

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

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

**Present:** Jesse Garlick (Chair); Paul Hammond; Jason Niles;  
Carl-Jan Rupp

**Absent for a  
Portion of the Meeting:** Justin Gammon; Deborah LeFrank

**Absent:** Elizabeth Balderston; Sorin Birliga; Stefan Schulson

**Staff Present:** Alison Meyer – Assistant Director, Development Services  
Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design  
Merinda Conley – Senior Heritage Planner  
Alec Johnston – Senior Planner  
Katie Lauriston – Secretary

**2. MINUTES**

**Minutes from the Meeting held January 24, 2018**

**Action:**

It was moved by Deborah LeFrank, seconded by Jesse Garlick, that the Minutes of the Meeting of Advisory Design Panel held January 24, 2018 be adopted as amended.

**Carried Unanimously**

**3. APPLICATIONS**

*Justin Gammon recused himself from Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00034 at 12:15 pm.*

**3.1 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00034 for 515 Chatham Street**

The City is considering a Development Permit with Variance Application to construct a five-storey, mixed-use building with ground floor commercial and four storeys of residential above.

Applicant meeting attendees:

CHRISTINE LINTOTT  
BEV WINDJACK  
CAROLE ROSSELL

CHRISTINE LINTOTT ARCHITECTS  
LADR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS  
SMALL & ROSSELL LANDSCAPE  
ARCHITECTS

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

- differentiation between Building A and Building B and its fit within the local context
- finishes and materials
- roofline articulation and building termination
- the appropriateness of the height variance.

Christine Lintott provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal and Bev Windjack provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

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

- what is the percentage increase in windows compared to the earlier?
  - there is about a 10% increase, from about 35% to 45%
- do the balconies on either side of the corten popouts allow for outdoor seating?
  - yes, these are full balconies
- who uses the courtyard?
  - the courtyard is for residents' use, with access from each suite and from the residential entry. This outdoor amenity space serves as a back yard.
- have the units reduced in size to achieve the articulation and depth in the façade?
  - all the units have proportionally increased in size; the townhouses have been eliminated, there are fewer studio units and more one-bedroom units were added.
  - the gap between Store Street and Chatham Street buildings has been narrowed, so is now considered one building in terms of building code.
- was the rooftop deck eliminated?
  - yes, to reduce the requested height variance which was a significant point of concern for the Downtown Residents Association
  - removing the townhouses and adding balconies has allowed a net increase in usable private outdoor space
- is the courtyard accessible?
  - yes
- can you elaborate on the public plaza design?
  - the streetscape design follows the Rock Bay standards and public realm strategy, with generous sidewalks and street corner gathering areas for street life, and opportunities for commercial tenant improvements such as seating or planters
  - the building is set back from the property line, providing opportunity for spill out
- is there bicycle parking?
  - yes, and a bench, two chairs and a waste bin
- has the corner commercial tenant been determined?
  - not yet
- why does the paneling on Buildings A and B come down to grade level but not at the Store Street corner?
  - the paneling does come down to the ground at the corner, to increase visibility and distinguish as a remark on the corner
- what is the reason for not having a stair close to the atrium space?
  - a stair would add complexity in terms of building code requirements and the corridors accessing the atrium space are not in line with each other

- there are other opportunities for lingering, but not vertically
- what is the rationale for the increased complex paneling?
  - these were added in response to staff comments to introduce a greater level of texture and vibrancy, break down massing and create visual distinction
  - working to distinguish buildings with varying proportions of the colour palette, while still staying in the metal material family
  - the proposal is not as restrained as it was previously
- will there be colour variation on the south elevation of building A?
  - yes, this isn't accurately portrayed in the plan's elevations but the Store Street building will be a lighter, varied colour
- is the parapet still serving as a garden?
  - it is still about 42" high
  - contemporary approach on the view from the street on how building meets sky.

Panel members discussed:

- the proposal is an appropriate revision and is much more open and improved from the last submission
- appreciation for bringing in natural light by removing townhouses
- commend the utility of the renderings showing the quality of the materials
- desire for a convenient and appealing main stair connection
- importance of distinguishing between Buildings A and B
- the cladding appears fairly similar between Buildings A and B, but it may not appear in reality as it does in renderings
- desire to anchor the Store Street corner of Building A
- great transition between Old Town and Rock Bay
- appreciation for having the driveway exit pushed closer to the existing driveway, although the driveway location off Store Street is not ideal
- opportunity for more street trees or vegetation along Store Street
- the more modern, pronounced cornice is appropriate
- a height variance for a stair tower is no reason to limit future rooftop access
- desire to design for future roof access
- lost opportunity by not using the roof as an amenity space, but recognition of the balconies and courtyard as resident amenity space
- landscape development and the addition of balconies are significant improvements.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Paul Hammond, seconded by Jason Niles, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00034 for 515 Chatham Street be approved as presented.

**Carried Unanimously**

*Justin Gammon returned to the meeting at 1:00pm*

### 3.2 Rezoning Application No. 00610 and Development Permit No. 000511 for 505, 517, 519 / 521 Quadra Street and 931 Convent Place

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to allow a six-storey multi-unit residential building at the corner of Quadra Street and Southgate Street, and for four townhouse units fronting onto Convent Place.

Applicant meeting attendees:

STUART KERR	ANALOGUE PROJECTS LTD.
PETER KERR	ANALOGUE PROJECTS LTD.
DAVID MCGRATH	WENSLEY ARCHITECTURE LTD.
COLIN HARPER	WENSLEY ARCHITECTURE LTD.
JAMES PARTLOW	LOMBARD NORTH GROUP INC.

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 massing
- landscaping along the Quadra Street frontage
- exposed parkade walls.

David McGrath 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 the inspiration behind the mix of warehouse-industrial aesthetic and the modern top?
  - stemming from an awareness of the size of the building
  - desire to capture a traditional architectural form for the corner with modern elements
  - visually too large when all in brick; modulation of the four levels with brick elements gives a streetscape within building itself
- were pedestrian entrances off Southgate Street considered?
  - initially there was a courtyard entrance on the south corner, but for security this was reduced to one access point off Quadra Street
- do the units off Southgate Street have entrances to the street?
  - yes, all ground-floor units have street-facing engagement with a sunken patio
- were other uses considered for the ground level, such as café or personal services?
  - the site will be zoned for residential use
- why is there a fence on the parkade exit wall at the northeastern corner? How will this present to the neighbours?
  - the fence is there for safety purposes and to prevent overlook into neighbours' back gardens, and has been pushed back as much as possible
  - substantial trees and lower-level ground cover are proposed for this area to address the impact of the 12' wall
- will there be any other fencing?
  - no, the fencing will only go to where there is daylighting

- the fence goes along the property line and there is a guardrail on top of the structure
- is the gathering space open to the adjacent yard?
  - yes, to reduce the height along the wall
- what kinds of trees are proposed?
  - large deciduous trees, perhaps maples
  - there is a continuous 5' wide strip along the east property line, and by borrowing on the neighbour's property the roots will not be restricted by the slab
- are the major existing trees at the southeast corner on the adjacent property?
  - yes; they will not be impacted by this project
  - an arborist was consulted and the construction impact has been assessed
- how does the bicycle access work?
  - there are two access points; one requiring a fob from the parkade entrance and another on Quadra Street
- A200 shows stairs to the bicycle access – is this correct?
  - yes, and there is a ramp beside the stairs that isn't shown on the plans
- what properties to the east have higher density, as referenced in the presentation?
  - there is one four-storey and one three-storey building to the east along Southgate Street. Although this is lower density than the proposal, they are nearby examples of multi-storey buildings
- is the only taller development in the area Academy Close?
  - yes
- what are the materials and colours of the base and top?
  - the base is made to resemble a light stone element correlating to the cornice structure, which terminates the brick elements
- is there a green wall by the bicycle entrance off Quadra Street?
  - this is a trellis with vines
  - there will also be windows placed on this wall to bring in natural light to the bicycle parking area
- is the lack of massing variation due to zoning requirements?
  - Mr. Johnston clarified that there is a concurrent Rezoning application to create a site-specific zone. For this reason, there will not likely be variances for height, as the required height could be written into the new zone
- could the new zone accommodate elements with more varied height?
  - Mr. Johnson confirmed that this would be possible
- on the east elevation, are the claddings actually articulating the mass of building or is this just a visual effect?
  - the renderings use shadow lines to accentuate a 8"- 1' articulation, and separations indicate balcony locations
  - designed to have structure and plumbing stacked while maintaining cost-efficiency
- will there be roof access?
  - it will not be accessible to the public
- was anything besides façade treatment considered to introduce massing variation?
  - further reducing the setback on the top floors was considered, but challenges arise from the wood frame structure
  - a specific unit count has to be met to make project feasible
- what materials are used for the balcony guards?
  - glass rails with extruded aluminum frame

- lower units with brick element will have a partial pony wall with articulated glass guardrail to meet the height requirement
- does the brick turn in to the balconies?
  - this is not shown, likely no
- is the side material of the balcony the same as on the upper floors?
  - yes
- the description of the project notes metal siding on the upper levels; is this still the case?
  - no; the corrugated metal is now hardie-panel with reveal
- is the building at the northeast for garbage and recycling?
  - yes, and the top will have a garden shed
- what types of uses would be supported for this site?
  - Mr. Johnston noted that the OCP designation is Urban Residential, which envisions low- to mid-rise residential uses or low to mid-rise mixed uses along arterial or secondary arterial roads
  - policy would support mixed-use for this site.

Panel members discussed:

- the proposal's proximity to Southgate Street compared to the existing building
- south setback could be justified in terms of pedestrian safety, and there is no relaxation requested for the setback
- shifts in massing and patios on the south elevation could be misconstrued as an entrance to the building, whereas the entry is marked only by a large canopy
- appreciation for the opportunity to overlook the park
- height on Southgate Street is not objectionable in itself, but the proposal has an abrupt, sheer verticality and a façade decorating a flat mass
- desire to see top floor set back, especially at the corner of Quadra and Southgate Streets
- opportunity to explore methods of reworking massing
- wood frame construction can allow for variation without over-complexity
- successful modulation of townhouses and how they meet the sky
- architectural language introduced in the townhouses could be successful if worked into the larger building to achieve variation
- questioning what is being referenced in the design; the surrounding context is modernism, with three to four storeys
- the need to take into consideration surrounding amenities and vista onto the site from St. Anne's Academy and Beacon Hill Park
- opportunity for a café at the corner
- the need to reconsider the façade and massing
- replicating a late 19<sup>th</sup> century warehouse aesthetic and merging with a contemporary expression gives the impression of a renovation, without the quality of an existing building of that nature
- lack of authenticity in detailing
- elevated brick supported by stucco reveals that this is just an application to break down the perception of height
- having the brick drop down further emphasizes the height of the multi-unit building in relation to the townhouses
- no need to build heritage buildings from the ground up without architectural reference or significance in the area or on-site

- townhouse design presents a much more subtle integration of brick and contemporary materials
- landscaping is very limited, everything is in a straight line with no articulation
- need for landscaping enhancement along the Quadra Street frontage to better integrate the townhouses, parkade, staircase and plaza
- severe massing at north end abuts neighbouring properties
- need to resolve overlook issue on northeast corner with parkade structure
- concern for exhaust fumes with the proximity of the eastern townhouse's entry door and the parkade entrance
- desire to see revised application if possible.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Paul Hammond, seconded by Carl-Jan Rupp, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Rezoning Application No. 00610 and Development Permit No. 000511 for 505, 517, 519 / 521 Quadra Street and 931 Convent Place does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined with reconsideration of the architectural language and massing in building design, materials and detailing, particularly on the six storey building, to be more authentic to the nature of new development on this site.

**Carried Unanimously**

**3.3 Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances Application No. 00005 for 603-607 Pandora Avenue**

The City is considering a Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances Application for a comprehensive development that would include adaptive reuse of the Plaza Hotel into a residential development with ground-level commercial use, and new additions above the Plaza Hotel building and to the north that would replace an existing one-storey addition facing Pandora Avenue.

Applicant meeting attendees:

ERIC BARKER	ERIC BARKER ARCHITECT INC.
NICK ASKEW	OCEAN GATE DEVELOPMENT
CAROLE ROSSELL	SMALL & ROSSELL

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-designated Plaza Hotel
- retaining the prominence of the Plaza Hotel
- integration of the character of the historic streetscape into the general expression, such as expressed concrete window sills
- contextual expression of the façade that is more sympathetic to the Old Town context and the Chinatown National Historic District
- diversity of built form
- massing and design of the building additions
- finishing materials
- clarification of exterior lighting location and style for the public plaza.

Ms. Conley then provided a brief summary of the recommendations from the Heritage Advisory Panel at their meeting February 13, 2018.

Eric Barker provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Carole Rossell provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

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

- how does the project's design respond to redevelopment potential of the lot directly to the east?
  - many windows are set appropriately back from the face
  - windows on the eastern property line are not the only source of light for units
  - interior lighting is not entirely dependent on the windows on the property line
  - it would also be problematic to have units face each other across the light well; it is better for units to face east and risk the possibility of development to the east
  - the south-eastern corner is also set further back from the property line
- is it only the three middle units that look out to the east?
  - yes
- what is new and what is old on the Plaza building?
  - two-thirds of the existing structure, including the timbers and façade, are being maintained
- what is underneath the existing heritage building?
  - just a basement; there is no parking as none was previously required
- does the proposal tuck some parking underground?
  - yes
- why are only 28 parking stalls proposed?
  - the client is comfortable with this proportion of parking given the number of units and the downtown location
  - initially no parking was required; 11 parking spaces have since been added
  - additional parking costs an estimated \$50,000 per stall and would negatively affect unit affordability
- what are the glass panels on the ground?
  - these prisms are only along Government street
- what is proposed for the urinal at the corner?
  - the applicant is putting \$50,000 towards its relocation
- will the existing street trees be removed?
  - yes, for construction and because the City has advised that they be replaced
- how is it that can the courtyard be heard without being accessible?
  - it is open to the air and the communal area at the same level, but is not designed for walking through
- have there been detailed shadow studies on the courtyard?
  - the lower levels will not get direct sunlight; this is part of the reason why the interior garden will be so lush and active with a water feature, and why there are only six units facing east
- was it considered to have fewer, wider and shallower units to increase the courtyard space?
  - this can be considered
- was a more unified approach to the new building considered, to better relate to the Plaza Hotel?

- the glass treatment carries through as one treatment idea, with the one column element that wraps around and frames the edge of the Plaza
- is the intention of the brick element to relate to the adjacent building façades?
  - yes, to provide a scale transition and to relate to the Old Town context
  - wanted to make a contemporary statement rather than a contextual statement
- what is the intention of the glass railing projection?
  - yes, to signify a cornice over the brick and appropriately respond to the brick element
- are these market units?
  - yes
- are the load-bearing walls between suites what determine unit configuration?
  - the walls are offset to coincide with the existing columns within the Plaza Hotel
- are the southeast corner balconies open to both the south and east?
  - the fourth level and above are open to the south and to the east, below the fourth level they are open only to the east.

Panel members discussed:

- concern for 6m wide, six-storey light well, especially with this as the only daylight to the west for lower levels
- questioning the liveability of some units, as the only source of direct light for the east-facing units could be closed with adjacent redevelopment
- appreciation that this is a challenging site, but the design struggles to bring light into some spaces
- need to design with consideration to the possibility of future development to the east, to avoid the possibility of buried, borderline liveable units
- commend the meaningful roof garden design
- concern for the significant reduction in proposed parking
- excessive width and starkness in plaza design
- questioning the need for open space with many open public spaces nearby
- opportunity for more creative plaza landscaping; a raingarden or meadow would require minimal maintenance
- reluctance to lose existing mature trees on Government Street
- there are about 6 balcony treatments proposed, and all seem very exposed; there are many successful examples of recessed balconies in Chinatown
- appreciation for the proposed restoration of the Plaza Hotel
- proposal lacks coherency and feels like a cluster of four or five different buildings
- north elevation could be simplified to strengthen thesis
- new development overshadows the heritage building
- proposal could benefit from refinement to a singular treatment so as to showcase the Plaza Hotel
- Plaza Hotel could be echoed or referenced around the corner to increase cohesion
- corner design contrasts with the way buildings typically turn corners in Chinatown
- heavy-handed articulation of the corner gives a tower-like appearance; it doesn't need to be its own element and should be integrated
- north elevation gives the visual impression of an entry where the brick and white elements come to the ground, yet the entry is obscured and embedded within the retail bay

- desire for renderings illustrating the pedestrian experience
- the importance of resolving the design in a way that does the site justice

*Deborah LeFrank left the meeting at 2:25 pm.*

**Motion:**

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Jesse Garlick, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances Application No. 00005 for 603-607 Pandora Avenue be considered for approval subject to the following recommendations:

- increase the degree to which the contemporary additions along Pandora Street and the key corner element are compatible, distinguishable, and subordinate to the heritage-designated Plaza Hotel and integrates with the rest of the new building
- provide a more contextual expression of the façade that is more sympathetic to the Old Town context and consideration of recessed balconies
- consider a simplification of the built form, materials, scale, rhythm and window openings within the historic district and the Chinatown National Historic District to add to the coherence of the proposal
- reconsider the plaza planting design to encourage activity and animation including planting, surface treatment, seating and active program elements
- consider light and liveability of suites and mitigate possible future development impacts.

**Carried Unanimously**

**4. ADJOURNMENT**

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of February 28, 2018 was adjourned at 3:45 pm.

---

Jesse Garlick, Chair