

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY AUGUST 22, 2018**

1. THE CHAIR CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 12:08 PM

Present: Stefan Schulson (Acting Chair); Sorin Birliga;
Deborah LeFrank; Jason Niles; Carl-Jan Rupp

**Absent for a
Portion of the Meeting:** Justin Gammon

Absent: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Elizabeth Balderston; Paul
Hammond

Staff Present: Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Leanne Taylor – Senior Planner
Rob Bateman – Senior Process Planner
Katie Lauriston – Secretary
Devon Cownden – Secretary

2. MINUTES

Minutes from the Meeting held July 25, 2018

Motion:

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Deborah LeFrank, that the Minutes of the Meeting of Advisory Design Panel held July 25, 2018 be adopted as presented.

Carried Unanimously

3. APPLICATIONS

3.1 Development Permit Application No. 000503 for 1400 and 1412 Quadra Street and 850 Johnson Street

The City is considering a Development Permit and Rezoning Application to construct a 14-storey mixed-use building with ground floor commercial and purpose-built rental above, including approximately 105 dwelling units.

Applicant meeting attendees:

PETER DE HOOG
ROB WHETTER
SCOTT MURDOCH
BIJAN NEYESTANI

DE HOOG & KIERULF ARCHITECTS
DE HOOG & KIERULF ARCHITECTS
MURDOCH DE GREEFF INC.
ALPHA PROJECT DEVELOPMENTS LTD.

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

- heritage landmark building context
- massing of the upper storeys
- uniformity of the façades and the cohesion of the building design
- the proposal's relationship to adjacent properties.

Mr. De Hoog and Mr. Whetter provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Scott Murdoch provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

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

- what are the proposal's specific design responses to the Conservatory of Music?
 - the proposal does not attempt to reproduce the Conservatory's massing, but the applicants have worked closely with the Planning department to ensure that the proposal provides an appropriate response
 - the proposal mirrors the Conservatory's scale, while the darker palette and variegated materials at the podium level provide an appropriate response to the Conservatory's stone wall colours
- what is the proposal's discrepancy with the Official Community Plan (OCP)?
 - Mr. Bateman clarified that the density limits are specific to the use. Residential use allows for a 3:1 floor space ratio (FSR) and the proposal has an FSR of approximately 5.21:1
- what is the reasoning behind the uneven distribution of balconies between the corner of Johnson and Quadra Streets as compared to the northwestern corner?
 - the balcony distribution reflects the location and sizes of units; studios do not have balconies and the larger, corner suites do have balconies
- were Juliet balconies considered for the suites without balconies, to lend a more residential appearance?
 - the applicants did not think this to be necessary, and the design's simplicity without balconies was thought to be more effective
 - more balconies were considered, but they were very small
- what is the rationale behind the different façade treatments, especially at the north side?
 - the window wall treatment is slightly distinct on the north side, with a slight adjustment to the window modules
 - the north façade has a more modern feel and interesting texture, which can be seen from 1-2 blocks away
- where is the parkade access located?
 - on the southwest side
- was increased height considered, given the adjacent buildings?
 - the applicants have been discouraged from pursuing this option, as increased height would not conform to the Downtown Core Area Plan (DCAP)
 - Mr. Bateman clarified that through the OCP amendment, the proposal is aiming to have the same urban place designation as the adjacent property. The new designation would limit the proposal's FSR, which in turn affects the allowable height

- what is the rationale for eroding the massing at the northwest corner, and was this approach considered for the northeast corner instead?
 - an earlier iteration of the proposal further addressed the northeast corner, but the applicants were asked by City staff to ensure setbacks to the interior lot lines to ensure the suites' liveability
- what is the rationale behind the dark spandrel colour, particularly on the Johnson Street side?
 - the renderings may not accurately reflect the intended colour; it will be a lighter colour to contrast against both the darker and the lighter brick elements
- what is the colour of the podium?
 - the podium colour will be variegated
- was a lighter colour considered for the podium to reduce its presence on the street?
 - the podium is not intended as a heavy element
- an earlier iteration of the proposal had a greater FSR; when this was reduced, was a taller, more slender tower considered?
 - increased height was discouraged by the Planning department, and the proposal also had to stay within the setbacks and have secondary walls
- what is the design rationale for how the building meets the sky?
 - there are construction limits as to how thin the upper floors can be, and the top two storeys' floorplate cannot be made smaller due to the costs
 - the height is limited in the DCAP, and the applicants are looking to minimize the number of requested variances
- how is security ensured for the second and fifth level patios?
 - the patios are accessible for maintenance and achieve the desired visual effect
 - there is an exterior railing for safety, but no dividers between units. This could be addressed through the placement of planters
- how would bicycle access through the lobby function, given the narrow vestibule?
 - the primary bicycle entrance is located off Quadra Street and is 5ft wide
- does the façade treatment come down to grade at the north and west, next to adjacent buildings?
 - the treatment extends to the height of the adjacent buildings because the lower levels are at a zero lot line.

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the subtlety of the brick detail and mix of materials colours
- desire for increased consistency between the elevations, especially on the north façade, for a more cohesive appearance
- concern for the dark colour and strength of presence of the five-storey podium on Quadra and Johnson Streets
- opportunity for lighter or reflective elements at the podium level to reflect and showcase the Conservatory building
- desire for increased liveliness, as shown in the precedent images, perhaps through the introduction of a lighter element brought down to the street level
- appreciation for the proposed massing and sensitivity to the nearby heritage buildings
- lamenting the move away from the previously-proposed massing erosion at the northeast in recognition of the Conservatory building

- appreciation for the sensitive and well-crafted response to context
- no concerns for the proposed OCP amendment and residential density
- the need to refine the building massing at the Johnson and Quadra street corner
- concern for the imposing podium massing, especially on Quadra Street
- opportunity to decrease the four-storey podium height to achieve a better-proportioned, more elegant tower
- the proposal's heavy and squat appearance and its abrupt truncation
- desire for increased height
- opportunity for a lighter element, especially where the building meets the sky
- desire for privacy screening between patios, especially to separate the communal patio from the private outdoor spaces.

Motion:

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Deborah LeFrank, that the Development Permit Application No. 000503 for 1400 and 1412 Quadra Street and 850 Johnson Street be approved with the following recommendations:

- improve the consistency of the elevations' expressions with particular attention to the north façade
- increase privacy between units from the exterior decks to restrict opportunities for overlook / trespass
- reconsider the building termination / how the building meets the sky
- refine the modulation of the building to emphasize its verticality and reinforce its slenderness.

Carried Unanimously

Justin Gammon recused himself from Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00078 for 945 Pembroke Street at 1:22 pm.

3.2 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00078 for 945 Pembroke Street

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit with Variances Application to construct two multiple dwellings.

Applicant meeting attendees:

CHRISTINE LINTOTT
LAURIE AVES

CHRISTINE LINTOTT ARCHITECTS
CHRISTINE LINTOTT ARCHITECTS

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

- the on-site hard and soft landscaping
- the residential entryways
- the east-facing windows of building A.

Ms. Aves provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal as well as details of the proposed landscape plan.

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

- how are the units accessed, and what is the purpose of the central stairway?
 - each unit has its own entrance, and the central stairway is used only as an emergency exit
- if a resident of unit A3 parked a vehicle in the rear, would they then walk up the driveway to enter through the front?
 - yes
- are all the existing trees on the western property line located on the adjacent property?
 - yes, all are on the neighbour's lot except one cedar, which will have to be removed for the installation of utilities
- are the bicycle racks at the front for visitors?
 - they are for visitors or residents, for use as short-term bike parking
- will the buildings be stratified?
 - yes, each unit will be in the strata
- how will parking access be ensured for both buildings?
 - a reciprocal easement will be made for the parking and patio areas
- is the only access to units 4 and 6 in buildings A and B through the easement?
 - yes
- will the driveway between the buildings be a shared path for vehicles and pedestrians?
 - yes
- how was the placement of the battens and windows determined, and were other arrangements considered?
 - the windows are aligned so as to reduce overlook into adjacent dwellings, and the battens are aligned to the windows in many locations; however, the battens' alignment differs at the top of the east elevation to accommodate the interior room configuration
- what is the separation distance between the buildings?
 - just over 4m for the most part, and a little closer at the emergency exit
- what is the height of the sill where the separation distance is 4m?
 - the sill heights are quite high, at approximately 4'6" or 5', to ensure that the view is towards the ceiling rather than inside the unit
 - the window placement and room arrangement are also staggered to ensure privacy across the driveway
- was increasing the separation distance or decreasing the height of the living room windows considered to maximize privacy?
 - one of the living room windows faces the neighbours, and across the driveway the high sill heights and staggered window placement reduces views into the living rooms
- are there specific design guidelines that prescribed the direction for this project, or is the intent to maintain the residential character of the neighbourhood?
 - the intent was for the proposal to fit in to the neighbourhood, similar to the existing dwelling
- would the site's zone allow for greater density on the property?
 - Ms. Taylor clarified that the Downtown Core Area Plan (DCAP) supports up to five storeys and a floor space ratio (FSR) of up to 2:1, and the zoning supports multi-family dwellings

- why are variances sought when the proposal includes a rezoning application?
 - Ms. Taylor clarified that the Application is to rezone to the existing R3-A1 Zone, as the proposal fits well in terms of the proposed use and density
 - the proposal provides more open site space, some reduced setbacks and greater site coverage than the R3-A1 Zone
- is the Senior Heritage Planner supportive of the move to mimic heritage façades?
 - Ms. Taylor clarified that staff have collectively reviewed the Application to ensure the proposal's consistency with design guidelines and its fit within the surrounding context.

Panel members discussed:

- concern for the liveability of the dwellings and the proposal's method of achieving density
- opportunity to explore alternate ways of achieving density while respecting the neighbouring dwellings; for example, by reducing the number of units and by building just one building on the lot
- desire to have the overall site plan and the buildings' presence as single family dwellings reconsidered, to add to the neighbourhood and achieve liveability
- need to reconsider the buildings' appeal to traditional typology while achieving multiple dwellings
- recognition of the significant potential for the site and its central location adjacent to Central Park
- concern for the reduced setbacks from the R3-A1 Zone, which would have helped to ensure liveability of the proposal and neighbouring dwellings
- appreciation for the effort invested into the window placement; however, the façade design needs refinement; some privacy concerns remain for the adjacency of the windows
- the emergency exit's location through bathrooms demonstrates the need to improve the site circulation
- the site plan's incongruity with the context as a pedestrian-friendly neighbourhood
- the need to simplify the site plan
- the proposal's lack of shared space on-site
- the need to improve the design of the tall, narrow laneway between buildings to eliminate potential for conflict between pedestrians and cars
- safety concerns with the parking located at the rear and unit entrances located only at the front of the buildings
- appreciation for the look of the concrete and grass laneway, but space must be provided for pedestrians to pass cars
- the need to review the proposed grass planting in laneway given the wet, shady conditions
- drainage concerns arising from the basement suite entrances' low grade
- concern for the proximity of the parking spaces to neighbouring dwellings, as well as adjacent units 6 in buildings A and B
- lack of space between vehicles in laneway and entrances
- concern for the cheap material selections and suburban-looking elevations
- lack of clarity as to why the Tudor reference was chosen
- caution against mimicking heritage aspects, as this takes away from the look of the adjacent buildings
- opportunity to explore a more contemporary design to better highlight the heritage features of neighbouring buildings.

Motion:

It was moved by Deborah LeFrank, seconded by Jason Niles, that the Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00078 for 945 Pembroke Street does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined, and that the key areas that should be revised include:

- improvement of the overall liveability of the proposal with particular attention to the interior and exterior site circulation and building separation distances
- reconsideration of the overall building expression to limit the replication of heritage façades.

Carried Unanimously

Justin Gammon returned to the meeting at 2:20 pm.

3.3 Development Permit Application No. 000522 for 210 Kimta Road

The City is considering a Development Permit Application to construct a 25-storey residential building with ground floor commercial.

Applicant meeting attendees:

JIM AALDERS	HDR / CEI ARCHITECTURE ASSOCIATES, INC.
JAMES PARTLOW	LOMBARD NORTH GROUP
KEN MARIASH	FOCUS EQUITIES

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 relationship of the ground floor to Kimta Road
- the building top.

Mr. Aalders provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Mr. 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 rationale behind the building's orientation in relation to the street?
 - the site plan and building orientation are largely laid out within the design guidelines, to which this proposal must adhere
 - the guidelines state that there must be a mews, as well as enforce the need to reduce shadowing on the heritage-designated roundhouse buildings and railway turntable
- why doesn't the proposal face Kimta Road to a greater extent?
 - the building's structure is built upon the below-grade parking layout, and its orientation is designed to maximize the two key views to the Olympic Mountains and towards the Inner Harbour
 - the building's orientation is dictated by the views, the structure, and the design guidelines
- is the site's master plan already completed?
 - yes, there is an approved Master Development Agreement (MDA)

- the applicants have begun the process of drafting a new site plan to create fewer walls and further open up the site
- is the roundhouse, as the site's largest amenity, to be completed at the end of the project?
 - Mr. Betanzo clarified that the MDA states that the roundhouse must be completed in either the first or second phase of development; it will be completed next
- is the hardscaped façade towards the Lime Bay mews designed to accommodate emergency access?
 - there are certain width requirements for emergency vehicle access, but the detailing can be carefully considered to place some trees in this location
 - the mews design is based on creating a view corridor from the roundhouse to the water, and any trees added would have to maintain these views
- why does the pedestrian path divert into Sitkum Park before paralleling the E&N Rail Trail?
 - the pathway separates pedestrians from cyclists, and the pedestrian path has a pleasant diversion towards the centre of Sitkum Park
 - the pathway's general configuration is already approved as part of the design guidelines through the MDA
- was a range of market prices considered to increase diversity?
 - although there is currently no rental component, there is a broad range of residential purchasers
 - most of the units are priced at the top end to add diversity to the existing community
 - at the beginning of the project, the desire was for an affordable community but the project was refused by the City for many years and the project costs have since increased
 - the units are no more costly than those downtown, and there are rentals located at the other side of the railroad tracks, closer to the commercial components
 - the applicants see no possibility of recuperating the costs of the development; the desire is simply to complete the project
- is there a historical rail connection to the water, or is this new?
 - historically, there was a spur going towards the water but not in the mews location
- are only passive uses proposed for the park?
 - Garry oaks and native planting were initially proposed, but the Parks department wanted a continuation of the boulevard trees
 - the public use of Sitkum Park will be maintained, and it will be contoured for some elevation with the pathway sloping down from the Rail Trail
- how does the grade of the entry plaza compare to that of the park?
 - the entry plaza is at a lower level than the mews, and there is a grade change at the southeastern corner of the entry plaza
 - the pool is at the same grade as the townhouse patios, which is approximately 2m above Kimta Road
- what is the proposed programming for the plaza area east of the pool?
 - the patio will be secured but visually open, with a lawn pathway connection to Sitkum Park
- who will use the pool?
 - the pool will be for residents only

- what is the difference of elevation between the outdoor patio and Sitkum Park?
 - the lawn will rise about 2ft so that it is level with the patio, and a fence will be installed for security
- is lighting proposed for the raised walkway connection between the outdoor patio and the pedestrian pathway?
 - yes, LED lighting will be installed to demarcate the pedestrian pathway
- what is the necessity of the two parking spaces at the main entry plaza?
 - these spaces are desirable as they provide an easy pickup location for residents; they are not intended for parking
- what is the rationale behind the proposal's two townhouse units on the main floor; were more townhouses or an entirely commercial main floor considered?
 - the corner unit at the mews is in a prime commercial location, and helps set the tone for the commercial aspect of the mews
 - the townhomes are not experienced as being mixed with the commercial spaces, as there is access to the townhomes that avoids the amenity and commercial spaces
 - the location of the townhomes helps to animate the Rail Trail and avoids a 'back of house' to the building
- the townhouse patios cover the pedestrian pathway on some plans; is this correct?
 - this is an error in the plans; the patios are smaller than indicated
 - the landscape plan shows the correct proportions for the patios
- will the planters be smaller than indicated, or are the patios smaller?
 - the planters are smaller, and stairs will step down from the patios towards the pathway
- is there leeway within the MDA for a lesser division between the Rail Trail's pedestrian and cycling pathways?
 - Mr. Betanzo clarified that a green buffer between the cycling and pedestrian trails is specified within the MDA.

Justin Gammon left the meeting at 3:05pm.

Panel members discussed:

- recognition of the value of the proposal's narrative (i.e. rails to sails); desire for this story to animate the space
- appreciation for the level of detail brought into the proposal
- appreciation for the addition of commercial activity within the master planned development
- anticipation for an increased volume of pedestrians along the cycling corridor at Sitkum Park due to the significant diversion from the pathway
- concern that the order of development may be ill-suited to the health of the area; desire for the roundhouse, as the site's main amenity, to be completed first
- caution against creating an enclave for a privileged sector of society given the lack of affordable housing and rental options
- recognition for the importance of a cohesive master plan
- concern that Sitkum Park is treated as a leftover piece, when it should be a desirable amenity for the area
- the need to review the adjacencies between the entry plaza and Sitkum Park
- desire for more and better-integrated greenspace on-site
- the need for increased landscaping at the west side
- opportunity for urban trees within the mews

- desire to eliminate parking at the front entrance
- appreciation for the mews concept
- desire for refinement of how the building meets the ground on the south and west sides to improve the pedestrian experience
- the need to resolve the relationship between public and retail spaces
- desire for the mews to be narrowed to a more pedestrian scale
- the building's alignment to the mews and its lack of response to Kimta Road
- need to improve the articulation of the south façade facing Kimta Road to avoid having a 'back of house'
- opportunity to better respond to Kimta Road through the building's alignment or a reflection of the road's gentle curve
- desire for fewer building corners facing Kimta Road, to increase the building's engagement and appeal towards the public realm
- no concerns with the proposed materials
- the need to resolve the arbitrary termination of the terra cotta brick; opportunity to extend this material further up the elevations
- desire for increased consistency between the elevations, especially at the podium level of the south and west elevations
- the need to resolve the prominent podium level
- desire for increased consistency with the trellis and eyebrows at the building top
- the mechanical room as a lost opportunity for the top of the building
- need to refine the building top and canopies with a more elegant, tapered approach.

Motion:

It was moved by Sorin Birliga, seconded by Justin Gammon, that the Development Permit Application No. 000522 for 210 Kimta Road be approved subject to the following recommendations:

- introduce more vegetation throughout the site, particularly along the Lime Bay Mews
- reconsider and refine the relationship between the first three storeys of the podium and Kimta Road to create a consistent podium level expression with the Lime Bay Mews in terms of materiality, scale and detail
- increase the integration between the lobby entrance area and Sitkum Park
- refine the building top to better align with the design guidelines and to screen the mechanical rooms.

Carried Unanimously

4. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of August 22, 2018 was adjourned at 3:53 pm.

Jesse Garlick, Chair