

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY JANUARY 24, 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: Paul Hammond

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

2. MINUTES

Minutes from the Meeting held November 29, 2017

Motion:

It was moved by Sorin Birliga, seconded by Elizabeth Balderston, that the Minutes of the Meeting of Advisory Design Panel held November 29, 2017 be adopted as presented.

Carried Unanimously

3. APPLICATIONS

3.1 Rezoning Application No. 00599 and Development Permit Application No. 000507 for 2910 Shelbourne Street

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to allow for the development of a six-unit townhouse within one building on a vacant triangular property.

Applicant meeting attendees:

LUKE MARI
D'ARCY JONES
BIANCA BODLEY

ARYZE DEVELOPMENTS INC.
D'ARCY JONES ARCHITECTURE INC.
BIOPHELIA DESIGN COLLECTIVE

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

- street relationship
- east and south setbacks
- north façade.

D'Arcy Jones 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:

- is the parking area paving permeable?
 - both the parking and articulation of entry porches will be cobbled, and the tumbled pavers will add texture
- will there be extensive landscaping on the roof decks?
 - there will be planters to the south; but landscaping signs of life on roof decks will be personal
 - the townhouses will have individual front doors and outdoor space
- how will privacy be experienced between neighbours at the rooftop level?
 - 5ft parapet separating units
- what was the intent behind sinking the building?
 - overlook concerns for the neighbours to the south, and the sightlines from the townhouse kitchens towards neighbours
- What might the transit corridor look like?
 - likely multi-modal; an active pathway of some kind to preserve the trees
- what is the materiality of the walls?
 - cement stucco with fibreglass in an earthy-bleachy colour, with charcoal around the windows
- what materials are used for the soffit?
 - stucco on DensGlass
- was there any exploration into opportunities to add a covered deck or more detailing on the roof decks? Is there a height issue preventing this?
 - although the proposal is still lower than adjacent townhouses, the height is very close to the maximum allowed at 3 storeys
 - there is no intent to add extra height or interpretation; the roof decks can be thought of as yards on the roof
- is the entrance door for the western unit obstructed by vehicle parking?
 - Yes, the vehicle will park in the carport, between the unit wall and the wood fence to the right
- why is the exterior stair for the western unit placed differently than for the other units?
 - with so many other neighbouring houses, the deck would put too much architecture in the corner
- the proposed roof deck access is through a hatch; why not use a vertical door?
 - the proposal eliminates excess architecture and height
 - a piston-assisted lift on the door ensures it is quite light, and still manageable while holding a plate of food or a child's hand
 - lower elevation avoids neighbours seeing the presence of roof decks
- what is the intent behind having small windows?
 - windows should be quite small in a traditional residential neighbourhood, and the proposal has a balance of furnishable rooms
 - there are large windows facing Shelbourne, and the sightlines to the west let a lot of light in
 - the floor to ceiling bedroom windows are 3ft wide, but could be made larger
- were finishes other than stucco considered?

- upkeep for shingles makes them impossible, and hardie shingles are not authentic enough
- the applicant also considered masonry stucco, but wanted to keep to the taupe earthy tones
- intent to fit into eclectic neighbourhood, where most houses are not too high-tech
- how well can vehicles get in and out with the proposed parking layout, particularly for the western unit?
 - a 180° turn is necessary for the western unit
 - the layout meets bylaws and is no tighter than in parking lots
- what is the surface material on the south property line?
 - densely planted garden with mulch
- had the applicant considered adding windows to the north elevation while using an opaque material or articulating mass without overlook?
 - film over the windows could be very successful; this could be offered as an option to owners
- was a higher, horizontal window considered on the north façade to break up the massing?
 - neighbours would be able to see into private zones
- is there access to the southern wedge of property?
 - everyone can claim their own yard space
 - a gate could be placed to the south facing Shelbourne for added security, but the design intent was to have few encumbrances on the pedestrian experience
- why not rezone the property?
 - Mr. Angrove noted that generally proposals aim to fit within existing zones when possible and apply for variances as needed
- are there primarily single family homes in area?
 - yes, although there is an RK-3 Zone directly to the north. The applicant initially met the setbacks but not the storeys for the RK-3 Zone
- is there a fall risk for children climbing onto parapet?
 - the parapets are designed to be very slippery and unclimbable
- how are the garage doors expressed?
 - they are as neutral as possible, with a wood accent on the doors
 - very discreet, a non-feature, in the same colour as the window panels
- what is the rationale for having six units?
 - the sixth unit lowers the average price of the units

Panel members discussed:

- the roof decks are an asset, providing infrastructure and added living space
- potential to provide weather protection with a pergola or canopy, which could bring an accent to the top
- structures could be added to the roof decks with no impact on the street view, and would be a significant improvement for residents
- the proposal does not meet the street in a typical way
- the proposal is an elegant solution in a challenging lot
- the plaza is an active space, not just a parking plaza
- the proposal could be more open with strong doorways
- appreciation for the change in paving texture

- the garbage area is a big concern for the streetscape; this behaviour could be brought out to the front instead of having blank fence
- the setback is considerable and provides a meaningful buffer
- neighbours must be considered
- the front (east setback) encroaches very close to the future transit right-of-way; all landscaping will be gone when transit right-of-way is implemented and there will no longer be space to soften the face
- the whole east setback may be needed to plant a tree, which could only be achieved by cutting out the entire first unit
- the desirability of having a building right up against the corridor on a transit-oriented streetscape, especially a blank wall without landscaping
- feasibility of the right-of-way, and whether surrounding buildings allow for the right-of-way
- the transit right-of-way is not a large concern at the moment, and future development would also have to respond to this as a starting point
- the need to plan responsibly for the future and take into account the transit right-of-way
- whether Shelbourne Street corridor is improved by this proposal
- the proposal encroaches quite a bit into the south setback and future development in those lots is difficult to foresee
- the north facade has considerable massing and may not be seen in person as it is presented in rendering
- the windows on the north façade are fairly narrow and the overlook is minimal
- difficulties with the materiality of stucco, as seen in other projects in Victoria; appreciation for the parapet flashing to prevent runoff
- concern that the parking design may be too difficult to achieve
- 5 residences instead of 6 could be more realistic
- western unit complicates vehicle circulation, which could be dangerous with small children in the courtyard; however, this may positively discourage car use
- appreciation for having six families living in such close proximity
- difficult parking may be better than no parking at all
- possibility of removing one parking space, acknowledging that at least one family will not have a vehicle.

Motion:

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Jason Niles, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Rezoning Application No. 00599 and Development Permit Application No. 000507 for 2910 Shelbourne Street be approved with the following recommendations:

- Explore increased fenestration on the north elevation
- Explore opportunities for weather protection, shading and access for the rooftop patio
- Submit a vehicle movement report for further consideration of access to the west unit's parking stall
- That the transit corridor right-of-way be developed in consultation with the property owner.

Carried

For: Jesse Garlick, Elizabeth Balderston, Sorin Birliga, Justin Gammon, and
Jason Niles
Against: Deborah LeFrank, Carl-Jan Rupp and Stefan Schulson

4. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of January 24, 2018 was adjourned at 2:55 pm.

Jesse Garlick, Chair