank facades won't cut it
- High quality and vibrant? How to define?
- Vibrant public realm?
- Defining high quality and innovation (how is this project innovative?) - not there yet
- Need definitions in intent
- How does it evolve? How does it stay current?
- Flexibility/Adaptability (how will technology change? 100-200 years - beyond building code today (define what it will be?))
- Resilience through future lens
- Standards of livability

Intent Statement #2: Urban Design Principles

The development should be well integrated with the existing urban fabric, respond to the historical context, provide adequate density, height, massing, open space, and achieve high contextual fit and express its own identity while also serving vital healthcare needs.

The site-wide concept should employ resilient and sustainable strategies to achieve cutting-edge low carbon designs and universal public realm that should encourage the creation of a highly walkable community.

Panel Comments:

- Campus identity? Blur lines from community into campus. How will this project achieve this?
- Define what you mean by fit and integration? → and integration to street grid
- Old water line helps tell story. Tell the story of its laid out the way it is
- Word it to allow for flexibility
- Perhaps do not refer to historical context → new use how does it apply? Is it possible to be compatible with context?
- Leave height and massing separate
- What urban space is being created? How do you get around?
- Historical context and public realm only?
- Public realm and city grid → maybe these are things that the project can respond to
- How do façade to the north connect to neighbourhood? - North façade green and blank
- Currently mass/scale setup to respond to industrial context not Strathcona → does not address neighbourhood impact for height → concentrate on green space
- Look at shadowing impacts to neighbourhood and public realm and connectivity
- Use buildings to create space
- Networks not height and massing

Intent Statement #3: Overall (Site-wide) Guidelines

The development should establish a vibrant mixed-use in the heart of False Creek Flats to create a sense of place and highly-liveable community that enable residents and patients to easily access healthcare functions and a wide array of community amenities.

Panel Comments:

- Interactive edges?
 - Can these be programming pieces?
- Strengthen wording on Wellness Walk or it will get lost
- No eyes on the wall adjacent to the Wellness Walk (off Malkin)
 - CPTED concerns
 - Include programming function on north side
 - Have positive edges on all sides

- Do ground floor better
- No porosity on north side
- Can Wellness Walk be on healthcare blvd? arterial hwy
- Allow for pockets of urban space (currently focused on Main Street)
- Positive edge on every frontage on ground floor
- Need to invite people through site
- Combine Guidelines 2 and 3

Intent Statement #4: Open Space

The overall public realm should be based on integrated, permeable, and accessible network of diverse open spaces (streets, pedestrian mews, plazas and roof-tops) to achieve varied identifiable spaces with high solar access that support healing functions.

Panel Comments:

- Solar access in public realm not adequate
- High solar access?
- Too much north facing open space
- Internal courtyards
- All public realm or only open spaces?
- Green parcel and encourage staying and playing
- Non-descript plazas "leftover places"
 - Defined by roads
- Use buildings to actually form space not roads
- Think spaces first, then buildings
- Get people from Thornton Park - legibility, porosity, purposefulness - good site lines from entrance
 - Blur lines between spaces
- Hospital is hidden from Thornton Park
- Opening of entrance (from station) → Combine west facing buildings to open
 - Slide buildings over to open up main plaza
- Open spaces are open and connected to site-lines → connected to Thornton Park
- Articulation to the north is important
- Quality of site-lines are important (widened)
- Variety okay
- Public spaces are being heavily impacted by cars
- Clear wayfinding
- Better to make one really good public space rather than two separate spaces
- Why underground access in healthcare blvd? → Especially if pedestrian environment. People over cars (drop-off on Main private) → How does it relate to secondary service routes?
- Drop people off closer to entry
- Sequencing of pickup/drop off

Intent Statement #5: Precincts & Building Form

The site should be comprised on four precincts; each one should provide its own distinctive identity and character and respond to the existing (and future) context.

Intent Statement #5a: North Precinct - The form of development on the North Precinct should transition and integrate sensitively, both in form and use, towards the low-scale developments to the north.

Panel Comments:

- Why so low?
- Important transition to Strathcona

- Model future viaducts development in future

Intent Statement #5b: Health Campus Precinct - The anticipated building form within the Health Campus Precinct should be orientated properly to facilitate solar access, minimize shadows onto open spaces, and provide transition of scale to the north and a visually interesting ground floor expression.

Panel Comments:

- Increase separation
- Porosity of research section
- Tilt buildings to allow penetration of natural light
- Add: “engaging” ground floor expression

Intent Statement #5c: South Precinct - The building located on the South Precinct should relate well to a key heritage adjacency (Pacific Station) and existing (and future) open spaces.

Panel Comments:

- Good aspiration
- Add open space to support connectivity to hospital (draw you in)
- Variety and flexibility important → connectivity with Thornton Park important
- Relate to Pacific Central Station

Intent Statement #5d: West Precinct - The expected building form for the West Precinct should contribute to a strong street wall to the north, engage the public realm with active uses and variation and respond sensitively its strategic location close to Thornton Park.

Panel Comments:

- Identity of parklet to the north of Thornton important → can it be enhanced?
- More legible from Thornton Park → Inviting and liveable
- Open space primarily north facing
- Informal courtyards?

Intent Statement #6: Architectural Components

The building form and expression of the New St. Paul’s Healthcare campus should exhibit excellence in architecture that reflects its central use and nature, but that also recognizes the site’s history. The design and scale of architectural elements and frontages should be relatable to the pedestrian environment to create a strong sense of place rather than leave a generic impression. Large blank or monotonous street walls must be avoided. Architecture should be highly legible and designed to add visual interest that enhances the pedestrian experience and public spaces.

Panel Comments:

- Flip height → higher on north side to mimic NEFC heights
- Add: street walls “must” be avoided

Intent Statement # 7: Environmental Considerations

The development should comprehensively integrate site-wide resilient and environmental, social, and economic sustainable strategies, such as passive design, thorough rainwater management, urban heat island mitigation, urban agriculture, and other tactics or considerations.

Panel Comments:

- Add social, economic
- More info on mobility
 - Car share, bikes
- Inclusivity - Can DTES hangout here?
- How does this fit to the FC Flats Plan? Connectivity, etc. - Show model w/ plexiglass

Additional Panel Comments:

Support density? Challenged

- Density too much to give meaningful public realm between health campus buildings
 - Can the buildings be higher?
- Too canyon like

Is this what PHC needs?

- City should consider removing part of view cone
- Sense of light needs to improve

Design guidelines

- Push to try harder
 - Street network might be different then what is proposed - makes sense that guidelines compliment this
 - Health outcomes - open space/green space
- **Applicant's Introductory Comments:** The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.