

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

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

Present: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Elizabeth Balderston; Sorin Birliga; Jason Niles; Stefan Schulson

Absent for a Portion of the Meeting: Justin Gammon; Paul Hammond; Carl-Jan Rupp; Deborah LeFrank

Staff Present: Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Leanne Taylor – Senior Planner
Jim Handy – Senior Planner, Development Agreements
Alec Johnston – Senior Planner
Katie Lauriston – Secretary

2. MINUTES

Minutes from the Meeting held October 24, 2018

Motion:

It was moved by Paul Hammond, seconded by Carl-Jan Rupp, that the Minutes of the Meeting of Advisory Design Panel held October 24, 2018 be adopted as presented.

Carried Unanimously

3. APPLICATIONS

3.1 Development Permit Application No. 000521 for 919 and 923 Caledonia Avenue

The City is considering a Rezoning, Heritage Designation and Development Permit Application to restore and heritage-designate the existing single-family dwelling, as well as construct a new two-storey building and four-storey multi-family residential building consisting of approximately 19 rental dwelling units.

Applicant meeting attendees:

PETER HARDCASTLE

HILLEL ARCHITECTURE INC.

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

- infill development
- massing of the low-rise multi-family residential building
- balconies on the east elevation.

Mr. Hardcastle 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:

- what feedback has there been from immediate neighbours?
 - there has been a positive response from the neighbours across the street
 - an earlier version of the plans was presented to the adjacent neighbours, and the proposal now has much better sightlines, which will benefit neighbours
 - as this is an urban setting, the site could have been developed to a higher density; instead, the proposal is a thoughtful and respectful contribution to the neighbourhood
- do the neighbours have any concern regarding the size and potential overlook?
 - the neighbours aren't directly supportive in this regard
- what is proposed for the existing trees on the east property line?
 - the construction of the foundation will compromise the existing hedge, but it will be replaced
 - there is no walkway on that side; it is a fully landscaped edge
- are the existing trees on the subject property or on the adjacent property?
 - they are on the adjacent property, and will be protected as much as possible
- what about the trees beside the adjacent heritage house?
 - this is the hedge that will be replaced
- is there any landscaping proposed at the railing located at the entrance of the parkade?
 - the railing design will be contemporary in nature, with the same obscure glass as is used for the balconies
 - at the edge of the property, an opaque wooden fence provides separation towards the adjacent parking lot
- is the opaque glass only at the top of the parkade entrance?
 - the glass railing forms an L-shape along the parkade entrance, and the wooden fence faces the neighbours
- how will the recessed planters be watered during the winter?
 - the planters are recessed about 400mm into the building, and the irrigation will run through the building so it will not need to be winterized
- what is the rationale behind the location of the sidewalk?
 - the sidewalk curves to accommodate the Statutory Right-of-Way, and eventually will run straight at a greater distance from the street
- what is the rationale behind the boxy roofline on the new home's front porch?
 - each of the surrounding buildings is subtly different in detail
 - the new building is intended to come across as new, while referencing the context and surrounding heritage homes
 - the roof's simple gable makes it distinct and purposely contemporary
- what is the distance between the new 2-storey building and the existing 2-storey building?
 - approximately 3.2-3.6m and 3.6-3.8m at the rear, towards the multi-family building

- what is the separation distance between the multi-family building and the existing adjacent buildings to the south and to the east? Was there consideration for liveability and privacy?
 - there is a 3m setback at the rear and glazing on the multi-family dwelling to mitigate privacy concerns
 - there is approximately 8m between the neighbouring dwellings and the multi-family dwelling at the courtyard
 - there is a similar distance of approximately 5-6m towards the neighbouring heritage building
- does the apartment exit comply with fire code, given the minimal pathway width?
 - fire distances and materials have been examined, and the materials are non-combustible
 - a building code compliant sprinklering system has been developed to protect the heritage house's bay window
- was increasing the performance of the glazing considered, given the potential for privacy and noise issues near the walkways?
 - there will not be a change in glazing on the existing building, and the new building has no glazing on one side and a good separation distance and height from the walkway.

Panel members discussed:

- the importance of retaining the trees along the east property line and the large deciduous tree on the adjacent property at the south
- opportunity to alter the underground parking structure to ensure the retention of existing trees
- there being significant benefits to the proposal as presented, and reluctance to require architectural alterations to ensure the retention of the existing trees
- the need for a tree retention plan
- the need to ensure sufficient soil depth for the proposed trees and all other planting
- appreciation for the sensitivity shown to the surrounding context, and for the care and attention to moving and supporting the existing house
- the proposal as an example of sensitive infill
- the community's desire for projects that are not built to the maximum allowable floor space ratio
- desire for further measures to mitigate the harshness of the street
- opportunity to review the peak roof on the multi-family dwelling, as a flat roof would better provide a contemporary addition, contribute to the building's massing and be more sensitive to the context
- appreciation for the materials selection.

Motion:

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Deborah LeFrank, that Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000521 for 919 and 923 Caledonia Avenue be approved with the following changes:

- that measures be taken to ensure that the existing trees to the south are protected as much as possible
- that adequate soil depth is ensured for the new planting as shown.

Carried

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

Opposed: Paul Hammond and Jason Niles

3.2 Development Permit Application No. 000525 for 90 Saghalie Road

The City is considering a Development Permit Application to construct a five-storey seniors' residential facility comprising a mix of independent living units, assisted living units and accessory facilities.

Applicant meeting attendees:

BARRY WEIH	WENSLEY ARCHITECTURE LTD.
DAVID ECHAIZ-MCGRATH	BARRY WEIH ARCHITECTURE LTD.

This application was previously reviewed by the Advisory Design Panel on May 9, 2018, and Committee of the Whole moved on August 2, 2018 that the revised proposal be referred back to the Panel.

Mr. Handy provided the Panel with a brief description of the revisions to the proposal and the areas that Council is seeking advice, including:

- the site's topography
- terracing of the upper storeys.

Mr. Weih 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:

- are the units all for independent living, or is assisted living also provided?
 - there will be 34 complex care beds and about 130 other residences
 - the facility would provide recreation, meals and assistance to residents
- is the building's construction flexible to allow for the required care needs?
 - yes; residents will be able to age in place
- what is the texture for the ground level planters?
 - the planters will be lightly sandblasted for a smooth texture
- was a rock material considered for the concrete columns along the north façade, for more natural materials?
 - no, this was not considered
- what are the lighter and darker materials on the roof?
 - the roof will have two tones of gravel as well as a green roof component
- is unit 21 on the fifth floor a private unit or a common amenity space?
 - this will be a private unit, but the interior layout still needs refinement
- the pedestrian pathway at the north is labelled as a public walkway, but has three flights of stairs. What is the difference in elevation along the pathway?
 - there are about 20 stairs, with an increase in elevation of about 6m from Tyee Road and another 2m increase at the other end
- if the pathway is a dedicated public right-of-way, is there no requirement for accessibility?
 - Mr. Handy confirmed that this is not a requirement

- the plans show a chain link fence separating the boulevard from the E&N Railway; is this the intended fence material?
 - no, the intent is for the fence material to match the building
 - there will also be landscaping along the fence
- is the green roof meant to be accessible?
 - no, it is not.

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the applicants' response to Council and Panel comments
- the proposal's effective unification of the podium level, stepping back of the top floor and elimination of the overhang
- appreciation for the proposal's response to concerns for the service entry
- the need for a building with a landmark feel at this important corner, and the proposal's success in achieving this
- appreciation for the site-specific design response, although opportunities still exist to introduce further curvature along the roofline
- opportunity for the proposal to be more dramatic and even more site-specific
- opportunity to improve the rectangular edges of the mechanical structure on the green roof, for the benefit of the taller surrounding buildings
- the improvement of the design of the north side of the building
- the proposal's success in outwardly expressing the building's programming
- the subtlety of how the building meets the ground.

Motion:

It was moved by Deborah LeFrank, seconded by Jason Niles, that Development Permit Application No. 000525 for 90 Saghalie Road be approved as presented.

Carried Unanimously

The Panel recessed at 1:40pm, and reconvened at 2:00pm.

Paul Hammond recused himself from Development Permit with Variances No. 00060 for 1811 Oak Bay Avenue.

3.3 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00060 for 1811 Oak Bay Avenue

The City is considering a Development Permit with Variances Application to construct a five-storey building containing approximately 15 dwelling units at a density of 1.6:1 floor space ratio (FSR).

Applicant meeting attendees:

CHRIS ROWE

LOW HAMMOND ROWE ARCHITECTS INC.

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

- exterior access
- the proposal's relationship to adjacent properties.

Mr. Rowe 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:

- is this a wood frame building?
 - yes
- what is the rationale behind the cladding palette?
 - the applicants began with an arrangement for a base, middle and top
 - the brick adds solidity in the base and complements the brick paving and concrete on the ground plane
 - the stucco above is lightweight and does not look too heavy
 - the green accents lighten the mood on the west façade
 - the durable copper screening adds texture to what is otherwise a small, economically-built apartment building
- were the screens initially proposed as wood?
 - yes, however wood was rejected due to fire code
- what is the size of the screen perforations?
 - they will be as illustrated on the plans, and have been scaled down for the materials board
- where is the wood cladding proposed?
 - this cladding is used as a liner for the pocket balconies, and as one of the exterior claddings
- is there a planted boulevard the whole way along the street?
 - Mr. Johnston clarified that the Statutory Right-of-Way was a requirement for the site, and the sidewalk's location provides space for wider planting and future plans for the roadway
- what is the height of the overhang above the sidewalk?
 - it is 9ft tall at the shortest point, as required by the City
- is the planter separating the sidewalk from the units along Oak Bay Avenue intended as privacy screening?
 - the planter's total width is just over 2ft., leaving about 18" of very deep planting space
 - the proposed planting includes ferns and salal, and is intended to be evergreen and lush without blocking light to the units
- was commercial space considered at the ground level?
 - Mr. Johnston clarified that commercial uses are not permitted within the current zoning, and the application does not include rezoning the site
 - the applicants noted that the site will be entirely residential
- what is the location of the windows within the rooms?
 - the windows have a low sill and extend to the ceiling
 - the interior configuration is still being resolved, particularly at the south elevation
- the level 3 floor plan shows a full window in the bedroom and kitchen; is this correct?
 - this may be a coordination error; the large windows are intended for either living spaces or bedrooms
 - the small windows' locations may shift
- were smaller windows considered for the south-facing windows overlooking neighbours?
 - the adjacent house has no windows on its north side, and the proposal overlooks only the neighbour's roof

- there are no privacy issues for the first three floors, and the upper floors step back
 - it is the nature of corridor development that there will be some overlook
- has any energy modelling been completed?
 - no energy modelling has yet been completed, but the proposal will be constructed to a built-green standard
- is offsetting the energy gains through the south- and east-facing windows anticipated?
 - any need for offsetting will emerge from energy modelling that has yet to be completed
- will any changes be made to the exterior of the building, or would energy offsetting simply be done through the installation of blinds?
 - the building's massing would not be increased, and there are many possible solutions to offset energy gains including blinds and exterior shutters
 - air conditioning may also be used
- how does vehicle circulation function for parking stall 1?
 - the proposal currently includes an excess of parking, so this stall may be eliminated
- can the parking be reduced to retain the large maple tree at the corner of the site?
 - the arborist's report recommended removal as a better long-term solution, but much will depend on what is found through excavation
 - much thought has gone towards this matter, and it will continue to be reviewed
 - if the tree has to be removed, a fairly mature will replace it
- what is the rationale for the copper screening at the front entrance?
 - glass was considered, but the view inside is only towards the stairs and the elevator shaft and the copper does not add further materials to the palette
 - the lighting and door handles help to signify entry, and the perforated screen acts as a double door between two outdoor spaces
- were smaller windows considered for bedrooms?
 - the interior layouts are still being configured, and some windows may be changed on private elevations
- will potential changes to the window configuration impact the northeast or northwest corner elevations?
 - these are significant elevations, and the window arrangement can be maintained with updates to the spandrels
 - the ratio of openings to walls will be maintained.

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the applicants' explanation of the building's massing
- the proposal as a striking piece of architecture
- the necessity of technical resolution of the details, given the proposal's complicated form in wood frame construction
- the need for simplicity in the cladding, given building's formal complexity
- the overhangs and recesses taking away from the building's form
- appreciation for the scale of the proposal and how it turns corners
- the proposal's spirited approach to massing
- desire for a reduction in proposed materials

- the need to resolve the transition between brick and stucco at the northwest corner, as well as the between the wood and stucco on the decks
- concern for stucco as a material choice, and the potential long-term issues in how it will age
- no issues with the exterior stair access; the screen and proposed colours are lively
- opportunity for the zero lot line to add to the pedestrian feel and slow down vehicular traffic along Oak Bay Avenue
- desire to push sidewalk away from the building, and if this cannot be done, potential to increase the ground floor setback
- appreciation for the current window configuration; however, concern for the lack of resolution as changes in fenestration may alter the appearance of the proposal
- privacy and liveability concerns for the first floor bedroom units facing Oak Bay Avenue
- desire for commercial uses at the ground floor, and the arbitrary nature of residential zoning at this location
- desire to retain the large maple tree at the southwest corner of the property.

Motion (defeated):

It was moved by Jason Niles, seconded by Justin Gammon, that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00060 for 1811 Oak Bay Avenue be approved as presented, with consideration to the following comments:

- simplify and resolve the cladding materials
- resolve the fenestration with regards to interior layouts and privacy
- reconsider the interior configuration of the ground floor unit 101 to remove bedrooms from proximity to the Oak Bay avenue frontage
- reconfigure the parkade structure to retain the existing maple tree at the southwest corner property line, if feasible.

Defeated

For: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Justin Gammon; Deborah LeFrank; Jason Niles

Opposed: Elizabeth Balderston; Sorin Birliga; Carl-Jan Rupp; Stefan Schulson

Motion:

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Jesse Garlick, that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00060 for 1811 Oak Bay Avenue be approved subject to the following changes:

- simplify and resolve the cladding materials
- resolve the fenestration with regards to interior layouts and privacy
- reconsider the interior configuration of the ground floor unit 101 to remove bedrooms from proximity to the Oak Bay avenue frontage
- reconfigure the parkade structure to retain the existing maple tree at the southwest corner property line, if feasible.

Carried

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

Opposed: Sorin Birliga; Carl-Jan Rupp

Deborah LeFrank left the meeting at 3:20pm.

Carl-Jan Rupp recused himself from Development Permit Application No. 000536 and Rezoning Application No. 00660 for 1025-1031 Johnson Street and 1050 Yates Street.

Paul Hammond returned to the meeting at 3:20pm.

3.4 Development Permit Application No. 000536 and Rezoning Application No. 00660 for 1025-1031 Johnson Street and 1050 Yates Street

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit Application and Official Community Plan Amendment to construct a twelve-storey mixed-use fire hall building, a fifteen-storey mixed-use building, a fourteen-storey mixed-use building and a seventeen-storey mixed-use building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

ADAM FAWKES
CARL-JAN RUPP
DAVID JAWL

HCMA ARCHITECTURE & DESIGN
HCMA ARCHITECTURE & DESIGN
JAWL RESIDENTIAL

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

- the overall massing and distribution of density in terms of access to light, liveability, and building separation distances
- the massing as it relates to the floor plate size of the residential portion of the non-market housing above the fire hall
- the podium portion of the fire hall building along Johnson Street
- the pedestrian experience, specifically along Johnson Street in front of the fire hall, and generally along all three streets at the perimeter of the subject properties
- the provision of green and open space.

Mr. Jawl, Mr. Rupp and Mr. Fawkes 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:

- what is the rationale for the 1.5m setback?
 - this setback was determined through neighbourhood consultation and provides more space within the public realm and more options for potential tenants
- is the City involved in further defining the dedicated urban plaza?
 - at this stage, the location has not been determined but it will be included within the new site-specific zone to increase green space
 - the plaza would be private property
- how many phases does the development include?
 - there will be four phases, starting with Cook and Johnson Streets then moving to Yates and Cook Streets
- is there any requirement for a mid-block crosswalk?
 - Mr. Betanzo noted that a mid-block crossing is not required through policy, but that applicants are welcome to propose one
- what is the intention for the wide truck apron outside the fire hall? Is this space meant to be animated, or to encourage lingering?
 - the apron is designed as a small plaza, providing integrated public art for the project

- it is intended to be interesting to look at while going past the site, but not so interesting as to need further exploration
- what density and building separation distances are envisioned for the entire site?
 - the separation distances outlined in the Downtown Core Area Plan have been used to illustrate some concepts for the entire site
 - some of the other buildings may come as close as 20m from the fire hall, but the precise distances have not yet been determined
 - the distances can be increased to ensure liveability, and the concepts illustrated demonstrate that this can be achieved
- how does the site's overall density compare to the requirements in the Official Community Plan (OCP)?
 - Mr. Betanzo noted that the OCP specifies a range of densities from 3:1 to 5.5:1 FSR, and that the proposal includes an amendment to the OCP to allow a density of 6.8:1 FSR
- how will noise from the fire hall be mitigated?
 - there is not significant noise at fire hall itself; noise is managed pre-emptively through the traffic light manipulation, and sirens are not turned on inside the bays
 - fire hall staff will continue to be good neighbours as they move closer to the downtown core
 - any noise from the site is not worse than other downtown locations
- will the six bays house six fire trucks?
 - there are several types of vehicles including ATVs
- do the trucks have to manoeuvre within bays?
 - the vehicles regularly on call are kept at the front of the bays, and seasonal vehicles and ATVs are kept towards the back
- will fire and ambulances have to back into the bays?
 - the apron allows trucks to back in
- if funding cannot be sourced for the housing component above the fire hall, will the units be rentals?
 - in that event, affordable housing would be reconsidered
 - an agreement for social housing is already in place and is only awaiting funding from upper levels of government
 - the goal is to deliver 130 homes above the fire hall
- can the fire hall be pushed further towards the front setback to increase the distance towards other buildings on the site?
 - the fire hall has been located as far northwards as possible without exposing the core to exterior
 - the cores cannot move, as they provide just enough width for the emergency service bays; there is not a millimetre to spare
- what is the rationale behind not having the tallest building at the corner?
 - higher towers were considered, but it did not meet City policies and did not look right in context
 - the goal is to emphasize the corners, but this can be done in ways other than increasing height
- how specific are the requirements for the new zone?
 - Mr. Betanzo clarified that the height, density and general distribution will be outlined in the new zone, and further development applications will specify the particular buildings' designs.

Panel members discussed:

- the emergency services building as a well-composed, simple and elegant solution to a number of urban components
- appreciation for the concept of urban integration
- concern for the coexistence of fire, ambulance and residential services
- the floorplate of the apartment being appropriate given its location above a larger structure and for the type of development
- the housing component's playful but sterile feel; however, the starkness working within the context
- opportunity to include more outdoor spaces and patios for residents above the fire hall
- desire for further information such as sustainability objectives
- concern that the common spaces will not be used, and that a level of animation could be lost
- appreciation for the rhythm of fenestration and colour of the emergency services and residential building
- appreciation for the glass bar above the emergency services portion of the building, helping to signify entrances and residential uses

Justin Gammon left the meeting at 4:32pm.

- concern for the master planning of the pedestrian realm
- the need to consider the provision of a mid-block pedestrian connection to improve pedestrian circulation and animation of the site
- appreciation for the overall sensitivity to the public realm
- the proposal's success in providing a gateway experience, particularly around the south corner
- appreciation for the third concept provided which proposed a pedestrian plaza on the south side; this may provide a compromise if a mid-block pedestrian connection cannot be achieved
- opportunity for smaller breaks in the podium for the proposed pedestrian plaza
- cautioning against a triangular plaza design on the corner of Cook and Yates Streets, due to the difficulty in animating these spaces
- the need to avoid a heavy overhang with pillars within the public realm, for the benefit of the pedestrian experience
- opportunity to conduct a wind study to assist in evaluating the outdoor public spaces
- appreciation for the level of detail conceived in the master plan
- the overall distribution of massing, height and density is appropriate, and it is understood that each building will be evaluated on its own merits at the development permit stage
- hesitancy in committing to the height without further information for the entire site
- the need for the site's landmark aspect to be the buildings' architectural significance rather than the public space aspect
- appreciation for the lightness and airiness of the concepts presented for the rezoning portion of the application
- desire for on-site storm water solutions to be examined over the entire site
- opportunity for public art and animation along Cook Street instead of at the truck bays.

Motion - DP

It was moved by Paul Hammond, seconded by Jason Niles, that Development Permit Application No. 000536 for 1025-1031 Johnson Street and 1050 Yates Streets be approved as presented.

Carried Unanimously

Motion - REZ

It was moved by Jesse Garlick, seconded by Jason Niles, that Rezoning Application No. 00660 for 1025-1031 Johnson Street and 1050 Yates Streets be approved as presented.

Carried

For: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Elizabeth Balderston; Jason Niles; Paul Hammond
Opposed: Sorin Birliga and Stefan Schulson

4. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of November 28, 2018 was adjourned at 4:50 pm.

Jesse Garlick, Chair