

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

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

Present: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Elizabeth Balderston; Justin Gammon; Paul Hammond; Deborah LeFrank; Jason Niles; Stefan Schulson

Absent: Sorin Birliga; Carl-Jan Rupp

Staff Present: Jim Handy – Senior Planner
Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Katie Lauriston – Secretary
Devon Cownden – Secretary

2. MINUTES

Minutes from the Meeting held May 23, 2018

Motion:

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Deborah LeFrank, that the Minutes of the Meeting of Advisory Design Panel held May 23, 2018 be adopted as presented.

Carried Unanimously

Minutes from the Meeting held June 27, 2018

Motion:

It was moved by Paul Hammond, seconded by Jason Niles, that the Minutes of the Meeting of Advisory Design Panel held June 27, 2018 be adopted as presented.

Carried Unanimously

3. APPLICATIONS

Justin Gammon recused himself from Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00080 at 12:15 pm.

3.1 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00080 for 701 Tye Road

The City is considering a Development Permit with Variances Application for a seven-storey multi-residential building as the final phase of the Railyards development.

Applicant meeting attendees:

KAI HOTSON	STEPHANE LAROYE ARCHITECT INC. / HOTSON ARCHITECTURE
DAVID SCHELLINGERHOUDT	STEPHANE LAROYE ARCHITECT INC
MEGAN WALKER	LADR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS
BEV WINDJACK	LADR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

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

- the contrast between the design of the east and west facing building elevations
- the use of finishing materials and colours.

Mr. Hotson provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Megan Walker provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

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

- is there an active use for the roof proposed, and if not, why?
 - no; stair access to the roof would add height, which is limited in this area
 - at this time, the applicants are not seeking this option; instead, there are generous balconies and gathering spaces in the park
- is the Right of Way from the bridge maintained by the applicant?
 - yes, there is a fully maintained allowance for a future bridge or bike lane expansion agreed in the Master Development Agreement (MDA)
- is there an underlying order to the random nature of the staggered steps in the north façade?
 - the intention is to mimic a hill town, with the winding street climbing the hill
 - viewed from straight ahead, the façade presents a grid which becomes dynamic as you add perspective
- the north façade appears strictly horizontal; what vertical elements are proposed?
 - the stepping of the balconies and the blue accent panels are vertical, which will help to break up the horizontality
- what is the reasoning behind the shift in language from the original design, which had solid massing with some recesses, to the current design, in which almost every balcony is recessed?
 - the intention is for the grid to be seen as a robust shell with recessed balconies, mimicking the cut at the south end of Phase 2
 - the recessed balconies also add privacy and acoustic separation
 - the coloured punches add interest along the building and help to break up the grid
- was a different configuration of the unit above the main entrance considered to avoid privacy and noise issues?
 - the canopy below will provide additional separation
 - while unit plans are flexible at this time, more privacy would be helpful and this can be considered
- was reducing the size of the third floor patios considered to provide additional greenspace to other units?
 - this can be considered; continuing the planting would be a great asset

- what is the size of the bridge setback?
 - the Right of Way is 18.5m, and there is a 3.5m setback from there to the parking structure
- where is the parking access located?
 - there is shared access with Phase 2 from Central Spur Road
- how will the plantings on the balconies be irrigated, and how will runoff be managed?
 - there will be irrigation on the balconies, and bands will be installed to avoid water dripping from one balcony to another
- what is the slope on the pathway connection to the Galloping Goose trail?
 - some sections are around 10-11%
 - the walkway design is largely set by the existing MDA
- are there stairs in the pathway between Tyee Road and the Galloping Goose trail?
 - the section between Phase 2 and Phase 3 has a consistent 9-11% slope from Tyee Road, and there are stairs at this point
 - there is an alternate pathway around the Tot Lot with an approximate 5% slope from Central Spur Road to the Galloping Goose
- are new trees or restoration being considered for the corner of Bay Street and Tyee Road?
 - trees and shrubs are planned for the area from the intersection to the Vic West plaza
 - the design has already been approved as a part of the MDA
- what is the reasoning behind the significant difference in size between the second and third floor terraces?
 - some second floor units have parking behind them
 - to avoid going to grade, these units were pushed a little further out than those on the third floor
- how will the entrance plaza be used?
 - the Vic West plaza will be actively used as a pedestrian and bicycle entry to the site
 - Mr. Handy clarified that as a part of the MDA, a number of amenities were still required for the project including street frontage, bridge dedication, Bridges Park and the pathway connection. These features have already been approved and any changes would require Council approval
 - the applicant added that changes to the MDA would delay the project by about 6 months
- what is the width of the path connecting the Vic West plaza to the corner?
 - about 2m, surrounded with landscaping to soften the urban edge
- are there physical dividers between units on the terraces?
 - there are physical dividers in addition to the planters
- is a common amenity room included in the project?
 - no; this is not a requirement
 - many outdoor amenities are provided
- what is the main floor elevation relative to the bridge?
 - the main floor is lower than the bridge's elevation; there is a slight slope down to the front door from Tyee Road
- was a lobby or other easily accessible entry to the second level from the lower path considered? How would a resident retrieve their mail?
 - there is a route within the building, through the parkade

- were 2-level units considered to improve liveability and entrance access?
 - no, because 2-level units become quite large through the addition of stairs. Increasing unit size decreases their affordability, and affordable units are more desirable in Victoria's market
- is this site identified for a landmark building?
 - Mr. Handy noted that the Railyards Development Guidelines do not specifically identify this site as such, but that this is suggested within the larger context given the permitted densities

Panel members discussed:

- concern for the horizontal building form as the elevations wrap around to the waterfront
- the building's truncated appearance from the bridge
- opportunity to improve the unresolved corner transition at Bay Street and Tye Road
- desire for the wall facing the bridge to be treated as a more solid element
- the previously approved design's more robust structure as better anchored to the space, and better fit within the context of the existing buildings
- desire to see the concept for hilltop terracing strengthened by reinforcing the building's vertical breaks and underlying geometry
- concern for the proposal's proximity and hard face to the bridge Right of Way
- the grid-like appearance of the proposal, with many cuts and recesses
- the corrugated metal having been previously proposed in a more interesting way, which gave the project a more vertical element
- the original design's more coherent façade; preference for the original materials and colours
- appreciation for use of colour to connect with the Railyards neighbourhood feel
- lack of visual relationship to the rest of the Railyards development, particularly as viewed from the bridge
- appreciation for the building's stepping back to reveal views into the neighbourhood from the Galloping Goose trail
- the need to reconsider the choice of materials and resolve the view of the project from the Bay Street bridge with consideration to its prominent location
- opportunity to redistribute surplus terrace space at the third floor
- desire for the building form to speak to the balconies
- the balconies being compressed to accommodate landscaping
- appreciation for the well-planned pedestrian and cyclist site circulation
- opportunity to articulate the sloping path to the trail to improve its fit within the natural curves of the landscape
- opportunity to move back the landscaping at the ground floor to create more balcony room above
- the need to review the Vic West plaza design to make it public space; this could be achieved by opening up the space and ensuring the bus connection
- the need for the Vic West plaza design to better relate to the project as a whole
- challenges in seeing the proposal as a landmark building
- potential conflict between policy and the MDA in the site's identification as a landmark building
- desire to increase allowable height to accommodate landmark building designation

- desire for an accurate rendering of the view from the bridge, without the man in the red hat, to illustrate the proposal's size
- appreciation for the effort invested so far, but lacking resolution at the moment
- desire for innovative design as a nod to the closure of the Railyards development.

Motion:

It was moved by Paul Hammond, seconded by Stefan Schulson, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 00080 for 701 Tyee Road does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined, and the key areas that should be revised include:

- re-examine the east façade to express the organizational element behind the cascading proportions
- develop the southeast corner façade to help define the change in design language from the more formal, industrial proportions of the west façade
- reconsider the relationship of the second floor balcony to the main entrance
- reconsider the second floor unit design to improve tenant access
- increase the amount of greenspace on the third floor patios to visually enhance the outlook for residents
- explore the materiality of the east façade to support the architectural purpose
- reconsider the size and proportion of the balconies for liveability
- review the Vic West Plaza entrance for accessibility for cyclists and pedestrians, including access to the bus stop, to create a more welcoming space
- consider stronger alignment to the *Railyards Development Guidelines*.

Carried Unanimously

3.2 Development Permit Application No. 000528 for 430 Parry Street

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to allow a four- and five-storey residential building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

D'ARCY JONES	D'ARCY JONES ARCHITECTURE INC.
RYAN GOODMAN	ARYZE DEVELOPMENTS
LUKE MARI	ARYZE DEVELOPMENTS
CHI-LING CHENG	ARYZE DEVELOPMENTS
BIANCA BODLEY	BIOPHILIA DESIGN COLLECTIVE LTD.
KATIE NIKOTA	BIOPHILIA DESIGN COLLECTIVE 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 general fit of the building in terms of its height and massing relative to adjacent properties
- the division of the building massing as an approach to increase light access to adjacent properties
- the design of the ground floor unit entrances in terms of being strong entry features and a transition from the public to the private realm.

Mr. Jones provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Ms. Bodley provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

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

- how do residents exit the building?
 - two units have entrances on the ground floor; all other units go through one of the two sets of stairs by the elevator
- were any shading measures considered for the west façade, to mitigate the amount of glazing?
 - trees will be planted to filter the light to the building
 - the window size is also reduced above the tree height
- what are the exterior elevator materials?
 - exposed concrete, to provide a grain and texture
- what is the view of the proposal from the church parking lot?
 - the church would see about the right third of the north west façade
 - the church appreciates the shade being cast on their property
- why does the brick not extend to the rear lot line?
 - the wrought iron fence allows light through
- what was the process behind removing the previously proposed curved entry?
 - the curve was in conflict with having three distinct entryways plus the garage entrance, and a lesser curve did not work
- is it correct that the fourth floor bedrooms exit to a shared walkway?
 - this is an egress route rather than a typical entryway; these units' main entrances are on the third level
- are the eastern roof decks accessible through the roof hatches?
 - yes; the greenery provides internal privacy between the fifth floor roof decks
- what is the impact on the southernmost unit of 440 Parry Street?
 - the proposal's massing matches up with the adjacent building's overhang
 - although there will be shadowing later in the day, there will not be any mid-day
- where are the proposed six black bamboo located?
 - in a planter running parallel with the fence, at the southwestern end of the parking level
 - the in-ground concrete planter is 18" x 18"
- what are the proposed tree heights in the courtyard?
 - the centre Japanese Maple will reach up to 15' tall
 - the other plantings are accurately rendered at around 12' - 15' tall
- will the Japanese Maple be planted as a mature tree?
 - it will be planted when it is already mature, so that it is at or near the desired height
 - the tree will be taller than residents as they walk in the courtyard
- what materials are proposed at the front entrance?
 - a wooden door and frame will soften the light from above
 - the concrete around the parking entrance is roughed up for patina
- how will plants at the north end of the driveway survive without a similar cut out above?
 - this area will have shade-tolerant plants
- what is proposed for the garage door?
 - it will be a high-quality, grey perforated custom door, similar to the perforated screens above

- if necessary in the future, could the north cut out facing the duplexes be filled in?
 - this would be possible; material could be attached to the brick and this would not diminish the units' liveability.

Panel members discussed:

- recognition as an excellent example of urban infill
- concern for the invasiveness of the proposed bamboo
- desire to review the proposed Japanese Maple, as its size will not give the desired lushness to the central area
- appreciation for the somewhat unusual entry
- concern for visitor wayfinding with no house numbers at the street level, especially for the main residential entrance
- CPTED concerns with the long, dark, enclosed entrance design and recessed vehicle entry
- concern for unwelcoming nature of the metal grate door
- the proposal's industrial feel
- appreciation for the animation brought to the street
- appreciation for the inventive solution to circulation within the building
- the proposal's conceptual strength and rigour in design
- clear expression of character at the street level
- recognition for the proposal's success in maximizing the site and creating a gem
- the proposal as elegant, respectful and innovative.

Motion:

It was moved by Stefan Schulson, seconded by Jesse Garlick, that Development Permit Application No. 00528 for 430 Parry Street be approved as presented.

Carried Unanimously

4. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of July 25, 2018 was adjourned at 2:45 pm.

Jesse Garlick, Chair