

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: April 28, 2004

TIME: 4.00 pm

PLACE: Committee Room No. 1, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:
Bruce Haden, Chair
Mark Ostry
Robert Barnes
Jeffrey Corbett (excused Item 1)
Alan Endall (excused Item 4)
Marta Farevaag (excused Item 4)
Steven Keyes (present for Items 3 -4 only)
Ronald Lea
Margot Long
Jennifer Marshall
Brian Martin

REGRETS: Larry Adams

RECORDING SECRETARY: Carol Hubbard

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	575 Bute Street (1200 West Pender)
2.	1 Kingsway
3.	3660 Vanness Avenue (Collingwood Village)
4.	1155 East Broadway (VCC King Edward Campus)

Business:

Woodward's: Scot Hein, Development Planner, advised this project is at the second phase of the RFP process which is a competition for which four teams are preparing submissions. It is proposed to hold a joint UDP/Heritage Commission workshop on Monday, June 21, 2004 (without selecting any of the four schemes). In discussion, it was agreed that the regular Panel meeting of June 23 will be cancelled. The time of the workshop meeting is to be confirmed, noting there is also a Development Permit Board meeting at 3 p.m. on June 21. The matter will be discussed further at the next Panel meeting.

-
1. Address: 575 Bute Street (1200 West Pender)
DE: 408162
Use: Mixed (33 storeys, 147 units)
Zoning: DD
Application Status: Preliminary
Architect: Hancock Bruckner Eng & Wright
Owner: Mondiale Development Ltd. (Pinnacle)
Review: Second
Delegation: Martin Bruckner, Peter Kreuk
Staff: Ralph Segal
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8-0)

- **Introduction:** Ralph Segal, Development Planner, introduced this preliminary application. The Panel did not support an earlier submission when it was reviewed on March 3, 2004. Mr. Segal briefly described the site context and noted that staff believe the applicant has made a substantive response to the Panel's previous concerns.

The Panel's advice is sought on the response to its previous comments, the overall response to the context, streetscape response, including the Bute high street, and the overall massing and whether it is believed the requested ten percent heritage density transfer can be accommodated on this site.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** Martin Bruckner, Architect, briefly described the revisions made to the scheme since the Panel's last review, and Peter Kreuk reviewed the landscape plan. Staff and the applicant team responded to the Panel's questions.
- **Summary of Panel's Key Issues:**
 - General support for the higher tower provided there is additional public benefit demonstrated;
 - Design development recommended specifically on the West Pender podium elevation;
 - Design development on tower and ground geometries - potential simplification and clarification of both the geometries in terms of the street relationship and the formal language of the tower.
- **Panel's Comments:** The Panel unanimously supported this preliminary application and found it considerably improved since the last submission.

The Panel generally believed the site could accommodate the additional 0.6 FSR heritage density transfer. The Panel was also not uncomfortable with the proposed additional height; however, at the complete application stage the Panel will look for a convincing demonstration that the extra height is merited for this scheme given its significant benefits to the applicant. It also would be helpful to see evidence of whether the additional 0.6 FSR, without the additional height, results in a significantly squatter tower form.

Comments about the Height and Heritage Density Transfer included:

- Not sure why this project would merit an extra 39 ft. - it does not contribute anything additional to the city other than accommodating heritage density which could be done without the extra height; Not sure whether the extra height makes or breaks it either for the city or building itself;
-

- Not worried about view impacts;
- Not sure it warrants the extra 39 ft. but I have no concern about the heritage density transfer;
- There does not seem to be any reason why the heritage density transfer cannot be accommodated on the site;
- Given the proposal is changing the ground rules by going beyond 300 ft. it is not doing a lot to earn the additional FSR, other than purchasing heritage density;
- I think the slim tower makes it worthwhile to increase the height but I agree there is not much offered to the city in return for the increased height; perhaps this could be achieved by doing more on Bute Street as a special public place in the city;
- I agree the site can handle the additional 0.6 FSR but I am not convinced the additional height is being earned - it is impossible to know without seeing some demonstration of how the additional density elsewhere on the project might impact the slenderness of the tower;
- I think the additional 0.6 FSR can be accommodated and there is sufficient indication of the direction in which the project is moving to provide confidence that in the detailed design resolution the architecture can be developed sufficiently to merit the extra density.

Other comments and suggestions on the massing and streetscape included:

- There have been some big improvements with respect to the orientation to grid: the Melville townhouses relate much better to the street;
- The relocated entry is a big improvement;
- The larger podium makes the building look more balanced;
- Melville Street and the townhouse entries are much improved - they work well and fit in the context;
- The public realm on Melville and Bute is working well but Pender Street needs a lot of help;
- The Melville townhouses and relocated entrance are big improvements since the previous submission;
- This submission does a much better job of addressing this special place in the city where the two grids come together;
- The Melville façade is much improved - I like the simpler townhouses and the overhang is a nice feature;
- The Bute Street façade is a good way to address the street;
- The Bute and Melville streetscape is much improved;
- The Melville townhouses are a big improvement to the streetscape.

Specific comments on the tower included:

- The mechanical penthouse seems large and heavy and perhaps could be slimmed down more;
- More effort could be made to redesign the mechanical penthouse;
- The tower massing seems fine and I like that it has slimmed down but there is too much happening - as with the Pender Street podium, the tower element needs some more strength;
- With respect to the design details, I do not like the creation of a "tide line" on the tower, which is very unresolved; there are too many ideas happening;
- The overall form of the tower is more interesting than previously although the shape of the penthouse seems a bit strange and needs some resolution;

- The midpoint break on the tower needs some blending between the two; I agree there are too many elements on the tower, especially the different balcony shapes;
- The punched openings on the southwest corner need resolution - they don't seem to wrap the corner very well;
- The tower is certainly more dynamic than the previous scheme;
- I like the angled balconies on the west side and the angled façade on the north;
- The tower could use more sculpting at the upper floors;
- There has been improvement with the slenderness of the tower and the added substance to the podium has helped the building; however, the resolution of the street orientation remains a bit awkward and needs greater clarity;
- The weakest part is the way the tower relates to the ground - there does not seem to be enough distinction between the residential and retail components;
- There are very positive signs of improvement, particularly in terms of achieving a slimmer and cleaner tower expression;
- One of the basic challenges is the detailed resolution and integration of the two geometries and there remains some confusion as to where one geometry starts and the other ends; at this point it holds promise but the proof will be in how the details are handled;
- The west side of the tower has an awkward transition from one geometry to the other, midway through the building, which seems somewhat abrupt and disconnected - this façade in particular needs much more attention;
- The tower feels particularly awkward at the top where the top few floors start to step back and are shaved off - there is confusion as to what the basic moves are;
- The central vertical element on the Melville frontage is in the Pender alignment whereas it might be more appropriate to truncate it in alignment with Melville - similar to the way the townhouses are handled - so that there is a common geometry between the townhouses and the tower;
- A lot more work is needed in how the tower meets the ground and the podium, particularly around the Melville entry.

The Panel had a number of comments about the Pender Street façade, with the following observations recorded:

- There have been great improvements made to the Pender Street podium façade but the Pender streetscape remains very unfriendly;
- The Pender Street podium façade has no life and it does little to improve this section of Pender Street which is a somewhat harsh environment currently;
- The extra height on the podium is a big help but the 35 ft. grid doesn't make sense;
- The Pender façade is quite oversimplified and needs further work;
- The change in massing of the Pender façade helps address the street better;
- I like the way the additional podium height creates roof decks for the amenity space and allows the private gardens to be recessed;
- The Pender streetscape seems lacking in character and could use more work;
- Perhaps by the complete stage some users will have been identified so that it can be designed in a friendlier way to suit their particular requirements;
- Increasing the scale of the Pender frontage is a positive move but this façade needs some design development.

With respect to the view study, an observation was made that while a great deal of effort has been made to illustrate the impacts, there is no indication of what the view actually is. It was suggested it would be helpful to include this at the next stage.

A detailed item for consideration at the next stage was that the access to the bicycle storage is via a very convoluted lobby condition rather than right off the street. Another suggestion was that the green roofs might need more patterning.

- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Bruckner thanked the Panel for the comments and said they will work diligently to earn what is proposed.

-
2. Address: 1 Kingsway
DE: 408303
Use: Community Centre
Zoning: C-3A
Application Status: Complete
Architect: Busby & Associates
Owner: City of Vancouver
Review: First
Delegation: Peter Busby, David Dove, Jane Durante
Staff: Mary Beth Rondeau
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10-0)

- **Introduction:** Mary Beth Rondeau, Development Planner, presented this proposal for a new Mount Pleasant Community Centre located at Main Street and Kingsway. It is an important civic project that will deliver significant amenity to the neighbourhood. In addition to the community centre, the proposal includes a daycare, a branch library and secured market rental housing. Ms. Rondeau briefly described the site context and the general character of Mount Pleasant. The application seeks a height relaxation (99 ft. at the south end on Kingsway and 105 ft. at the lane), noting the outright permissible height in C-3A is 30 ft. but may be relaxed to an unspecified maximum. The guidelines suggest 70 ft. in this sub area. Staff support the requested height relaxation given the character of the local historic context and given the significant public benefit offered by the proposal. Mr. Rondeau explained that the submission proposal has been revised after consulting with the Mount Pleasant neighbourhood and the Panel is asked to consider the revised scheme. With respect to sustainability, the intent is for the project to seek LEED silver certification.

The Development Planner advised that staff are looking for ways to reduce the scale of the rear lane elevation, and to scale down the elevator penthouse to minimize view impact. The advice of the Panel is sought on whether the application earns the height and density it seeks, and whether the massing character development of the revised scheme is proceeding in the right direction.

- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** Peter Busby, Architect, briefly reviewed the plans and Jane Durante described the landscape plan. Staff and the applicant team responded to the Panel's questions.
- **Summary of Panel's Key Issues:**
 - Design development to improve the east façade and the lane treatment;
 - The desire for a greater civic expression of the library, potentially towards the corner;
 - Design development issues with respect to the residential component - some ambiguity but areas such as how the top is handled and the general squatness of the building.
- **Panel's Comments:** The Panel unanimously supported this application and found the submission very complete and thorough. The Panel had no doubt that this project has earned the requested height and density, through the provision of the daycare, community facilities and secured rental housing.

A summary of the Panel's comments are as follows:

Overall Massing:

- I agree the height is achievable although the only reason it is at 100 ft. is because the majority of the massing is at one end of the site. Without the community centre it would be distributed a little differently over the site and have less impact on the Metro Vista;
- The project has been delineated by programmatic zoning and is quite legible, but the question is whether the programming could have been handled differently, e.g., by distributing the residential use over the site whether there could be more community presence at the most prominent corner of Main and Kingsway;
- I have no concern about the scale of this building given what is going to occur in the future in this area;
- There are very interesting uses around the edges, providing good animation at pedestrian level;
- I appreciate the very simple rationale, the very ordered organization of this project; it has a level of sophistication and discipline that is very good;
- There are a lot of good benefits for the people who will use the community centre but I'm not convinced there is as much benefit as there should be for people driving by this civic building;
- This building reads very much as a residential building from the corner, which is the most prominent corner of the site - I question whether it should read more as a community facility at the corner, perhaps with an expression of the library at the corner;
- Any negative aspects of locating the residential component in the place of privilege at the corner are offset by the benefits to the community facilities, particularly in terms of solar access;
- The project also earns the extra height because it does not significantly impact on the view lines from Metro Vista;
- Support the volume at the corner of Kingsway which provides an anchor to this awkward intersection;
- Since the two building masses are quite different perhaps an entry volume in the middle could bridge the two; also question whether the entry point should be either higher or lower to make a better connection;
- It is very important that the library is strong enough to give a civic expression at the corner - it feels more mid-block now;
- From an urban design point of view the resolution is excellent;
- I do not believe there needs to be more civic presence at the corner - the fact that this is not an icon building is positive and to try to make something more of the corner would be a mistake;
- The public and civic presence is strongest the street level, which is where it needs to be;
- Having residential above it, particularly since its rental, is of civic importance as well, and the massing strengthens the streetscape in the urban form and the grid within Mount Pleasant;
- The site is very well selected - it really is the heart of the community and I think it will be perceived that way and used that way;
- There is opportunity to make the building more permeable, e.g., cafes opening outside, etc.;
- The building form is well conceived in terms of dealing with the issue of the additional height on this site;
- The height matches the buildings around and it makes good sense to pair in the way that it does.

Overall Character:

- This project is a gateway to Kingsway as well as a community building so it has to respond at a city as well as a local level. I think it is unfortunate that this is the way that Mount Pleasant would choose to announce itself to the rest of the city: it is a somewhat dry aesthetic;
- A fundamental characteristic of Mount Pleasant is the use of brick but I believe that when historic buildings are replicated it diminishes the impact of the original buildings;
- I'm not sure this is in the Mount Pleasant vernacular;
- I don't care for the enclosed balcony bays on Kingsway, especially the white colour;
- I like the retro expression of the civic component. It is very much in the character of Kingsway, historically;
- Appreciate the references to existing buildings and the translation of the details in a more modern and contemporary way, although recognize that this approach may not always be appreciated by local residents;
- The legibility of the references to local buildings is more successful in the residential component than the low rise civic component;
- The development of the community component is very deftly handled and I support the its contemporary expression; it will be very lively and animated;
- I am grateful this is not an historicist project which would erode the quality of the wonderfully restored buildings in Mount Pleasant: it is contemporary while being respectful to the materials loved by the community;
- The proposal does match the material character of the area, i.e., the building materials are substantially equal or compatible with the various neighbouring large buildings;
- I look forward to the inclusion of ceramic tile, reflective of the Lee Building;
- The architecture is a reflection of Mount Pleasant and supports it in a very positive way;
- The graphic exercise on the Kingsway façade is very interesting - anything that can be done to strengthen that graphic approach will be beneficial;
- Anything that can be done to enhance the streetscape on Kingsway will be beneficial, noting that offices at street level can have a negative impact;
- While the character of the building doesn't blend into the Mount Pleasant streetscape, I don't think it should;
- It is an important building for the community so I question whether it should announce itself more - it is a bit anonymous.

Residential Component and Library:

- Support reflecting the top of the Lee Building on the residential component but think it could be stronger;
- Concern about the simplicity and rigidity of the residential massing, specifically the abrupt nature of the south façade. Suggest increasing the amount of glazing and how the openings are handled to give some relief;
- There are a couple of problematic units in the building (2 BR suites on the third and fourth floor) which lack fenestration;
- The massing being pushed to the north creates a floorplate that is less than ideal for developing a residential component on this site;
- In some respects it appears that this building could have been taller but it appears to have been truncated at the 100 ft. level - there needs to be some development to the top of the building so that it doesn't seem like a total extrusion from the second floor up;

- The northwest corner appears to encroach over public property - consider an architectural element at the sidewalk level of this corner to convey an extension overhead rather than a projection over public space;
- A rooftop deck would be a nice benefit for the residents;
- The library is very recessive and should have a stronger presence;
- The library could be more visually separated from the residential building - it's a bit hidden underneath the residential building.

Lane Treatment/Open Space:

- There needs to be some treatment to the expansive wall at the lane, e.g. community art, murals, vines, etc., to make it less of a target for graffiti. There should be some attempt to make it less of a back lane;
- The lane treatment is very plain and needs to be more welcoming, particularly for the future new property adjacent to it;
- The lane warrants the same attention that has been given to the street;
- The lane should be friendlier;
- It is important to know where the lane drop-off is on the lane for arrival by car;
- Question the community garden at the lane - perhaps there should be more a "tip of the hat" to Brewery Creek in this location;
- Support the open space planned for this project and the future project on the north side; I agree the community garden is not the best approach here;
- Question whether more active uses (small playground, basketball hoop) could be provide at the south and 8th Avenue;
- I like the way the various open spaces have been addressed and dealt with, except where it seems like the project has stopped at the property line of the lane. Like Kingsway and 7th, the lane needs to be incorporated into the project more, in keeping with the many interesting lanes in the neighbourhood;
- I would like to see low shrubs on Kingsway to help the streetscape and provide more of a separation from cars - the lawn is not the right approach on Kingsway.

Sustainability:

- We are at the stage where one of the characteristics of sustainability is not only to provide sustainable buildings but include ways of educating the public about sustainability. It is very especially important in a public facility such as this to find opportunities to explain what the building is doing, and why;
 - I strongly support the roof being used for water collection and irrigation, which is a sustainable feature that many advocate but is seldom achieved.
-
- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Busby expressed appreciation for the suggestions which he said they will work on. He noted there is a public art component and they intend to develop some artistic aspect to the rear elevation. He agreed they can make some changes to improve the pedestrian amenities. With respect to the civic presence at the corner, Mr. Busby said there are some things they can do to make it more apparent that there is a library under the residential and to bring its presence out to the corner. He noted there has already been some design development to the residential component and some of the Panel's input will be considered. He stressed that the massing solution was the result of solar access considerations. Other alternatives were investigated in great detail but solar penetration of the daycare was thought to be of primary importance. The proposed massing is also preferable for the Metro Vista residents. He noted the community garden will be restricted to growing flowers; however, consideration will be given to introducing a basketball hoop. He also agreed with the suggestion of including an educational component with respect to the project's sustainability initiatives.

3. Address: 3660 Vanness Avenue (Collingwood Village)
DE: 408325
Use: Residential (21 storeys)
Zoning: CD-1
Application Status: Complete
Architect: Lawrence Doyle
Owner: Crowley Drive Holdings Ltd.
Review: First
Delegation: Richard Henry, Larry Doyle, Randall Sharp, Lese Lock
Staff: Bob Adair

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (10-0)

- **Introduction:** Bob Adair, Development Planner, presented this application for the last tower development in Collingwood Village. The site is at the corner of Vanness and Ormidale, adjacent to the Skytrain at the far eastern end of Collingwood Village. To the west of the site are two signature towers now under construction, and to the east is a future park to be constructed in the near future. Two public walkways dissect the site, one north-south and one east-west. The proposed 21-storey tower with two 4-storey wings on each side conforms to the CD-1 regulations in terms of siting, floor plates and massing. Underground parking is accessed from Ormidale.

Planning staff support the proposal, noting it conforms to the approved CD-1 zoning. The Panel's advice is sought on the following:

- The detailed massing approach to the tower, recognizing the CD-1 defines the general bulk and height, i.e., how the tower comes to grade at the corner, and its integration with the low-rise form at the eastern end;
 - Treatment of the south elevation of the westerly wing which has a stair tower and an expanse of blank wall facing the corner;
 - The relationship to grade at the northwest corner.
- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** Richard Henry, Architect, noted that Collingwood Village was established by the City to provide affordable housing for first-time buyers in the area. He noted there have been some recent modifications made and there is now about a 3 ft. grade change between the amenity area and the public pathway. Mr. Henry summarized the key elements of the project and briefly reviewed the design rationale. He also apologized for some inaccuracies on the model and advised that the drawings are a more accurate reflection of the intent. Randall Sharp reviewed the landscape plan and the applicant team and development planner responded to the Panel's questions.

Key issues:

- Design development of the ground plane and landscape in order to clarify the public/private realms and to resolve conflicts between service and other areas;
 - Design development to the south side to enhance the relationship to grade, with suggestions of enhancing both detail and the level of transparency;
 - Consider de-emphasizing the corner trellis, not necessarily eliminate it, in favour of the entry - there seems to be a conflict between the corner trellis and the entry.
- **Panel's Comments:** The Panel unanimously supported this application and was satisfied that its character is in keeping with the Collingwood Village development to date.

The Panel had no concerns about the relationship to grade at the northwest corner of the site.

The Panel supported the tower being expressed all the way down to the ground and with the two adjacent wings being subservient to the main building. There was, however, a recommendation to consider some gesture to acknowledge the relationship of the lower floors to the adjacent landscape space, possibly with reveals in the concrete or a change in colour. There was also a suggestion from one Panel member that the glazing at the rear should be consistent with the rest of the building.

One Panel member found the whole public circulation on the ground floor plane to be unnecessarily mean and strongly recommended consideration of day-lighting in all the circulation areas wherever possible.

Some privacy conflicts were identified at the connection of the tower to the east wing, specifically units D2 and L1, and improvements were recommended to the enclosed balcony in suite J1 in the west wing. There was also a recommendation to consider enclosed rather than open balconies for the east wing type P suites above the parking entry.

The main concerns about the building were with the south elevation which the Panel generally found was not as well resolved as the rest of the project. There were particular concerns about the exposed stair tower on the south elevation of the west wing which it thought would benefit from some additional design development. The addition of windows and more generous openings into the stairwell would help to soften its appearance. One Panel member thought the south elevation was making the building appear wider than it is, and suggested reworking the floorplates to achieve more of a cruciform shape to give a greater sense of verticality. Adjustments to the colour palette might also help to reduce the visual mass of the building.

With respect to the east wing, the Panel had concerns that the corner trellises, while supported as being very attractive, seem to be competing with the main tower entrance. The recommendation was to de-emphasize them a bit and strengthen the entry in some way to address this ambiguity.

The Panel had a number of concerns about the landscape plan which was found to be rather difficult to understand. There were particular concerns about the end of the arc which terminates in a seating area by the loading bay. It seems unresolved and needing some softening. There is also some ambiguity about what is public and semi private open space which needs to be clarified. There was a recommendation for greater articulation of the relationship between the amenity court and the play area. Stronger edge definition was suggested.

- **Applicant's Response:** Responding to comments about the treatment of the amenity around the loading bay, Mr. Sharp said he supported the notion of providing hard surface play area for children, even if it's unofficial. He explained, it is basically an outdoor room and they intend to make it more attractive, including the use of permeable pavers. With respect to defining the public realm, Mr. Sharp advised there will be a fence integrated just below the inner walkway. Mr. Henry thanked the Panel for its comments and said the issues raised will be addressed.

-
4. Address: 1155 East Broadway (VCC King Edward Campus)
Use: School
Zoning: CD-1
Application Status: WORKSHOP
Architect: Stantec
Owner: Vancouver Community College
Review: Second
Delegation: Rainer Fassler
Staff: Anita Molaro, Tom Phipps
-

- **Introduction:** Tom Phipps, Rezoning Planner, introduced this second workshop discussion on this very large site, noting the intent is to resolve the basic issues before proceeding to a rezoning application.

At the last workshop, the Panel questioned the significance of the view corridor from Broadway across this site. Staff have since researched this issue and have concluded that it arose from a broader city-wide concern for view protection, particularly across public locations. This concern subsequently evolved into the view protection policy and view cones adopted by the City. However, that policy was not followed through on the east side of the city from a number of public locations such as this, except in what is reflected in the Council approved form of development for the CD-1 zoning. Staff therefore believe that view protection on this site is a part of Council policy as a component of the larger picture of protecting public views. Mr. Phipps noted this was originally a park site containing a submerged velodrome and it was redeveloped to provide the existing community college. At that time it was considered essential to protect the views to the north from Broadway because of the publicness of the site.

Anita Molaro, Development Planner, briefly reviewed the current massing arrangement, noting the proponent is still working on establishing urban design principles on the site. She briefly reviewed the Panel's previous comments and noted the following areas in which the Panel's further response is requested:

- The view to the north from Broadway and the need to improve the presence on Broadway, noting that intervention into the view corridor is still being tested;
 - The effectiveness of the proposed spine in the creation of campus;
 - The value of the upper level pedestrian bridge and separation of pedestrian activity, with 7th Avenue evolving as a campus street, knitting the two pieces of the campus together at grade;
 - The overall distribution of the density, and scale of the buildings.
- **Applicant's Opening Comments:** Rainer Fassler, Architect, explained the current stage of the scheme. He noted the future False Creek Flats development is an important context to consider, including the role of Glen Drive and its relationship to the spine. Mr. Fassler requested the Panel's response to the question of whether the disposition of the required 685,000 sq.ft. is feasible on this site. General discussion followed.

Panel's Comments:

The Panel generally found this submission to be much improved since the last review and was encouraged that the applicant now has a strong idea for the project and is enthusiastic about the direction in which it is now heading. Panel members generally supported this direction, with a number of questions and comments, as follows:

General:

- Given that future funding is an unknown factor, ensure the project is complete at each stage of its development;
- Find ways to glamourize the "guts" of the facility, e.g., the kitchens and workshops;
- Even at this very preliminary stage it is important to think of ideas around sustainability because a lot of those concepts and initial ideas will help form some of your spaces and ideas and get more definition;
- Corporate involvement might be a useful tool;
- Re-branding of this community college might be beneficial.

Northerly View from Broadway/VCC Presence on Broadway:

- The apparent conflict between providing a legitimate presence of the VCC on Broadway and maintaining the view corridor does not necessarily have a built form solution - consider the minimal (and affordable) means of creating a presence on Broadway without building on which addresses the scale of Broadway;
- The long term the character of Great Northern Way will change much more than this stretch of Broadway;
- I have no problem whatsoever with eliminating the view at the corner, especially with the enticement of the potential for another view from the public plaza area;
- It is possible to preserve the view and have a Broadway presence;
- The view is important for people passing by - it is what Vancouver is about;
- Think about how the spine comes to Broadway, connects to the plaza and makes a front door to the building - this is more important than thinking about how to put mass on the corner;
- The view can be maintained and still allow a building at the corner - perhaps with a building like the Westcoast Transmission building with a clear view underneath;
- I think this should go back to Council because it's a bit of a red herring. The view is a minor item there and the campus presence on Broadway is much more important;
- The corner building at the very least is critical;
- Consideration might be given to finding public sector benefactors for a facility which is also available to the general public (e.g., theatre, art gallery);
- The view corridors were set up as a long term vision and are sacred. I feel very strongly that the view corridors are really important - not just from Broadway but the park across the street and other open spaces;
- What is lacking is a front door on Broadway - there is no sense of where the real entrance to the building is;
- There needs to be good reason to lose the view;
- There are other ways of creating the same entry court shown without giving away the view;
- Suggest an incremental study to see how much view can be saved with different gestures;
- The view is important - the city is full of peek-a-boo views and it's important to see it from the street rather than having to enter a plaza;
- Difficult to keep a presence on Broadway and keep a view without building on top of the existing building;

- In reality the front door to the campus will eventually be on Gt. Northern Way;
- I'm not sure about the importance of the view from Broadway given the speed of the traffic; however, the concept of maintaining view corridors has held up for many years and probably should continue.

The Spine:

- It is important to consider the hours the spine is not open to the public;
- The spine is now much more defined;
- Consider having the spine right at Glen, with the circulation extremely transparent, so that the street is animated by the students moving through the building;
- Concern that it is too internalized and more like a commercial shopping mall than a campus;
- Agree the spine is the way to go to make it work well;
- There is need for a collective gathering space, a node where the energy of the campus is;
- Make the most of the spine for its full length and concentrate on how it comes to Broadway;
- Fully support the spine down the centre - it helps integrate the existing and future buildings;
- The connections to Glen are really coming along well;
- While the north-south spine is very promising the east-west connection is weak. I think there should be a strong connection down 7th Avenue as well, and if that is the crossroads it is the logical place for the heart of the campus;
- There should be more actual physical penetration into the spine on Keith;
- The double-sided spine really knits the whole project together and is really positive - it has strengthened a lot since the last review;
- I agree that the east-west Glen and Keith connections are also important and need to be carefully handled;
- If the spine can be seen from the perimeter, that's where it starts to make it successful;
- Build off from the spine idea that there is a heart to the campus and a gathering space, even if some of that evolves from a public area;
- If you don't create a place for gathering to occur then the students will make their own space and it might not be where the college wants - it is inherent for the campus to have that space;
- Keith is still the weak street without penetrations and has a "back door" look;
- The vertical connections into the spine are good;
- The spine must be the heart and soul of this whole campus;
- The bulk of this project is tending to the north so Broadway will play less significance;
- The spine should have a gathering place so that all students, in whatever program, will be drawn to the same place.

Density Distribution and Scale:

- This is where I have the most difficulty and with the proposal because in some ways you are still trying to find an acceptable massing without a defined program - how flexible will the space be designed for future change?
- It would help to see even the conceptual zoning diagram to help understand the zoning of the site rather than abstract blocks;
- I wonder whether the 9-storey buildings could be reduced to 7 or 8, and what would be the impact of applying that area to some of the lower buildings;
- The narrower office space above the wider classroom won't affect streetwall and you gain the potential of roof decks;
- I definitely think the square footage is feasible on the site but there needs to be a very careful look at solar access to make sure it will work;
- No strong opinion on whether it can support the density;
- Pleased to see that the maximum height of the tower has been lowered since the previous submission;
- If the currently proposed height is necessary to maintain the reduced streetwall height I think that's the highest priority. Alternatively if the height can be reduced on the tower without the expense of compromising the streetwall that should be explored;
- If this is the density that's required, then let's accommodate it;
- The density distribution is much better than before;
- Building scale is going in the right direction - I like what you're doing on Gt. Northern Way and I think 6 storeys is probably right;
- Massing, height and density, no problem at all as long as it is out of the view corridor;
- The revised heights are much improved since before;
- The jury is still out on whether the overall density will work but from the moves being made there doesn't appear to be a problem;
- A weak point of the building is the southwest corner where the embankment runs into the building and doesn't come to grade;
- This is a good time to look at how the campus will be serviced because it will have some implications on how you enter the building;
- This is an important function so if this is the density needed, it's okay;
- This RM-4 district is an inappropriate place for 3.0 FSR; the City should examine upgrading the zoning in the neighbourhood so that it could be a source of student housing.

Pedestrian Circulation:

- I wouldn't rule out the possibility of having cars on 7th with traffic calming;
- No problem with having to go outside to get from one building to another - it's part of what makes a campus;
- No problem with the pedestrian bridge but it may have to be enclosed;
- Encourage a mix of cars and people on 7th;
- I think you should have to go outside to go on the pedestrian bridge;
- I like the idea of a pedestrian bridge (with a canopy over it) if it is consistent with the proposed spine. You would still have the sense of being outdoors and I don't think it would preclude any circulation at the lower level;
- If 7th Avenue is a spine then it needs to be controlled from a design point of view;
- A second storey link makes a lot of sense to me - it's in the heart of the massing and makes sense on this sloping site;
- I agree it's better to go outside but it could have a cover;

- The bridge idea is great and I could see a number of them as long as they are open and light and not land bridges but connecting important spaces, either garden spaces or important decks;
 - The pedestrian bridge is okay - wonder if it could be one level higher up so that people on the second floor may choose to go down one level to the street;
 - The pedestrian bridge is a good idea and I agree it could be higher.
- **Applicant's Response:** Mr. Fassler said he really appreciated the time the Panel has taken to look closely at the proposal and considering all the issues.