

**MINUTES OF THE  
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY MAY 23, 2018**

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

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

**Absent:** Justin Gammon

**Absent for a  
Portion of the Meeting:** Elizabeth Balderston; Deborah LeFrank

**Staff Present:** Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design  
Moira Wilson – Senior Planner, Urban Design  
Alec Johnston – Senior Planner  
Leanne Taylor – Senior Planner  
Katie Lauriston – Secretary

**2. MINUTES**

**Minutes from the Meeting held April 11, 2018**

**Motion:**

It was moved by Elizabeth Balderston, seconded by Stefan Schulson, that the Minutes of the Meeting of Advisory Design Panel held April 11, 2018 be adopted as presented.

**Carried Unanimously**

**3. APPLICATIONS**

**3.1 Rezoning Application No. 00621 for 819-823, 825 and 827 Fort Street**

The City is considering a Rezoning and Heritage Alteration Permit with Variance Application for a 10-storey mixed-use development containing approximately 98 rental units and ground floor commercial at a density of 5.99 floor space ratio.

Mr. Johnston noted the following corrections to the staff report:

- the proposal is for a **10-storey** development with rooftop mechanical room above
- the development would contain approximately **98** units
- parking stalls would be distributed between **2** levels of underground parking
- the majority of street-facing units do **not** have private balconies.

Applicant meeting attendees:

RENANTE SOLIVAR	MUSSON CATTELL MACKEY PARTNERSHIP
SYDNEY SCHWARTZ	MUSSON CATTELL MACKEY PARTNERSHIP
KRISTINE LIU	THE SALIENT GROUP
ROBERT FUNG	THE SALIENT GROUP
JULIAN PATTISON	CONSIDERED DESIGN
LARRY CECCO	ARCATA / STELLER ARCHITECTURE
EDDIE WILLIAMS	ARCATA / STELLER ARCHITECTURE
PATRICK SCHILLING	PARC RETIREMENT LIVING

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 height
- privacy and livability
- integration with the Fort Street corridor.

Ms. Schwartz provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Julian Pattison provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

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

- why is there no development permit application associated with the rezoning?
  - Mr. Johnston clarified that the development permit component would be included in the concurrent Heritage Alteration Permit application
- what structural maintenance is proposed for the Fort Street façades?
  - the application includes two types of buildings; 825 Fort Street is a heritage-designated poured-in place concrete building. The windows will be refurbished and the storefronts will be restored
  - 821 Fort Street is a 2-storey stick frame building; its façade will be retained and will be heritage-designated for its importance to the streetscape
  - both storefronts will be partially or entirely rebuilt, and the historical configurations will be integrated into the new, concrete building
- will the heritage buildings affect the new buildings' structure at the ground level?
  - the heritage-designated buildings will have only their façades retained
  - the height of the first three storeys is driven by the 10 ft. ceiling heights of the heritage façades
- were light and liveability concerns considered with the proposal's long, narrow units?
  - the retention of the heritage façades drives the proposal's design
  - the proposal includes units that are liveable but not massive, and some units have over height ceilings
- how will light enter into the rear of the two-bedroom units? Do the bedrooms have windows?
  - the sliding glass doors in the front of the suites provide ample light for the entire suite
  - units that are high enough will have transom windows
- is there an ability to share parking access with Broughton Street?
  - Mr. Johnston noted that staff have encouraged the applicant to explore this option, but that it was not deemed feasible

- what is proposed on the heritage buildings' roofs?
  - a common amenity space with dog run on the 2-storey building, and private decks for adjacent suites on the 3-storey building's roof
- why are the proposed setbacks required for the balcony projections on the south and west sides?
  - the setbacks for the balconies create more usable space for the units, but also improve the articulation and termination of the building
- what is proposed for the top level roof, and was this space considered for additional outdoor space?
  - using this space as further amenity space was considered, but the applicants felt that it would be best used if adjacent to a room
  - further rooms were not allowed at this level without exceeding the Downtown Core Area Plan (DCAP)
- was a green roof on top of the building considered, even if it were not accessible?
  - this has not been explored
- are the applicants still in discussion about the potential for a pocket park on Fort Street?
  - yes, this is still in discussion.

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the effort invested into the design
- desire for the inclusion of colour renderings in the submission
- potential for liveability concerns for the west side balconies, depending on what is constructed on the adjacent site
- whether carrying through the lower podium layout to the floors above is successful
- light and liveability concerns for some units
- opportunity for a modern, contemporary insertion to alleviate liveability concerns associated with long, dark units
- recognition of the success in catching borrowed light into the buried bedrooms on the second and third floors
- opportunity to redistribute massing and add daylighting to the upper levels
- the need to consider the detailing of the interiors and building massing to increase livability
- potential to increase the rear setback, especially with floor-to-ceiling windows proposed 3m from the property line
- no issues with the setback on the podium level
- appreciation for the preservation of the two façades
- questioning the contemporary expression of the addition to the 2-storey heritage building
- the integration of the heritage building being designated within the overall project
- the overall balance of composition while emulating growth over time
- appreciation for use of space in the lower level as amenity space; however, the amenity space seems small relative to the size of the project
- overall support for the proposed height; increased height would be supportable if it resulted in increased livability
- appreciation for the use of glass at street level
- desire for a less heavy, more residential material than the proposed brick
- need to refine aspects of the materiality, especially the terra cotta colour, to increase cohesion between the three distinct components

- caution against replicating the heritage materials in the new additions
- opportunity for modern, contemporary insertion to alleviate light and liveability concerns in deep units
- opportunity to green the top roof, even if not accessible
- desire to better integrate the mid-block crosswalk with the proposal
- concern for safety with the location of the parklet and underground parking entrance at the mid-block crosswalk
- the importance of maintaining the diversity of character of the street
- the proposal's successful fit within the context.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Paul Hammond, seconded by Stefan Schulson, that Rezoning Application No. 00621 for 819-823, 825 and 827 Fort Street be approved with the following considerations:

- improve suite livability and access to daylight
- develop the side elevations with more coherent articulation of materials and patterns relating better to the north and south façades to create a more cohesive whole
- reconsider the materials on the northeast façade to increase cohesion.

**Carried**

For: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Elizabeth Balderston; Paul Hammond; Deborah LeFrank; Jason Niles; Stefan Schulson  
Against: Sorin Birliga, Carl-Jan Rupp

**3.2 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00071 for 1046 - 1048 North Park Street**

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit with Variance Application to construct a four-story rest home consisting of approximately 34 rooms.

Applicant meeting attendees:

SHARI KHADEM	ARCATA / STELLER ARCHITECTURE
MELISSA BRUNNER	MI VENTURES INC.
RAY CHUCK	MI VENTURES INC. / NORWOOD ISLAND HOLDINGS LTD.

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

- application of building materials.

Mr. Chuck provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

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

- which parts of the building will be finished in stucco?
  - the middle section on the south elevation, the white finish on the north elevation and the grey and white portions on the west elevation

- the proposed elevator placement creates a recess on the exterior; can the elevator be moved flush with the wall?
  - this was the initial design, but the proposed elevator recess was designed to create a shadow line on the east elevation
- how much of the east wall will be covered by the adjacent building?
  - the whole first floor will be concealed
- how far back does the brick veneer extend on the east elevation?
  - there is a 2ft return for the front corner on the concrete base
- how many parking spaces are included?
  - 4 parking spaces for staff
- how do vehicles circulate within the parking area?
  - there is space to back out within the parking area
- would it be possible to incorporate heating elements in the shady outdoor amenity space on the north side?
  - heat elements could be considered
- might any residents have mobility issues?
  - currently a couple residents use walkers
- was access to the upper floors considered?
  - no, due to the safety concerns associated with unsupervised balconies
- is the arts and crafts area shared among all residents?
  - yes
- the route from the bedrooms to the washrooms goes through the common rooms at the south corner; were privacy concerns considered?
  - the space could be more semi-private, as the northern media rooms present more common space
- could the elevator be pushed into the hallway?
  - initially the elevator was flush with the east wall, but it was pushed in to add interest and shadowing
  - parking space would be lost if the elevator were moved towards the centre of the building
- what are the materials on the west elevation?
  - grey aluminum panels and white stucco, with gray stucco and longboard aluminum panel to give a wooden look
- is the stucco on the west elevation the same texture, with different colours?
  - yes
- what is the design rationale for the number of materials and the square panels on the east elevation?
  - this was to avoid having all white across the east wall
- why not use the full zero lot line at the front entrance?
  - this was requested by the Planning department
  - Ms. Taylor noted that this space allows an opportunity to add greenery and to soften the entrance at this location, and also provides relief from the narrow sidewalk and surrounding buildings located at the zero lot line
- there are accessible washrooms provided; have the corridors and doors also been reviewed for accessibility?
  - yes
- is the north wing an accessible zone?
  - yes
- will there be an automatic door from the dining room to the outdoor area?
  - likely, yes

- is there grass proposed for the back yard?
  - yes
- are the doors separating the common area and hallway required by the fire code?
  - yes
- can the doors be held open?
  - yes
- why is the driveway gate set far back from the sidewalk?
  - this is the Engineering department's requirement for vehicular movement
- is the front office staffed at all times?
  - yes, twenty-four hours a day.

Panel members discussed:

- the building massing fitting in well with the context
- appreciation for a good infill project
- opportunity for increased privacy for washroom access from the rooms
- desire to see the elevator moved to be flush with the east wall
- opportunity to explore alternative ways to break up the east façade
- opportunity to improve the materials application on the east façade
- questioning the durability of stucco, while recognizing its cost efficiency and ability to create articulation
- desire for a streamlined material palette, perhaps through a reduction in the number of colours of stucco
- appreciation for material selection and placement
- opportunity to replace the asphalt with concrete for the parking area
- the great amount of space required for few parking stalls
- desire to move parking gate closer to the sidewalk
- crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) concerns with the proposed alcoves off the street near the front entry combined with the low level of street activity at night
- the need for plant irrigation at the doorway
- the importance of integrating the front canopy with the rest of the project
- accessibility concerns for the unit pavers set into the lawn, as the width and uneven terrain would be challenging for people using walkers or wheelchairs
- need to improve safety and comfort of outdoor spaces to draw people outside
- the need to redesign the proposed landscape elements to prioritize accessibility
- questioning the use of grass in terms of maintenance
- desire to see the garden integrated with the covered area.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Jesse Garlick, seconded by Sorin Birliga, that the Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00071 for 1046 - 1048 North Park Street be approved with the following recommendations:

- reconsider the placement of the southeast corner pedestrian gate with respect to CPTED principles
- review the accessibility of the outdoor space, specifically in the rear yard, from a safety and comfort perspective
- consider refining the materials palette for consistency and cohesion
- consider removing the elevator notch on the eastern façade.

**Carried Unanimously**

### 3.3 Development Permit Application No. 000508 for 926 - 932 Pandora Avenue

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to allow a ten-storey, mixed-use building with ground floor commercial and residential above.

Applicant meeting attendees:

CURTIS KNICHEL	HDR / CEI ARCHITECTURE ASSOCIATES, INC.
MEGAN WALKER	LADR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS
CARLY ABRAHAM	KANG AND GILL CONSTRUCTION LTD.

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

- overall massing and building bulk
- ninth and tenth storey balconies and clearance to side property lines
- application of building materials.

Ms. Abraham provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal and Meghan Walker 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 for not having green roofs at the southwest corner of the second floor?
  - desire to avoid having personal items cluttering the street view
  - it would be possible to green the roofs
- what is the inspiration behind the panel pattern?
  - spires were considered, but in the end greenery was the design inspiration
- what is the material of the perforated screens?
  - pre-finished metal cladding
- what is the rationale for the location of the garbage/recycling collection?
  - the proposed location results from lengthy discussions with City staff
  - a waste management service provider has advised that picking up off of Pandora Avenue would not be an issue as long as the paving surface was smooth
  - the only other option would be in the courtyard with access from Mason Street, but this would be more disruptive to residents
- why is the proposed landscaped island not closer to the crosswalk?
  - this could be moved
- were noise and vibration concerns considered with the proposed garbage bay location next to the lobby?
  - the proposed location is a secondary entrance point
  - these services are disruptive no matter what, but will be most disruptive to the townhouse residents if placed by the primary residential entry at Mason Street
- how will the amenity space on the first level be programmed?
  - the outdoor and tenant space will be used for social gatherings and tenants' parties
- what is the rationale for the main entrance not being visible from the sidewalk?
  - the applicants have done similar projects before and have found it difficult to situate the elevator lobbies at the best point in the building

- placing the main lobby off Pandora Avenue was explored, but the vehicular access location and the noise and grit of Pandora Avenue drove the decision to make the entry off of Mason Street
- the entrance is not as visible from Mason Street, but entering through the courtyard is nicer, the canopy provides a visual marker and there is a very nice feel along Mason Street
- do the townhouses only have windows towards Mason Street?
  - yes; although the two western units have an opportunity for windows at the rear, these would face neighbours
  - the interior layout supports the proposed window placement
- would glazed windows be possible for the inbound townhouse bedrooms?
  - this can be considered, but would have to respect the fire code and work around the L-shaped tower
- how is the tenth floor roof deck separated from the adjacent unit's bedroom?
  - there is glazing situated at the northwestern corner of the unit and the hedge planting also helps with privacy
  - sound insulation could also be improved for this corner
- what is the reason for the change in the ground level canopy colour on the Pandora Street elevation?
  - the initial design had a break at this location
  - the change helps define the lower commercial floor, but the colour could be made contiguous
- do the top balconies have any canopy above, or are they exposed?
  - at the moment they are exposed, although it would be desirable to extend the glass canopy
- were live-work opportunities with Mason Street explored?
  - the primary focus of the mix of unit types is to attract families, but live-work opportunities could also be explored
- is there a bathroom for the tenth floor amenity patio?
  - this could be added inside beside the storage area
- are the townhouse patios on Mason Street at street level?
  - Mason Street is sloped, so some patios are at street level
- is there opportunity for a green roof adjacent to the sixth and seventh floor patios?
  - this is a possibility
- were the materials purposely selected to create a muted palette?
  - the proposed materials evolved from many samples; the lighter colours in the lower floors complement the nearby churches and the bluish tones echo the lighter blue spandrel panel
- was an independent CPTED analysis completed? In particular, were the benches in the landscape plans included in a CPTED analysis?
  - no independent review was completed
  - there is sufficient light and enough eyes on the street to mitigate security concerns
- have the proposed benches been approved by the City?
  - no, this is just at a conceptual stage at the moment
- will the landscaped island be maintained by the developer?
  - this has not yet been discussed with the City
- what is the rationale for the paving pattern in the driveway from Mason Street?
  - the pattern highlights the main point of entry.

*Deborah LeFrank left the meeting at 3:00pm.*



Panel members discussed:

- recognition of the importance of the site in setting the tone for the area
- the proposal's scale in relation to its current surroundings and the need to consider future development and guidelines
- opportunity to improve the building's mass and functionality by adding a balcony on the top level
- appreciation for the building's shifts in the ground floor aligning with potential adjacent open spaces
- the successful integration of the townhouses and the creation of a street wall
- potential concern for privacy, ventilation and light with windowless bedrooms in the townhouse units
- opportunity to create some detachment of the townhouses for distance, to create a more exciting volume and provide light
- appreciation for the townhouse concept and materiality
- need to refine the second floor canopy to avoid an arbitrary change in colours
- need to break up the continuous glass railing at the top of the building
- concern for the reflectivity of the building overall; the opportunity to add materials to reduce the shininess
- need to reconsider the spandrel glass cladding
- recognition of the proposal's overall success in addressing the large mass
- potential to create an amenity space in the courtyard off of Mason Street

*Elizabeth Balderston left the meeting at 3:20pm.*

- concern for the functionality of the garbage and recycling removal route
- the necessity of improvements to the public realm
- concern for the liveability of the western units labelled "2 bedroom A" on all floors above the second, if an adjacent building is constructed near the property line
- the need to focus on the pedestrian experience
- concern for the cold, hostile pedestrian streetscape and entrance at Pandora Avenue
- appreciation for the glazing at the ground level on Pandora Avenue
- opportunity to make a statement with the entry canopies and resolve the entryways
- lack of visual clarity for main entry off Mason Street
- opportunity to benefit the future street wall through recessed balconies or by revealing greenspace.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Sorin Birliga, seconded by Stefan Schulson, that the Development Permit Application No. 000508 for 926 - 932 Pandora Avenue be approved:

1. subject to the following recommendations:
  - a) introduce non-reflective materials in lieu of spandrel panels;
  - b) revise the 9<sup>th</sup> floor continuous balcony;
  - c) refine both Pandora Avenue and Mason Street streetscapes and entrances; and
2. with consideration to the following recommendations:
  - a) reconfigure the garbage and recycling removal route;

- b) consider adding windows to the townhouse bedrooms;
- c) review the design of the amenity spaces to improve functionality, privacy and serviceability; and
- d) consider the Panel's comments as captured within the meeting minutes.

**Carried**

For: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Sorin Birliga; Paul Hammond; Carl-Jan Rupp;  
Stefan Schulson  
Against: Jason Niles

#### **4. ADJOURNMENT**

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of May 23, 2018 was adjourned at 3:45 pm.

---

Jesse Garlick, Chair