

**MINUTES OF THE  
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY DECEMBER 19, 2018**

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

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

**Absent:** Paul Hammond

**Absent for a  
Portion of the Meeting:** Elizabeth Balderston

**Staff Present:** Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design  
Robert Batallas – Senior Planner  
Joaquin Karakas – Senior Urban Designer  
John O'Reilly – Heritage Planner  
Katie Lauriston – Secretary

**Guest:** Steve Barber – Heritage Consultant

**2. MINUTES**

**Minutes from the Meeting held November 28, 2018**

**Motion:**

It was moved by Deborah LeFrank seconded by Stefan Schulson that the Minutes of the Meeting of Advisory Design Panel held November 28, 2018 be adopted as amended.

**Carried Unanimously**

**3. NEW BUSINESS**

**Review of Application Types for the Panel's Consideration (Jason Niles)**

Panel discussed:

- appreciation for the opportunity to review and provide design advice on City policies and projects, such as the draft Old Town Design Guidelines
- interest in reviewing more such projects, such as bike lane corridors, local area plans and city-led initiatives such as the Ship Point Master Plan
- whether it would be best to view these projects in their early stages, or later, when it is nearly ready for Council's consideration

- other municipalities mandate that significant municipal planning projects are reviewed by their ADP
- Robert Batallas noted that any project with a design component can be reviewed by the ADP. At the beginning of the year, staff could compile a list of projects with design components for the Panel's information
- a small committee could be established to review the policy that determines which projects that are reviewed by the ADP, and to make recommendations to Council.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Jason Niles, seconded by Justin Gammon that the Panel establishes a working group in relation to municipal-led policy and capital projects.

**Carried Unanimously**

Panel discussed:

- concern that there are no landscape architects on the 2019-2020 Panel
- concern that the Panel has no designated Councillor liaison, especially given the volume of design and development issues on each of Council's agendas.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Jason Niles, seconded by Jesse Garlick that the Panel recommend that Council to have a designated, non-voting Council liaison to the Panel.

**Carried Unanimously**

**4. APPLICATIONS**

**4.1 Draft Updated Old Town Design Guidelines**

Staff are seeking input regarding the draft updates to the *Old Town Design Guidelines* (2006). Robert Batallas, Joaquin Karakas and John O'Reilly provided the Panel with a brief outline of the updated Guidelines.

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

- what is the relationship of this document to the Official Community Plan (OCP)?
  - the Guidelines work in conjunction with the OCP; a proposal's development permit area (DPA) will determine which guidelines apply
  - the Old Town Design Guidelines apply to new developments within Old Town, which includes DPA 1 and parts of DPA 9
- have the precedent images been reviewed to ensure that the examples comply with all of the Guidelines overall?
  - there is no image that meets all the guidelines; rather, each precedent image highlights particular design aspects and components of the design guidelines
  - through statements of intent and without being prescriptive, the Guidelines describe strategies to achieve the community's and the City's goals
- why isn't St. Ann's Academy included in the Guidelines?
  - although St. Ann's Academy is in DPA 9, it is located outside Old Town

- there are other design guidelines that apply within DPA 9, and one of the most important documents pertaining to St. Ann's Academy as a heritage building would be the *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*
- can the topics of height, density and liveability be emphasized to carry more weight?
  - in addition to these design guidelines, every property will also have zoning and land use policies in place to regulate height and density
  - the Guidelines do not alter or affect height or density
  - updated language emphasises but does not enforce the general 15m maximum height
  - section 5.6 addresses liveability through form and character; although staff welcome any additional suggestions for guidelines from the ADP
- is there a design document that addresses the skyline?
  - the Downtown Core Area Plan (DCAP) has detailed guidelines and statements specific to the skyline, including the relationship of Old Town to the downtown and Central Business District skyline.

The Panel discussed the following recommendations:

- appreciation for the forward-looking description of Old Town character without being prescriptive
- recognition of the quality of the imagery; the document reads like an architectural digest
- the need for the Guidelines to be implemented as intended, with room for interpretation
- appreciation for the technical writing and the Guidelines' clear layout
- opportunity to include at least one local example within the precedent images of section 5.4
- a larger map at the beginning of the document would be helpful
  - Robert Batallas noted that a recent update to the draft Guidelines included the addition of a map
- the need for a common vision for the City, and consistency with the OCP so that the policies and guidelines support each other
- appreciation for section 1.6; opportunity to include an examination into the nature of contemporary monuments and how they relate to other buildings, without being prescriptive
- need to consider how best to transition between areas for sites located on the edge of Old Town.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Sorin Birliga, that the quality of the draft Design Guidelines be acknowledged and that the Advisory Design Panel endorses the document as presented, with consideration to the comments discussed at the Panel's December 19, 2018 meeting.

**Carried Unanimously**

## 4.2 Development Permit Application No. 000530 for 902, 906 and 910 McClure Street

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit to retain the two existing buildings (Abigail's Hotel) and construct a four-storey hotel building with additional guestrooms and a meal room for guests. Heritage Designation of the building at 906 McClure Street is also proposed.

Applicant meeting attendees:

BARRY COSGRAVE	NUMBER TEN ARCHITECTURAL GROUP
DANIEL SMITH	NUMBER TEN ARCHITECTURAL GROUP
CARL PETERSON	NUMBER TEN ARCHITECTURAL GROUP
KEITH GRANT	KEITH N. GRANT LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE LTD.

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

- the proposed landscaping elements.

Barry Cosgrave provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Keith Grant provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

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

- will the lots be consolidated?
  - yes
- will the proposed building be attached to the heritage building, or are they separate buildings?
  - there will be three distinct buildings, with a covered walkway connecting the new building to the heritage building
- are 16 parking stalls proposed?
  - there are 16 existing stalls, and 21 are proposed altogether
  - one existing stall is lost and six are added with the proposal
- is the parking shared between the buildings?
  - yes, this is one hotel with rooms among three buildings
- how many trees are being removed?
  - four trees will be removed and 13 will be added
- is it possible to retain the large elm tree in the rear of the lot?
  - this elm is not much more than a short stump with shoots, yet it is counted among the trees being removed
- is there a proposal for the adjacent property to the east?
  - yes, there is a large project proposed, which will consolidate properties to the east
- can the number of electric car charging spaces be increased in the future if necessary?
  - yes, this could easily be done
- what is the design rationale for the contemporary-style railing around the new building's patio?
  - the railing provides screening and safety for the steep slope towards McClure Street
  - the design can be revised

- what is the reason for the secure fencing and gate separating the proposed building's patio?
  - this is for separation and security from the street
  - the existing patios are less visible from the street and are not gated
- what is the rationale behind the contemporary detailing of the proposed building?
  - the *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* frown upon the replication of heritage buildings
  - the new building is distinct from and respectful to the heritage building
  - the building proposes the same materials, colours and roof form, but with simplified details
  - the proposed building initially included detailing which was closer to the heritage building, but this was changed as a result of comments from the Heritage Advisory Panel
  - the new building is not supposed look brand new; the heritage quality is part of Abigail's corporate identity
  - the proposal should look close to the original hotel while being easily distinguished as a separate project
- what is the age of the heritage building?
  - the main building was built in the 1930's and renovated in 1985, and the coach house was constructed in 1998.
  - the applicants are in the process of designating the heritage building
- why is there a retaining wall around the two new parking stalls at the northeast?
  - there is a drop in grade of about a foot between the newly-consolidated northeastern corner of the property and the existing parking area
- what is proposed for the stormwater collected from the parking area?
  - the new parking stalls will have permeable paving
  - the existing parking remains as-is, with the addition of one parking stall and additional planting
- how do cars access stalls 1 and 2 at the northeastern corner of the lot?
  - there is a sloped drive aisle to the south of these spaces
- is the parking stall closest to the new building in front of any windows?
  - no, it is not
- was an alternate parking configuration considered, such as continuing the existing layout towards the northeast corner?
  - this option was considered, but one stall was lost by continuing the existing parking layout
- how important is the retention of one additional stall?
  - it is important to retain this stall for peak occupancy times, and because parking was one of the neighbourhood's few concerns
  - the proposed configuration has been reviewed at a Fairfield Land Use Committee meeting
- would it be possible to shift the proposed building a half meter to the south?
  - this could easily be done
- are the proposed stairs connecting to the new building covered?
  - yes, and the ramp is not covered
- why is the proposed building so far from McClure Street?
  - the building was initially proposed closer to McClure Street, where the patio now sits; however, City staff requested that the side view of the heritage building be maintained
  - the applicants would be happy to move the proposed building southward

- what is the current use of the adjacent property to the north of the new parking area?
  - residential; there is a house there
- for what adjacent use does the landscape buffer provide screening?
  - the adjacent property to the north of the new parking area will be part of the proposed 6-storey senior's facility
  - the landscape buffer and covered parking also respond to concerns from residents of the apartments on Burdett Avenue.

Panel members discussed:

- concern for the tight parking layout and the proximity of vehicles to the proposed building
- appreciation for the overall site plan
- opportunity to shift the proposed building southward by about 2ft. to resolve vehicle circulation and parking configuration
- opportunity to reconfigure the proposed parking layout by swapping the location of the accessible parking stall with stall 12
- appreciation for the proposed landscape buffer for the surface parking
- the need for ample landscaping around the proposed patio's railings
- the proposed building as being insufficiently distinct from the heritage building
- concern that the new building is a poor reproduction of the heritage building
- the need to re-examine the proposed building's expression so that it is subservient and clearly distinguishable as a complimentary, contemporary addition
- the proposed building's lack of contemporary materials or style
- the boxy massing of the fourth floor is not harmonized with the rest of the proposed building
- if the proposed building is intended as a simplification of the heritage building's design, opportunity to reduce the number of batons in the gable and refine the fenestration in the proposed building
- opportunity to more delicately reflect the design of the heritage building
- opportunity to improve how the proposed building meets the ground.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Jason Niles, that the Development Permit Application No. 000530 for 902, 906 and 910 McClure Street be approved subject to the following recommendations:

- shift the proposed building at 910 McClure Street marginally to the south to facilitate a reconfiguration of the rear parking area
- reconsider the proposed additional parking for ease of use, access, and proximity to the new building, with consideration to the provision of more permeable paving
- consider a more distinctly contemporary approach to the architecture of the new building, with special consideration to the massing of the fourth floor roof dormer.

**Carried**

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

**Opposed:** Deborah Le Frank

Panel recessed at 2 p.m. and reconvened at 2:08 p.m.

Elizabeth Balderston recused herself from Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00028 for 1417 May Street.

#### 4.3 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00028 for 1417 May Street

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit with Variance Application to allow for construction of a two-storey ground-oriented residential building with four dwelling units.

Applicant meeting attendees:

PETER JOHANNKNECHT	CASCADIA ARCHITECTS INC.
SARA HUYNH	CASCADIA ARCHITECTS INC.
BIANCA BODLEY	BIOPHILIA COLLECTIVE LTD.

Miko Betanzo provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the Application and the following design revisions since the June 28, 2018 Council meeting:

- the butterfly roof with tongue and groove cedar soffits
- the projecting balconies
- the removal of fin walls between the units on the north and south façades
- the wood siding of the south façade
- privacy screening on the rear balconies
- the shiplap wood siding on the south, west and east elevations
- rainwater leaders' location on the facades, leading to rain gardens
- the addition of shrubs and ornamental grasses to replace the front landscape rain gardens.

Peter Johannknecht 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 applicant's feeling about the current proposal? Are the applicants embracing a change in design, or are they lamenting the loss of what was previously proposed?
  - the applicants are embracing change with the proposed contemporary language and some playfulness
  - the former design was a purposeful expression of a box, and had very positive reception from neighbours
  - the current design has been shifted horizontally and vertically, in response to the comments made at the public hearing.
- how has the roof design been refined in the revised design?
  - the revised roof design brings on board comments from the public hearing, and has a changed expression at the front
  - a classic approach with base, middle and top has been maintained
- are the exterior materials flush, or are there shifts in plane between the materials?
  - the board and batten sits slightly farther out than the basement and top materials, creating a slight shadow line between materials which is visible along the driveway

- how is the building entrance demarcated from May Street?
  - house numbers and mailboxes are clearly displayed at the fence line, and each front unit also has a house number
  - the rear units are accessed down the side path and along the sidewalk beside the driveway, which is demarcated by a change in the driveway materials
- is the southernmost portion of the lot to be used as common space?
  - yes, there is access through the garage
  - this area also houses the bioswale to filter the run-off from the roof
- is grass proposed for the rear yard?
  - yes; all the nearby trees are on neighbouring properties
  - the lawn will provide a flexible open space for the four resident families to use
- how would a resident of a front unit, parked at the rear, carry their groceries inside?
  - they may choose to carry their groceries from the rear to the front entry, otherwise they might also park on the street temporarily, to unload groceries
  - the cemetery across the street reduces the demand for parking on May Street
- are the materials colours accurate as shown on the plans?
  - yes, there is a warmth to the pastel green and blue, reminiscent of the Côte d'Azur
- so the blue is not intended as an eggshell blue?
  - no
- were noise concerns considered with the proposed location of the bedroom headboard against the neighbouring unit's bathtub?
  - a party wall with sufficient sound insulation will separate the two units; however, switching the location of the closet and the bathtubs can be considered
- what is the rationale behind the window locations on the east and west façades?
  - the pattern is determined by the inside spaces; windows are placed where they are needed in the interior
  - the windows are for sunlight and add an element of verticality and playfulness to break up the façade
  - the side façades will not be visible in full due to the driveway width and the location of the adjacent buildings
- what is proposed at the top of the upper floor windows? Were punched openings in the wall for the windows considered?
  - the windows are punched
  - the siding will be capped with flashing, which continues above the upper windows
- is there only flashing above the windows?
  - yes, there is no board and batten siding above the windows
- what is proposed where the downspout reaches the ground? Was a landscape feature or a rainwater garden considered?
  - the rainwater leader on the west side could be daylighted
- what material is used for the rainwater leaders?
  - 4" round steel

- how are the rainwater leaders protected from vehicles?
  - there is a 10ft. drive aisle and people will be hesitant to damage their vehicles; however, additional protection for the rainwater leaders can be considered
- is there sufficient driveway width for the rainwater leaders, which is not devoted to the sidewalk or the drive aisle?
  - yes
- is the aluminum screen on the south elevation a similar colour to the board and batten siding?
  - no; however, there is a similar warmth in tone for the cedar-coloured aluminum screen, which adds privacy and a sun screen for the patios
- were privacy concerns considered with the offset balconies?
  - the balconies were shifted to reduce privacy issues, and the aluminum screening also adds privacy
- is there a shift in plane between the top shiplap siding and the board and batten?
  - yes, the board and batten projects about 2"
  - the siding acts as passive insulation
- is the roof edge at the same plane as the board and batten siding?
  - yes
- what is the distance between the proposed building and the adjacent building to the east?
  - there is approximately 4.5m to the building to the east
- what type of windows are proposed?
  - punch windows, similar to other buildings in the neighbourhood
  - the window design has been carefully designed to minimize the impact on adjacent neighbours
- do any windows face directly towards adjacent neighbours' windows?
  - no, they are all offset
- what is the rationale for the location of the lower floor kitchens, which do not have windows?
  - due to the challenging constraints of the project, the kitchen does not have windows; however, interior breaks in the walls will allow some natural light into the space
  - the lower level is as open as possible while meeting seismic standards
  - there are lightwells for the bedrooms below grade
- was a lightwell to the kitchen considered?
  - a lightwell to the driveway would be possible
- the bedrooms facing May Street show a door through the closet; is this correct?
  - this door is for access to the space under the stair
- what is the primary reason for offsetting the units?
  - to break up the massing, to express residential proportions towards the street and to add privacy for the patios.

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the project's integrated sustainability measures
- the project as an asset to the community
- recognition for the liveability of the units
- concern for the proposal's inactive presentation to May Street
- desire for increased refinement towards the May Street frontage.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Deborah LeFrank, seconded by Carl-Jan Rupp, that Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00028 for 1417 May Street be approved as presented.

**Carried Unanimously**

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of December 19, 2018 was adjourned at 2:50 pm.

---

Chair