

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY APRIL 11, 2018**

1. THE CHAIR CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 12:05 PM

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

Absent for a Portion of the Meeting: Paul Hammond

Staff Present: Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Alec Johnston – Senior Planner
Michael Angrove – Planner
Katie Lauriston – Secretary

2. MINUTES

Minutes from the Meeting held February 28, 2018

Motion:

It was moved by Deborah LeFrank, seconded by Paul Hammond, that the Minutes of the Meeting of Advisory Design Panel held February 28, 2018 be adopted as presented.

Carried Unanimously

Paul Hammond recused himself from Rezoning Application No. 00620 and Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00076 for 210 Gorge Road East.

3. APPLICATIONS

3.1 Rezoning Application No. 00620 and Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00076 for 210 Gorge Road East

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to allow for the development of a six-storey, multi-unit residential building consisting of rental dwelling units and supportive housing dwelling units.

Applicant meeting attendees:

KATHY STINSON
BARRY COSGRAVE
BRAD FORTH

THE VICTORIA COOL AID SOCIETY
NUMBER TEN ARCHITECTURAL GROUP
FORSITE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

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

- building height
- corner treatment of the building at Gorge Road East and Carroll Street
- treatment of blank walls on the east elevation
- building mass along the upper storeys
- application of materials on the building.

Kathy Stinson provided the Panel with an overview of the Victoria Cool Aid Society, Mr. Anthony provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal and Brad Forth provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

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

- what is the design rationale for limiting the glazing on the east elevation?
 - this was a response to overlook concerns from the neighbours to the east
 - the proposal is set back as far as possible, so the windows are set back about 45 ft. and all other windows are turned back or into the courtyard
- were high windows considered?
 - the interior planning is still preliminary, but this would be a possibility
- does the neighbour to the east have windows looking towards the proposal?
 - yes, there are a series of units with windows oriented towards the proposal
 - there are very few windows facing the proposal on the building to the north
- are the renderings accurate illustrating less glazing on the main floor street level?
 - this is incorrect in the renderings but accurate on the floor plan; there will be windows into the mechanical/maintenance room and a glazed door on the first floor
 - the entry corner is glazed all the way around, except for the solid portion at the washroom location
- what is the presence of the mechanical/electrical room at Gorge Road East?
 - it is buried to the east, with only the maintenance office visible
- why is the massing broken down vertically into three distinct sections?
 - guidelines recommend 4-storey commercial along Gorge Road East, and staff have requested a subtler transition to the 6th floor
- was it considered to turn the gravel roof on the east side into a green roof or accessible space?
 - this was discussed, but there were maintenance and security concerns associated with access and green rooves technically presented a bigger issue to the owners
- is the gazebo in the patio area open to both sides?
 - no, it is only open to the patio
- were CPTED concerns around the gazebo placement considered?
 - the patio is a secured area with access only from inside, and the gazebo is only for residents' use
- is the egress area off Carroll Street a patio space or just for parking?
 - this space is for four visitor parking stalls for staff and visitors
- the site plan shows parking to the north; does the landscaping go right up to the building?
 - the underground parking is underneath the surface planting
- how tall is the building to the east?
 - 3 storeys

- was glazing considered at the top floor?
 - yes, the 6th floor is stepped back quite a bit but the proposal is still close to the south and to the north
 - part of the top floor obscures the rooftop mechanical structures
- could more glazing be added on the east elevation?
 - the applicant is hesitant to propose new windows facing the neighbours to the east, although higher windows could be considered on the east elevation at the 5th and 6th floors.

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the attention to detail translated into design, and the experience of the proposal in the public realm
- appreciation for the articulation of the façade, as well as the proposal's movement and massing
- the desire for high bedroom windows or glazing to mitigate concerns for the blank wall to the east
- the opportunity to shift the gazebo placement to eliminate CPTED concerns arising from a blind corner
- no concerns regarding the height and transition to the buildings to the north, as they do not have windows facing the proposal
- opportunity to accentuate the corner with increased landscaping to mitigate staff concern for the corner height
- desire to see 6th floor visually integrated into the lower floors by avoiding the introduction of new materials and massing, particularly on the east elevation
- the choice of materials being a bit heavy overall
- opportunity to make changes to benefit residents instead of working to avoid offending neighbours
- private amenity spaces could be improved by bringing them to the level of public-facing spaces
- desire for access and/or landscaping on the roof of the southeast corner mechanical and electrical room
- opportunity for the courtyard to be a real amenity space rather than bringing parking noise up to some residents
- opportunity to soften parking entrance from Carroll Street with a median or surface treatment
- desire to increase prominence of the front entryway from the street
- desire to break up the surface treatment of the parking entrance or to have the gate placement further back to encourage activity.

Motion:

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Jesse Garlick, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Rezoning Application No. 00620 and Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000076 for 210 Gorge Road East be approved with the following considerations:

- Explore opportunities to introduce glazing on the east façade
- Review gazebo placement to eliminate CPTED concerns
- Consider access and/or landscaping opportunities on the southeast corner mechanical and electrical room roof

- Consider enhancing the parkade and pedestrian entrance treatments and increasing the prominence of the front entrance.

Carried Unanimously

Paul Hammond returned to the meeting at 1:05pm.

3.2 Rezoning Application No. 00613 and Development Permit No. 000516 for 829-899 Fort Street and 846-856 Broughton Street

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to allow for a ten-storey mixed-use building containing independent seniors' rental apartment units, market rental apartment units, commercial offices, a childcare facility, music school and retail commercial uses on the ground floor.

Applicant meeting attendees:

HELEN BESHARAT	BESHARAT FRIARS ARCHITECTS
RAINER MILLER	PARC RETIREMENT LIVING
RUSSELL HUBBS	PARC RETIREMENT LIVING
PATRICK SCHILLING	PARC RETIREMENT LIVING
MARGOT LONG	PWL PARTNERSHIP
RICK MARZOLF	MARZOLF & ASSOCIATES
JULIE MARZOLF	MARZOLF & ASSOCIATES
ROB WALTER	AME GROUP
SIMON BUTTON	BUNT & ASSOCIATES
SCOTT WILLIAMS	MORRISON HERSHFIELD CORP.
LORNE GAVINCHUK	30-60-90 CONSTRUCTION

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 scale and massing as they relate to the step back policy
- the street level design
- building differentiation
- the rooftop mechanical rooms and height.

Helen Besharat and Rainer Miller 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:

- were other design scenarios for the window treatments explored?
 - there have been many design iterations; the proposal emphasizes a 2-3 storey building at streetscape, with the rest of the façade having a dignified, well-detailed brick
 - triple-glazed windows with taller proportions to achieve a good proportion of window to wall
- in the bridge component, are the horizontal windows designed as punch windows?
 - no, they will be spandrel glass in a horizontal pattern
- are the sills in pre-cast concrete?
 - yes, and they have changed to the buff colour and warm brick colour as a result of immediate neighbour feedback

- what is the proposed occupancy, especially relating to the proposed parking?
 - 263 proposed rental units, which will become seniors' residences in 4-5 years for 280 seniors
 - the leases will work in instalments, leaving 47 units in the northwest tower that can be offered to preferred renters over a period of time
 - childcare and medical offices are a desired amenity in this area for the community, and a grocery store would also be desirable on the ground floor
 - the bicycle parking will mostly be used by residents in the northwest building, although some members would also use bicycles
 - 8 parking stalls will be rented to tenants, and vehicle transportation is included for the seniors' residences
- can the suites' windows be opened?
 - yes, there are operable windows in all the suites
- were balconies considered for the Fort Street frontage?
 - balconies are shown on the top 2 levels facing Fort Street, and are also proposed on Quadra and Broughton Streets
 - only a few units facing Fort Street do not have balconies and are compensated through roof gardens and the sunny amenity rooms
- how does the proposal respond to the proposed development to the west?
 - there are very few windows facing west
 - the applicants will be analyzing the two proposals to minimize overlook and ensure that residents' and neighbours' privacy is not impacted
- is there space in the rooftop amenity areas for fridges, sinks and barbeques, etc.?
 - yes, there will also be walking loops and washrooms
- is the intention to accommodate a B3 level of care as the senior population grows and diversifies?
 - seniors moving in are independent; as care needs increase 3rd party providers may become necessary; but the property managers do not control this process
 - the intent is simply to create a very safe building to accommodate as much as possible, but no memory care or residential care will be provided
- will all the rental units' leases end after five years?
 - no, the units can be rented as long as the tenants want to live there, and there is a statistical four-year average turnover
 - after five years the applicant intends to start offering these units to seniors
- why target this demographic specifically?
 - the building is built to accommodate seniors, so it would be a waste for these units to not to be for seniors' use
- why not rent to seniors from the beginning?
 - typically retirement units take 2-4 years to be leased, and there are many units
 - all the units could likely be leased within a year if not offered exclusively to seniors
- what is the purpose of the large roof garden between the intergenerational building and the daycare?
 - a multi-use area with large planter pots, screens and overlook onto Fort Street
 - not highly programmed but can be used for urban farming, meditation, tai chi, etc.

- does the City have plans for a mid-block walkway at this location to connect through the site?
 - Mr. Johnston noted that this site was not identified as a location for a mid-block pathway, but that there is one further west at 825 Fort Street
- what is the balcony railing material?
 - glass
- were features providing shade considered on the Broughton Street façade?
 - yes, further to the energy and sun analysis provided in the plans, the balconies help provide shade
- were overhangs considered for shading and to break up the massing?
 - some overhangs are provided in the internal court
 - where there are no balconies, there are eyebrows
- if the YMCA site were redeveloped, what would be its maximum height?
 - Mr. Johnston noted that this site is within the radius of the Christ Church Cathedral and would be subject to policies prescribing how a building should step down towards the historic building
- will much sunlight fall on the children's play area on level 2?
 - part of the play area will be covered by an overhang, but there are various times of the year that this area can get some sun.

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the quality and clarity of the submission as well as the concept overall, particularly the spaces for tenants
- appreciation for outdoor space for each unit, as well as southern and western rooftop exposure
- the need to properly program roof garden spaces
- questioning utility of artificial lawn patch
- desire to see a contribution to the public realm given the size of the project for Fort Street and the surrounding neighbourhood, as well as the project's imposition on the public elevation
- opportunity to enhance the pedestrian environment on Fort Street
- lack of spillout beyond Fort Street
- need to review materials distribution below the eave line and how the materials come to the ground
- dated materials choice takes away from desired vitality
- opportunity for design to alleviate age-related barriers inherent to tenancy
- the need to strengthen the prominence of the residential entrance
- commend the building's massing and the large drop outs as an amenity to the public realm
- disconnect between depth of study and the presented architecture
- the need to clarify the design intent with massing
- the Fort Street elevation being unresolved despite evident depth and clarity in design process
- lack of interlocking between masses, appearance of being stacked and layered
- opportunity to improve articulation, fenestration and horizontal striating to clarify the concept and ameliorate the visual massing towards the public realm
- desire to see tower separation at higher levels translated to the street level
- need to improve large, boxy presence at street level

- composition shifting height and bringing daylight through the site is preferable to having step backs
- requiring a base, middle and top may be too forced
- lack of playfulness and vitality in articulation; proposal comes off as monolithic
- some parts of the towers are well-detailed, but precedents could be further examined to present a more contemporary articulation
- concern for the proposal's form and character as it relates to the neighbourhood
- opportunity to take advantage of views from site through a review of the balcony design
- problematic flatness of the façade, particularly on the Fort Street elevation
- appreciation for the balconies on Broughton Street, but further opportunity to reduce flat façade on Broughton Street
- opportunity to improve window to wall ratio and reduce horizontality
- desire to see the façade respond to the historic Fort Street context through finer, warmer detailing
- desire to review revisions.

Motion:

While the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) recognizes the merits for the conceptual massing strategy (3 tower concept) of the proposal, It was moved by Jason Niles, seconded by Justin Gammon, that the ADP recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000516 for 829-899 Fort Street and 846-856 Broughton Street does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined.

Carried Unanimously

3.3 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00043 for 1050-1054 Hillside Avenue and 2708 Graham Street

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to allow for a new four-unit townhouse development within one building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

WIL PEEREBOOM
ERIN RENWICK

VICTORIA DESIGN GROUP
GREENSPACE DESIGNS

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

- north, south and west elevations
- transition to the single-family dwelling to the north
- site coverage.

Wil Peereboom provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Erin Renwick provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

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

- what in this application triggers the ADP's review?
 - Mr. Angrove clarified that while the ADP is typically requested to review proposals for townhouses with 5 or more units, this application's unique characteristics would benefit from the ADP's knowledge and would also benefit future applications
- what private outdoor space is proposed for the existing duplex?
 - small balconies off the rear of the existing duplex, as well as converting part of the lawn into two small gardens
- does the existing building have a garden?
 - no, but there is a yard
- what is proposed for the patio shown behind the existing duplex?
 - the sunken patio will remain up against the driveway, separated by a 3 ft. retaining wall
- is the patio above the driveway?
 - yes, there are two steps up to the patio from the driveway
- are there windows overlooking the existing building?
 - there are two windows at the basement and another two at the second level
- what is the difference in elevation between the duplex patio and the driveway?
 - 0.38m difference
- how does the patio access work?
 - there will be access from inside by going down the stairs or walking up the steps from the driveway
- is the parking area open to the back yards?
 - yes
- is the opening to the parking area at the south for air circulation?
 - yes
- are there guards or railings for the sunken patio?
 - there is a fence, railing and gate on the street side
- is a variance required for the proposed setback to the rear of the new townhouses?
 - yes
- have the neighbours been consulted?
 - yes, they were clear in not wanting an adjacent parking lot
- will trees be planted behind the new townhouses?
 - yes
- has the invasiveness of Salal been considered?
 - it will be contained between the side and retaining walls
- is there any landscape buffer proposed around the parkade area to the south of the new townhouses?
 - this area is under the stairs and the building overhang, so it would not be an ideal planting location
 - there is planting proposed against the fence, but not against the stairs
- would planting be possible in this location?
 - this is not a very hospitable place for plants
- has the City's Engineering department reviewed the proposed parking design, and does it meet bylaw requirements?
 - it has been shared with Engineering and the proposal does comply with bylaws, although the bylaw doesn't consider the turning radius
 - the parking stalls are almost 10 ft. wide, as some cars will need more space to manoeuvre

- the bicycle stalls are shown as one stall but are large enough for two bicycles
- has the existing tree on Graham Street been surveyed?
 - yes
- why is the lattice on the south elevation not used elsewhere as well?
 - this can be changed.

Panel members discussed:

- the application would benefit from including all required elevations as well as more views from the street and surrounding areas
- apprehension for use of Salal due to its invasiveness
- opportunity to improve shading issues arising from overplanting around the patio area of unit 4
- problematic proximity of existing tree on Graham Street
- opportunity to resolve many components including ramp and patio access
- desire for a reconsideration of the stair connection to the back decks
- opportunity to increase north-facing outdoor space at ground level
- concern for the proposal's impact on existing suites, especially the elimination of green space for the shared, sloped driveway
- desire for all units to have equal amounts of green space
- the functionality of the parking area could be improved by reducing the driveway slope and relocating bicycle parking spaces
- concern for the proposed density creating unliveable spaces on such a small site
- opportunity to eliminate one or two units to create more usable indoor, outdoor and parking manoeuvring spaces.

Motion:

It was moved by Elizabeth Balderston, seconded by Justin Gammon, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00043 for 1050-1054 Hillside Avenue and 2708 Graham Street does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined.

Carried Unanimously

4. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of April 11, 2018 was adjourned at 3:32 pm.

Jesse Garlick, Chair