

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY APRIL 25, 2018**

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

Present: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Elizabeth Balderston; Sorin Birliga; Paul Hammond; Jason Niles; Stefan Schulson

Absent: Justin Gammon; Deborah LeFrank; Carl-Jan Rupp

Staff Present: Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Robert Batallas – Senior Planner
Joaquin Karakas – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Alec Johnston – Senior Planner
Merinda Conley – Senior Heritage Planner
Katie Lauriston – Secretary

2. NEW BUSINESS

Introduction: Review and Update to the Old Town Design Guidelines

Mr. Batallas and Mr. Karakas provided a brief presentation on the review and update to the Old Town Design Guidelines.

3. APPLICATIONS

3.1 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00066 for 1501 and 1503 Haultain Street

The City is considering a Development Permit with Variance Application to expand and renovate the exterior of the building and construct a third residential storey.

Applicant meeting attendees:

JOHN WILLIAMS
LI SHARP

ALAN LOWE ARCHITECT INC.
APPLICANT

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

- building transition
- canopies above the ground floor commercial units and residential entryway
- application of materials on the building.

Mr. Lowe 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:

- why was brick selected?
 - initially stone was proposed, but brick is more modern
- does the brick reference any surrounding buildings?
 - no, but either brick or stone provides a stronger base
- is there a difference in height between the lighter-coloured accent element and the rest of the building body?
 - there is a difference in the height of the parapets, but no difference to the ceiling height
- what paving materials are proposed in the rear exit area?
 - there is a concrete sidewalk at the back connecting the stair access to the new crawlspace
- was a fence considered at the rear to separate private and public spaces?
 - a fence is proposed along the south side as well as a fence and lattice for the garbage area
 - a gate could be considered
- is there any requirement for private outdoor space with this application?
 - outdoor balconies are provided
 - balconies were desired on Haultain Street as well, but after speaking with the Parks department the street trees were prioritized
- does only the one corner unit have a balcony?
 - yes, and the other units have Juliet balconies
- why is the east corner of the building cantilevered?
 - this space is for bicycle parking
- how do vehicles manoeuvre in the parking area?
 - the proposal maintains the existing parking conditions
- are any parking spaces for commercial use?
 - the parking may be for commercial during day and residents at night, but this has yet to be determined
 - an extensive transportation review and neighbourhood consultation has been conducted
 - Council previously approved a large parking variance at this location for a wine bar
- will the community garden be retained?
 - yes, and it will be expanded
- what was the result of the neighbourhood discussions?
 - neighbours have mostly been very supportive of the proposal
 - the community is very passionate about the garden; many appreciate that there will not be changes to the garden and that the owners will continue to provide water for the garden
 - neighbours would like a Walnut tree planted
- what is the transition between brick and acrylic stucco on the northeast corner?
 - the brick is proposed on the north façade, with stucco on the east façade
- how were the materials selected, and were any other materials considered?
 - no further materials were considered; the two colours of stucco break up the face of the building while the brick is appropriate at the base
- is there stucco above the residential entry?
 - yes
- was the opportunity for a window into the front stairwell considered?
 - this would be possible

- what is proposed for the outdoor space between the community garden and the office addition?
 - this will be patio space
- is the same patio space proposed along the Haultain frontage?
 - yes
- was a vertical element or glazing on the sides of the residential entrance considered?
 - carrying the brick across the north façade was considered, but the proposed design creates an entrance that pops without the need for additional materials, and is accented with a different canopy
- was glazing on the sides of the entrance considered?
 - this could be considered
- is there a reason that the door on the west elevation is not centered on the wall?
 - the window placement is based on the existing location of the windows, and they have been left in this location
 - the windows could be moved
- were any other design approaches considered to the window treatments at Haultain Corners?
 - the existing windows were brought out 6m
 - the proposed design has the windows better placed to front Belmont Avenue rather than having four windows facing the corner
- what is the proposed signage placement?
 - signs will likely hang from the canopies, but this would be confirmed through the sign permit process.

Panel members discussed:

- opportunity to reconsider proposed stucco materials in lieu of more durable materials appropriate to the context
- the need to refine how the brick turns the southeast corner
- desire for lighter, continuous wood element to make entry less abrupt
- desire to revisit window alignment on the west side
- the need to sensitively transition to the lower-scale residential neighbourhood, especially on the east elevation
- opportunity to carry canopies over to the corners to create more visual interest and to shelter pedestrians, or to extend the garden where there is no canopy
- opportunity for placemaking to improve Haultain Corners
- 3-storey scale is appropriate, and the proposal improves the existing conditions
- safety concerns with the existing parking configuration
- CPTED concerns for the proposed bicycle parking area
- opportunity to reconfigure the parking area to add private outdoor green space for residents
- opportunity to avoid cantilever with redesign of parking area
- desire for landscaping to soften the amount of concrete
- the need for a gate at the rear to mitigate CPTED concerns
- the need for railings at the rear stair access
- the need to resolve the entrance area
- opportunity for a more delicate, interesting residential entrance addition
- the proposed scale, rhythm and upper level articulations supportability from an OCP perspective.

Motion:

It was moved by Jesse Garlick, seconded by Elizabeth Balderston, that the Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00066 for 1501 and 1503 Haultain Street be approved with the following recommendations:

- review the site plan including the south exit path and the east portion behind the bicycle parking from a CPTED perspective to eliminate safety concerns
- consider reducing the paved parking area to increase residents' private outdoor space
- that the City consider working with the residents' association to improve pedestrian circulation with regard to the community garden
- consider replacing the stucco on the upper floor with a higher quality material
- reconsider the overall building design, including the window and door placement and the termination of the brick façade
- refine the canopy design including extents and detailing.

Carried

For: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Elizabeth Balderston; Sorin Birliga; Paul Hammond;
Stefan Schulson

Against: Jason Niles

3.2 Development Permit with Variance No. 00068 for 1622-1628 Store Street

The City is considering a Development Permit with Variance Application to construct a seven-storey residential building with ground-floor commercial.

Applicant meeting attendees:

FRANC D'AMBROSIO	D'AMBROSIO ARCHITECTURE AND URBANISM
ERICA SANGSTER	D'AMBROSIO ARCHITECTURE AND URBANISM
BEV WINDJACK	LADR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS
TERRY FARMER	TRIAD HOLDINGS LTD.
DARLENE TAIT	TRIAD HOLDINGS LTD.

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

- the height variance in relation to the overall fit and context of the area, as well as any potential impacts resulting from the height variance
- the suitability and function of the proposed variance to permit ground floor residential units along the Harbour Pathway
- the proposal's overall response to the area context.

Mr. D'Ambrosio and Ms. Sangster provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Ms. Windjack provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

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

- is there glass on the inner corridor stairs on the west side?
 - yes, so that there would be light throughout

- what is the location of the security barrier between the commercial space and the lobby?
 - the lobby is semi-private, and is open to the café
 - secured access to the residences is located further west in the lobby
- is the lobby access unrestricted?
 - yes, it is open to the café
- are the Janion's ground floor units at the water commercial or residential?
 - they are commercial
- are the ground floor units at Mermaid Wharf also commercial?
 - there is a combination of residential and commercial
 - recognize desire to have commercial spaces along the David Foster walkway, but there is a time lag to ensure businesses would be viable in this location
 - proposed work-live apartments along the pathway can be converted over time from units with residential patios to commercial spaces with moveable landscaping
- what is the proposed shoreline treatment?
 - the walkway will be cantilevered over a shore-stabilized rock wall to minimize intervention
- is there a sculpture proposed in the stairwell facing the water?
 - no specific piece has been determined yet, but there will be more than just lights in the stairwell
- are the units rentals or condominiums?
 - they will be condos
- how does the proposed metal cladding relate to the area?
 - there is a lot of metal typically found in the surrounding industrial and commercial buildings, especially for cornices and fire escapes
 - this long-lasting material also relates to the bay on the Janion

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the shadow studies provided
- commend the proposal's careful consideration for access to light and liveability
- support for proposed massing and height variance
- the proposal relates well to its surroundings in scale
- recognition of excellent infill
- limited clearance to the south, obscuring water views for some units
- the proposal's success in being contextual and well-defined
- desire for a long-term vision for the David Foster Harbour Pathway to ensure projects enhance the public realm and relate well to each other
- uncertainty regarding the City's intent for the types of business that would best animate the pathway
- no concern for proposed flexible live-work units along the pathway
- appreciation for well thought-out landscape plan including passive stormwater management and quasi-unarmoured shoreline treatment
- desire for more engagement with and detailing of the public realm along the David Foster Harbour Pathway
- opportunity for soft landscaping on the public side of the retaining wall to improve pedestrian experience and soften the edge
- opportunity to shift the retaining wall to add landscaping to the walkway.

Motion:

It was moved by Jesse Garlick, seconded by Jason Niles, that the Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00068 for 1622-1628 Store Street be approved as presented.

Carried

For: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Sorin Birliga; Paul Hammond; Jason Niles; Stefan Schulson

Against: Elizabeth Balderston

3.3 Rezoning No. 00294, Development Permit No. 000259 and Heritage Alteration Permit No. 00136 for 1314-1318 and 1324 Wharf Street

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

Applicant meeting attendees:

ALAN BONIFACE	DIALOG
ADRIAN POLITANO	DIALOG
JUAN PEREIRA	RELIANCE PROPERTIES
JON STOVELL	RELIANCE PROPERTIES
JASON WEGMAN	PWL PARTNERSHIP
TERRY FARMER	TRIAD HOLDINGS

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

- overall response to the area context in terms of building massing and expression as these attributes relate to the specific policies and guidelines outlined in the report
- overall public realm
- distribution and expression of cladding
- vista termination elevation of the building as a character-defining element
- overall response to the existing heritage-designated Northern Junk buildings and Old Town, specific to characteristics of the Old Commercial District and the Waterfront.

Mr. Betanzo noted a correction to the height listed in the report's data table, as the proposed height is 24.83m.

Alan Boniface provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal and Jason Wegman provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

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

- were any units lost in the change from the previously proposed plans?
 - no units were lost; the reconfiguration proposes a higher density on the north side and adds a light well to help relieve this additional density

- what environmental requirements were considered with the proposed natural shoreline being underneath the building?
 - there is more work to be done on this aspect of the design
 - it is within the lot line and recognized high water mark, and cantilevered so as to connect back to bedrock
- what is the shoreline treatment underneath the cantilevered area near the heritage-designated buildings?
 - until the mid-block connection it is like Reeson Park and entirely open shore, then becomes a raised wharf with a vertical retaining wall
 - there is more detailed design work to be done
- what is the design rationale for the pavilion?
 - this presents a tiny moment of low-scale drama, allowing for the heritage-designated buildings to be revealed
 - a staircase invites people onto the rooftop, providing public access and a view to the inner harbour and Reeson Park
 - the pavilion footprint is set by the sightlines to the water, along the sidewalk and into the site
- is the patio access secured?
 - this may become public space controlled during the day, not accessible at night
- how will the pavilion's green roof work on such a steep slope next to the stairs?
 - there is a steel cable webbing to support the grasses' root systems, allowing them to remain in a near-vertical position
 - the same design has been used on Vancouver's convention centre
- how is landscaping maintenance performed on the sloped roof?
 - as on the convention centre in Vancouver, the grasses can be taken down for the winter and bounce back in the spring
- on the residential tower, was an eyebrow or canopy above the top level deck considered to minimize balconies' exposure?
 - there are glass canopies not shown at this level of detail over the doors
- what will the City do when the new bridge eventually needs replacing?
 - Mr. Betanzo noted that the bridge replacement has not been a consideration in the evaluation of this proposal
 - there is still a significant boulevard surrounding the bridge, especially at the north side
- are the balconies at the corner of Johnson and Wharf Streets each dedicated to one unit?
 - yes
- are there renderings showing the proposal from farther away, up Johnson Street and Pandora Avenue?
 - these were not included in the presentation, but can be provided
- is the intention to provide accessible public access to the lower area?
 - there are accessible, public routes through the central area and from Reeson Park
 - the parkade ramp includes a vehicle loading area and is not an accessible route, as it needs to be as deep as possible
- is there anything in City policy to encourage accessible boardwalks?
 - the boardwalk is meant to remain accessible
 - for this site, there is a ramp at Reeson Park and the north end of the walkway is accessible at-grade

- is there a rendering of the proposed park redesign?
 - the City has requested that this development represent the existing conditions of Reeson Park
 - the plan is for the proposal and the park to function as one project in order to create a successful public space
 - the park design also influences the geometry of the proposal and lines of sight through the site
- are there any concerns relating to the use of corten steel on the planters?
 - the applicants recognize that this material can be staining and imposes on everything, so it is being used strategically
- can a floor be removed to reduce the height?
 - the proposed number of stories are required to achieve density and to make the project viable while conserving the heritage-designated buildings
 - throughout public consultation there were many conversations around massing and height, and the applicants are satisfied that the proposal strikes a balance between competing requirements
 - part of the beauty of Victoria is the eclectic mix of building massing.

Panel members discussed:

- the proposal being a vast improvement over existing conditions and over previous design iterations
- the success of the proposal in enhancing the heritage component and activating the site
- the proposal's success in incorporating the park space to the east
- appreciation for the pedestrian-oriented design
- the success of the overall massing
- appreciation for the view to the water from the corner of Wharf and Johnson Streets
- whether the proposal integrates well into the Old Town context
- the west side lower levels' successful integration into the surrounding context
- the proposal giving the impression of many buildings for not that large a project
- the condo building seeming very heavy
- the proposal's appearance as substantially taller than the Janion and other buildings on Store Street
- concern for the proposed height of the condo building given the site's importance as a marine gateway
- the interpretation of the building as a landmark may justify the additional height, but the design approach is hyper-responsive
- the lower level's success in relating to the heritage-designated buildings
- appreciation for the white finish on the lower levels
- a lot of materiality for the size of the project
- questioning the appropriateness of the scale of the brown metal panels
- appreciation for the green roof on the pavilion and its interface with the heritage buildings
- concern for scale of planters in mews as shown in the landscape plans
- the proposal's success in restoring and enhancing the heritage-designated buildings while creating visual interest and reveals with mews
- success in achieving the OCP's objectives for this area

- the need for concrete resolution of the northern boulevard, and the need to work with the City on this aspect of the design
- concern for blocking the views of the shoreline from the harbour
- appreciation for the creation of the public plaza and the connection to the public realm
- concern for the projecting black balconies on the north side taking away from the architecture
- concerns for cold and darkness on the north side commercial space.

Motion:

It was moved by Stefan Schulson, seconded by Elizabeth Balderston, that the Development Permit No. 000259 for 1314-1318 and 1324 Wharf Street be approved subject to the following recommendations:

- refine the material palette to support a more cohesive approach
- recognition that the northern public plaza be developed and constructed concurrently with the project as proposed.

Carried Unanimously

4. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of April 25, 2018 was adjourned at 3:45 pm.

Jesse Garlick, Chair