

**MINUTES OF THE  
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY MARCH 28, 2018**

**1. THE CHAIR CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 12:10 PM**

**Present:** Jesse Garlick (Chair); Elizabeth Balderston; Sorin Birliga; Justin Gammon; Deborah LeFrank; Jason Niles; Carl-Jan Rupp

**Absent for a Portion of the Meeting:** Stefan Schulson

**Absent:** Paul Hammond

**Staff Present:** Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design  
Leanne Taylor – Senior Planner  
Alec Johnston – Senior Planner  
Merinda Conley – Senior Heritage Planner  
Katie Lauriston – Secretary

**2. APPLICATIONS**

**2.1 Rezoning Application No. 00587 and Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00041 for 1802 Chambers Street and 1147-1163 North Park Street**

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit with Variance Application to raise and renovate the existing building (Teacherage) at 1802 Chambers Street and construct a new three-storey multiple dwelling and duplex consisting of a total of 32 dwelling units.

Applicant meeting attendees:

JOHN WILLIAMS  
JAMES PARTLOW

ALAN LOWE ARCHITECT INC.  
LOMBARD NORTH GROUP

Ms. Taylor provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application and the areas that Council is seeking advice on, including the following:

- Chambers Street (east) elevation
- residential entryway design
- surface parking lot design
- application of materials and addressing on the building.

John Williams provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Jim Partlow provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

Questions of clarification were asked by the Panel on the following:

- what is the process for adding buildings to the heritage register?
  - staff have enquired with the applicant as to whether they are willing to add the building to the register. The applicant has been in contact with the City's Senior Heritage Planner for this matter

- is the primary entrance to the three-storey rental located off of North Park Street?
  - yes
- is there another entrance?
  - not another primary entrance
- where is the mailbox located?
  - on North Park Street
- is the park area intended as a public amenity or only for residents' use?
  - this space is semi-private; it is neither fenced off nor secured
- what is the envisioned use for the landscaped space?
  - a seating area for residents is accessed via the pathway, and a small play area for children is located on the other side of the garden plots
  - three areas complement each other, with uses for the whole family
- are the permeable pavers only on first portion of the parking lot?
  - yes, it increases the site's permeable area
- with a parking reduction as part of application, does the Planning department support the number of stalls proposed without a concurrent increase in bicycle parking?
  - Ms. Taylor noted that staff are working with the applicant on this aspect of the proposal.

Panel members discussed:

- desire to see the main entry off of Chambers Street instead of North Park Street
- the need to emphasize the village-like quality and importance of the corner of North Park and Chambers Streets; an opportunity for placemaking
- the need to resolve parking design
- understanding for the economic rationale for not putting the parking underground
- problematic proximity of duplex and parking; adding a planted strip at the rear would give a buffer between parking and entrances
- negative neighbourhood impacts from the fenced in parking, which would encourage car use and cause safety issues with the screened fence limiting drivers' line of sight when exiting the parking lot
- desire to see permeable pavers carried through the whole parking area
- desire to integrate parking with other uses to make the space more social
- opportunity to introduce planting beds in the parking area to break up mass
- vehicle circulation issues could be mitigated by reducing parking by two spaces
- main entryway shouldn't be tucked away by the parking lot
- opportunity to celebrate the back entry and allow outlook into greenspace
- the need to resolve the site circulation overall, including street access from the entryway and the connection into the site from Chambers Street
- need to consider liveability for the communal space at ground; increasing the courtyard connectivity would turn it into a true amenity
- appreciation for breaking up the massing around the Oak tree
- potential reconsideration of at-grade townhome entries if the main entryway is at grade through the parking lot
- the need to enhance individual unit entries and clarify transition between public and private spaces through planting and the elimination of private lawns
- the front entry would be better accentuated with a building number at the main entry and unit entries distinguished with something more residential (e.g. trellises)
- duplex typology typically includes more private outdoor space

- shading concerns for planter design around large Oak tree
- the proximity of the community garden may eliminate the need for additional planters
- outdoor seating area is disconnected from lawn
- trellis and bench configuration do not facilitate conversation
- logical massing and distribution of buildings while preserving the Teacherage
- Teacherage entry could be designed much more delicately
- three-storey massing is appropriate for the corner of Chambers and North Park Streets
- need for simplification of the materials palette
- opportunity for improving monolithic design on the Chambers Street elevation of Building 1 without adding further complexity in materials
- disconnect between claddings at ground level from North Park elevation to Chambers Street elevation
- desire for coloured elevations in plans.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Stefan Schulson, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Rezoning Application No. 00587 and Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00041 for 1802 Chambers Street and 1147-1163 North Park Street be approved with the following recommendations:

- review the communal space at grade to improve liveability and to unify the pedestrian circulation including parking design, configuration & materials
- enhancement of Chambers Street elevation to emphasize the importance of the corner of North Park and Chambers Streets
- overall simplification of the materials and palettes, particularly for Building 1
- review the entry design and staircases to the Teacherage.

**Carried**

For: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Elizabeth Balderston; Sorin Birliga; Justin Gammon; Deborah LeFrank; Carl-Jan Rupp; Stefan Schulson

Against: Jason Niles

**2.2 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00059 for 605-629 Speed Avenue and 606-618 Frances Avenue**

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit with Variance Application to amend the approved plans associated with Development Permit No. 000302, which permitted the construction of a mixed-use development consisting of ground floor commercial space and two multi-unit residential towers of 12 storeys each.

Applicant meeting attendees:

ROBERT ROCHELEAU  
JAMES PARTLOW

PRAXIS ARCHITECTS INC.  
LOMBARD NORTH GROUP

Ms. Taylor provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application and the areas that Council is seeking advice on, including the following:

- building massing
- application of materials
- new balcony projections
- pedestrian pathway off of Speed Avenue.

Robert Rocheleau provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and James Partlow provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

Questions of clarification were asked by the Panel on the following:

- what is located on the adjacent properties?
  - there is a warehouse built to the property line to the west, an auto dealership to the east, and residences to the north
- when were the geotechnical issues associated with underground parking identified?
  - the geotechnical firm's experiences with a similar site triggered their decision not to support an additional level of parking, which caused the design changes associated with this application
- is the finish on the first level of the townhouses the same as on the commercial base?
  - yes, there is brick on the base and on the second level
- was changing the townhouse materials to respond to use considered?
  - this was considered initially, but was changed as a response to staff comments
- where is the entrance located?
  - either the via the stairs or through the parking lot using the elevator
- is the walkway indoor or outdoor?
  - the pathways are outdoor
  - there is a bridge to the bike parking area on second level, as well as access to the corridor system for bike parking and storage access
- what is the rationale behind pushing the residential units to the property line?
  - the residential units are oriented away from a busy street
- how will spatial separation issues be managed?
  - using sprinklers and water curtains
- how does the interior site circulation work?
  - residents can take the elevator with a bicycle to arrive on the outdoor bridge, entering the wide interior corridor through a double door
  - there is a slightly longer walk to get to the east tower
- how many doors do cyclists pass through to get into the lock-up?
  - once a resident is into the secured area of the building, they enter into the apartment area
- page A102 shows the elevator cutting off the sidewalk; can the elevator be integrated into the building?
  - this would be possible
- is there a right of way through the site?
  - no, it is all private property
- what are the landscaping and hardscaping details on the pedestrian pathway?
  - the green roof is over the parking level, so only small trees can be planted

- the pedestrian site entrance is on the east side of the commercial component, adjacent to the drive aisle and separated by bollards
- is the site entrance from Speed Avenue at grade?
  - yes, and this grade carries through to Frances Avenue without stairs or ramps
- is all the paving permeable?
  - yes
- the bollards, columns and parking stalls reduce the width of the pathway; can this be widened?
  - the columns carry the structure above and their placement is determined by the structural engineer; they may change in size but are required
- is there no opportunity to incorporate landscaping within the parking area?
  - not without losing parking stalls
- is there a shortage of parking associated with the application?
  - at this stage, more parking is proposed than is required
  - the applicant wants to keep the extra parking for some flexibility until the structural engineer's report is completed
- could the two parking stalls encroaching on the sidewalk be used for landscaping?
  - this would be possible, as there is more parking than required
- what are the geotechnical issues associated with pushing the parking deeper underground?
  - the water table is approximately one level down, and the type of soil does not allow digging deeper. The proposed parking arrangement will also have less impact on the neighbouring properties
- what are the balcony materials?
  - the developer is considering a timber structure above the second level, which would be the material on the underside of the balconies
  - balconies will have aluminum cap rails and a coloured glass panel relating to each unit
- are the red parapets covering mechanical on the roof?
  - no, these are a design element.

Panel members discussed:

- the opportunity for increased green space and soft landscaping on the ground level, particularly at the point where two parking stalls encroach on the pedestrian walkway
- the desire to extend the landscaped area along Speed Avenue further into the site to widen and better demarcate the pedestrian pathway, and to improve site circulation
- the need to incorporate the elevator into the southern commercial block
- the need to redesign the grey façade at the second level on the Frances Avenue elevation
- questioning the environmental benefit of permeable pavers on a raised parking level
- desire for supporting documentation illustrating paving colour scheme and patterns
- the need to redesign the second storey to avoid a perceived lack of animation from the street
- CPTED concerns for the long, visually dead-end corridors without natural light, which are proposed as the principal access route for people with bicycles

- appreciation for the townhouse massing
- desire for the townhouse design to be clearly expressed as residential from the public realm, through a reconsideration of the materials
- the need to redesign the blank townhouse wall overlooking the parking lot
- opportunity to redistribute bicycle parking to avoid bottlenecks in tight corridors
- the desire for additional renderings and supporting documentation to show the details of the pedestrian realm and through-block pathway
- opportunity to improve the shape of the balconies to better integrate within the building massing.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Elizabeth Balderston, seconded by Sorin Birliga, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00059 for 605-629 Speed Avenue and 606-618 Frances Avenue be approved subject to the following recommendations:

- enhance the pedestrian link and experience through the corridor by increasing greenspace and soft landscaping, paving patterns and textures
- provide significant landscaping enhancements at the ground level
- redesign the second storey including the south elevator adjacent to townhouse block with consideration of CPTED principles, circulation, natural daylighting and distribution of amenity that is reflected in exterior elevations
- provide additional renderings and other supporting documentation for the pedestrian realm and through-block pathway
- integrate the north and south balconies into façade design.

**Carried Unanimously**

**2.3 Rezoning Application No. 00618 and Development Permit Application No. 000519 for 1712 and 1720 Fairfield Road**

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to allow for a three-storey multi-unit residential development.

Applicant meeting attendees:

ALEC SMITH	SHAPE ARCHITECTURE
DWAYNE SMITH	SHAPE ARCHITECTURE
MATTHEW HARTY	SHAPE ARCHITECTURE
BIANCA BODLEY	BIOPHILIA DESIGN COLLECTIVE
LUKE MARI	PURDEY GROUP

Mr. Johnston provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application and the areas that Council is seeking advice on, including the following:

- the height and roofline within the existing context
- the transition with Hollywood Park
- site planning around the rear block of townhouses.

Alec Smith provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Bianca Bodley provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

Questions of clarification were asked by the Panel on the following:

- what is the materiality at the ground plane?
  - a single, large picture window for each unit, with pebble dash stucco, significant glazing and wood panelling above
- how do the roof forms emulate the topography of the site?
  - the hip roof has been modified to match the site's topographical lines
- are there open volumes within the habitable spaces?
  - yes, the open volumes are above the top floor
- is there an accessible alternative to stairs to enter the plaza?
  - no, as townhouses do not have the same accessibility requirements as other residential typologies
- would it be possible to incorporate ramps to accommodate strollers and children on bicycles?
  - this is something that could be addressed if recommended
- what is the distance between the corner of Block 3 and Block 2?
  - 6.2m
- how close to the proposal is the tennis court?
  - the proposal is approximately 3m away from the property line, and the tennis court is another 3m from the site
- was breaking up the massing facing Fairfield Road considered?
  - the renderings may not do this justice, but each entry point set back from the road and each has a bench
  - designed with consideration to shading and light conditions
  - there is a flat massing, but it is articulated where it will engage with public spaces
- what is the height of the guard wall separating the courtyard and the parkade?
  - 3.5 ft / 42"
- South point block 3 – contemplating angled end unit
- was angling the south corner of Block 3 considered to add more distance between blocks and add light to the courtyard?
  - it was considered both ways, and the architect found purity of form in the proposed configuration
  - density is beneficial to this project; with the overall spacing right, density creates magic, lane-like conditions
- what are the proposed passive house / environmental standards?
  - striving for high-performance, double-glazed or vinyl windows and a high R-value roof
  - electric baseboard heating provides the lowest carbon impact
  - considering solar panels
- are there thick walls?
  - not at this point
- is there sufficient slope for the proposed standing seam rooves?
  - the standing seam would wrap around all sloped rooves, and the flat portions would likely be a membrane
- what is the root mass for the large trees in the planters?
  - the root wall depth is a minimum of 3' wide and 24" deep

- how much soil would be in the planters?
  - 2' x 3'
  - the trees will be dwarfed by the planters but will be an appropriate size for the area
- was the fencing in the backyards included in the first design concept?
  - Block 3 was up at plinth level in the first iteration, and has now been pushed down to grade as a result of discussions with the City
  - this has helped to unify the project
- is it only the height triggering the Official Community Plan (OCP) amendment?
  - yes; the OCP does not envision three storeys along Fairfield Road
  - urban residential zones would allow the proposed height
  - the proposal is within density requirements, it is just the number of storeys triggering the OCP amendment
- does the draft Gonzales plan envision the proposed height?
  - Mr. Johnston clarified that the draft Gonzales plan does support three-storey buildings along Fairfield Road; however, Council recently moved to limit opportunity for 3-storey apartment buildings
  - this guideline may change through the consultation process
- is the site not designated as a small urban village?
  - Mr. Johnston noted that the site is zoned commercial. Although there has been previous discussion to change its designation, it is not being considered at this point
- are there skylights on Block 3?
  - yes, above the stairwells
- why not include skylights on the other buildings?
  - skylights will be included on all buildings, but were not drawn in the plans
- why does the fence along Hollywood park not follow the property line?
  - the concept was for the fence to follow the roofline, but this will likely change so that the fence follows the property line.

Panel members discussed:

- concern for height, although Fairfield Road is noisy and the proposal may be in alignment with the proposed area guidelines
- the view of the proposal from the park
- questioning the appropriateness of precedents such as New York, UK and California in Fairfield
- the urban feel and architectural strength of the building
- the proposal being a challenge to support for this site
- the proposal's lack of fit within the neighbourhood and the OCP, being too dense and urban for the context
- the potential for a small urban village designation and changes to the local area plan
- the OCP outlines issues relating to height, but other issues include the proposal's form and character
- the precedent-setting nature of the proposal
- the proposal being an urban solution in a residential area
- an appreciation for the materiality and the rooftop following the site's topography
- appreciation for the complexity of the site
- recognition of the proposal's architectural merit

- the proposal representing an opportunity to improve the area's character through good architecture that is responsive to the site
- the importance of the proposal's relationship to the park
- the proposal offering a different interpretation of residential
- concern for adequate breathing room between the proposed buildings, particularly the southern corner of Block 3 and the space between Block 3 and Block 2
- lack of soft landscaping in the central courtyard
- insufficient density of planting space
- concern for proposed Leyland cypress as an invasive species and its impact on neighbours
- the planters being too small to for growing large trees
- shading concerns for the site
- safety concerns for the height of the wall into the parkade
- the desire to see the parkade entrance softened
- desire for more amenity space for residents
- recognition of the interior plaza as an interesting and contemporary idea
- accessibility concerns
- concern for the appropriateness of the materials in a rainy climate
- the importance of the prominence of the front entries
- opportunity to improve the pedestrian experience
- the monolithic massing of the proposal from Fairfield, looking north
- the opportunity to step down or otherwise refine massing towards the east, especially on Block 3.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Jesse Garlick, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit No. 000519 for 1712 & 1720 Fairfield Road be approved with consideration of the Panel's discussion as captured in the meeting minutes.

**Carried**

For: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Sorin Birliga; Justin Gammon; Jason Niles; Carl-Jan Rupp; Stefan Schulson  
Against: Elizabeth Balderston; Deborah LeFrank

*Stephan Schulson recused himself from Rezoning Application No. 00611 and Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 00225 at 3:35pm.*

**2.4 Rezoning Application No. 00611 and Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 00225 for 1306-1324 Broad Street / 615-625 Johnson Street / a portion of 622 and 630 Yates Street**

The City is considering a Rezoning and Heritage Alteration Permit Application to construct a mixed-use building for ground floor commercial and student rental units and to allow the renovation and addition to the existing Duck's Block heritage building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

DAVE CHARD  
CHARLES KIERULF  
PETER KURAN

CHARD DEVELOPMENT  
DE HOOG & KIERULF ARCHITECTS  
UVIC PROPERTIES

Ms. Conley provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application and the areas that Council is seeking advice on, including the following:

- compatibility, distinguishability, and subordination of the contemporary additions to the heritage-registered Duck's Building
- response to the "saw-tooth" streetscape characteristic of Old Town and the Historic Commercial District
- retaining prominence of the Duck's Building
- integration of sustainability features, such as a green wall on the south side of the new University of Victoria building
- documentation of existing ghost signs on the south wall of the Duck's Building for the potential reinstatement on the south wall of the new University of Victoria building
- opportunity for interpretive plaques to describe the history of the Duck's Building, as well as the rear rubble stone wall of the existing Johnson Street building and the Duck's Alley
- replacement of three mature Hornbeam trees proposed to be removed on the Johnson Street frontage.

David Chard and Charles Kierulf provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

Questions of clarification were asked by the Panel on the following:

- on the corner transition from brick veneer to exposed concrete, does the brick wrap the corner?
  - this can be done
- is there an intention to develop the corner of Yates and Broad Streets?
  - no, not at this point
- what is the purpose of the lane dedication?
  - the lane does not function well as a lane, and is private property at the moment
  - the Duck's Building and the proposed additions are on the lot line, so dedicating as a lane eliminates fire separation issues
- does the proposal involve expanding the laneway?
  - it does not involve moving the existing buildings, just removing the addition that constricts the lane access
- what is the merit of maintaining the median walls?
  - the painted advertising is exposed and adds character to units
- what is the proposed occupancy?
  - the University portion will be student housing, and the Duck's building will be market strata units
- how important are the courtyards to the project's viability?
  - reducing the number of units presents too many challenges, and the viability of the project depends on having all the units proposed

- the number of units facing the courtyard has been reduced as much as possible
  - the proposal targets a younger demographic with smaller, affordable units
- the west-facing units don't show any windows – is this correct?
  - this is an error in the plans; all western units will have windows facing west
- what is the rationale for having a less detailed façade for the student housing?
  - the project should read as a whole, with slight variation between the buildings
  - there is a higher level of detail on Johnson Street end, which is simplified towards Yates Street
- why are the trees on Johnson Street being removed?
  - the Hornbeams are healthy, but the primary reason for removal is to allow site access for construction
- how do the four mid-level mezzanine units function?
  - there is a level 2A between levels 2 and 3
  - allows for maintenance of commercial space
- why not add an additional floor above the Duck's building?
  - height has been a sensitive issue
- are there seismic challenges associated with the height?
  - in addition to the financial cost, there would also be seismic issues, as keeping the structure is already a challenge
  - Ms. Conley noted the importance of the height restriction in the City's policies and guidelines to the character of Old Town and the Historic Commercial District, in addition to the guidelines for a "saw-tooth" streetscape characteristic
- what is the total unit count?
  - there are 163 units proposed.

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the new construction acting as visual bookends in addition to being seismic support to preserve the Duck's Building
- although the proposed surrounding buildings are taller, they feel subordinate and supportive to the Duck's Building, like a jewel box surrounding gem
- appreciation for the sensitive siting of the Duck's Building
- appreciation for the glazed hyphen around the heritage building, which could be proportionally increased
- appreciation for not having the new proposed buildings try to imitate surrounding heritage features
- the desire to see the brick and concrete masonry around the south edge wrapped around to appear more finished
- opportunity to add additional detailing to the façade of the student housing, without drawing attention away from the Duck's Building
- lack of resolution provided by the top floor of the Duck's Building
- appreciation for pulling back the top floor of the Duck's Building to give "saw-tooth" characteristic
- no issue with the proposed height
- concern for liveability with very close units and the height of the light well; the need to balance affordability and liveability
- desire to open up the light well to allow air flow

- opportunity to redistribute density, possibly by adding height towards the corner of Johnson and Broad Streets, to improve liveability
- opportunity to add more differentiating features for the two new buildings; however, there is a strength to presenting a unified thesis, recognizing that these are part of the same project
- appreciation for the project's consistency with the Official Community Plan
- support for the provision of an interpretive historical photographic display
- support for the replacement of the mature Hornbeam trees.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Jason Niles, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Rezoning Application No. 00611 and Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 00225 for Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 00225 for 1306-1324 Broad Street / 615-625 Johnson Street / a portion of 622 & 630 Yates Street be approved with the following recommendations:

- continue cladding around the southern elevation of the building
- review interior unit design with consideration to access to light and air for liveability
- provide an interpretive historical photographic display on the:
  - inside the Duck's Building that informs the public of the building's history from its initial construction in 1892, the seismic upgrading process, and the initial Duck's Carriage Factory constructed in 1874
  - west laneway side wall that informs the public of the significance of the stone rubble wall and the lane that was historically known as "Duck's Alley"
- replace three mature Hornbeam trees proposed to be removed on the Johnson Street frontage.

**Carried Unanimously**

**3. ADJOURNMENT**

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of March 28, 2018 was adjourned at 4:50 pm.

---

Jesse Garlick, Chair