

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 24, 2018**

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

Present: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Elizabeth Balderston; Paul Hammond; Carl-Jan Rupp; Stefan Schulson

Absent: Sorin Birliga; Justin Gammon; Deborah LeFrank
Jason Niles

Staff Present: Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Leanne Taylor – Senior Planner
Katie Lauriston – Secretary

2. MINUTES

Minutes from the Meeting held September 26, 2018

Motion:

It was moved by Elizabeth Balderston, seconded by Stefan Schulson, that the Minutes of the Meeting of Advisory Design Panel held September 26, 2018 be adopted as presented.

Carried Unanimously

3. APPLICATIONS

3.1 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000506 for 953 Balmoral Road

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit with Variance Application to construct a four-storey multi-unit residential building consisting of approximately 11 rental units.

Applicant meeting attendees:

| | |
|-----------------|--------------------|
| PAMELA ÚBEDA | COAST + BEAM |
| RAJINDER SAHOTA | METHOD BUILT HOMES |

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

- the overall building size, scale and massing
- window size, shape and placement
- landscaping and outdoor open space
- entryways and articulation along the building base
- the transition between the public and private realm.

Mr. Sahota and Ms. Úbeda 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 behind the small second storey windows?
 - these windows were initially larger like those on the third and fourth storeys, but their size was reduced by request of the Planning department
- are the windows on the east and west façades intended to be recessed or punched?
 - the intent is for the windows to be set back within the thick exterior stucco wall, to create interest
 - there has been less and less time spent on the renderings, because this is the fourth design iteration
- are there balconies proposed?
 - no, these have been removed
- why were the previously proposed balconies removed?
 - the balconies were removed at the City's request to mitigate overlook concerns
- has the building footprint changed from the previous iteration where six storeys and a landscape buffer were proposed?
 - hard landscaping is proposed due to feedback from the property management company for similar rental buildings; hardscaping will be more easily maintained and better looking
 - the removal of the carshare parking stall in the front yard, the required Statutory Right of Way and bicycle storage also reduce the site's potential for greenspace
 - the entrance from the driveway was removed as requested by the City, and the opportunity for vegetation was lost because greenery cannot be added on the exit
 - boulevard trees could be provided through the street remediation
- is there opportunity for more of a transition from public to private space at the front of the building?
 - it is not really feasible, as it would be very difficult to plant trees at the front
 - the front setback cannot be increased to accommodate trees, as the suites are already as small as is feasible
- when will the Statutory Right of Way be utilized by the City?
 - Ms. Taylor clarified that Statutory Right of Ways can be requested as a part of any rezoning application, and that the frontage would have to be constructed to future plans for Balmoral Road
 - Ms. Taylor also noted that the applicable design guidelines do not encourage front yard parking stalls, and that the Transportation division would likely support the carshare vehicle being located on the street; however, the parking space on-site has to be secured by covenant so that it cannot be removed
- would the carshare vehicle be available to all members of the carshare program?
 - yes
- would public access be required to access the carshare vehicle?
 - yes
- have shadow studies been conducted?
 - yes; the proposal will shadow the neighbouring Cool-Aid housing in the evenings

- none of the other neighbours will be affected
- is bicycle parking provided?
 - 16 secure and six visitor stalls are proposed
- is the hardscaped walkway at the east required as a walkway, or can more soft landscaping be put in its place?
 - although it is not required to be hardscaped, the goal with the landscaping was to ensure that it was as attractive as possible over the long term
- so a walkway at the east is not required?
 - correct; however, the applicants are concerned about the amount of camping in the area and seek to address this concern through design
- why does the current proposal have a larger footprint with less soft landscaping, compared to when the proposal was six storeys tall?
 - if the Panel's recommendation is to include soft landscaping at grade, this can be changed and would be less costly
 - a previous design iteration had expensive green elements such as a green wall, but any soft landscaping will become run-down due to the type of long-term usage in the neighbourhood
 - hardscaping will be more easily maintained and better looking
- do fire safety standards allow the proposed wood siding at the east?
 - the applicants are not certain, but the material could be replaced with a less combustible material
- can the building be moved over to allow more room for a walkway at the east side?
 - the area at the east is not meant as walkway, it is just a setback.

Panel members discussed:

- difficulty in evaluating the proposal as presented, with very little information compared to other rezoning applications
- the need to provide a shadow study and 3D renderings
- need to improve consistency in renderings, including window detailing and clarification on the depth of the façade
- need for an additional level of refinement in the plans, including resolving the design of the rain water leaders to ensure that they are not simply tacked onto the façades, providing a secondary exit and ensuring that doors do not swing into the drive aisle
- many desirable features having been lost in this design iteration as compared to previous plans
- the proposal's limited contributions to the public realm and the street's need for improvement
- the provision of reliable rental units as not being sufficient to warrant a lack of contributions to the public realm
- recognition of the need for the building to be durable while still making a long-term contribution to the public realm
- the need for greenery and trees on the site
- opportunity for trees and planters at the front of the building that will not be as easily walked on, to create a transition between the public and private realm
- the need to find a compromise in the landscaping to include easily maintained green space
- opportunity for the parking area to be developed into a mixed use area, to provide outdoor amenity space as well as vehicle storage

- appreciation for the proposed permeable paving
- desire for communal space on the ground plane
- the need for outdoor public or private space
- opportunity for soft landscaping elements between the sidewalk and the front entry to create a sense of entry and transition between public and private realms and to provide eyes on the street
- concern for the appropriateness of the front door without a transition space to separate public and private realms
- concern for the liveability of the ground floor units, given the proximity of the front door to the sidewalk as well as the proximity to the drive aisle, the limited light, and the lack of outdoor space for the middle ground floor unit
- appreciation for the general north-south orientation of most units
- no issue with the proposed height or number of storeys; however, the site is small and is not being developed in context with other sites
- desire for the lot to be developed in consolidation with adjacent sites, but understanding that this has not been achievable
- the building's mass being too great for the site, eliminating any ground-level amenity space
- the proposal's many variances to the zone contributing to the site's lack of a green buffer
- concern for the eastern wall's length and shadowing impacts on adjacent properties
- opportunity to shift the building's massing, possibly by adding one storey, to reduce and adjust the building footprint, mitigate the impact of a long eastern wall to neighbours, and maintain the proposed density
- desire for a deliberate relationship between the window size of the lower storeys and the upper storeys
- desire to see the window recesses implemented as rendered.

Motion:

It was moved by Jesse Garlick, seconded by Elizabeth Balderston, that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 000506 for 953 Balmoral Road be approved subject to the following changes:

- increase the side yard setbacks and redistribute the massing to reduce negative impacts on neighbours' properties, allow for enhanced soft landscaping and improve liveability
- provide design consideration to enhanced landscaping, attention to street frontage, main entrance sequence, private walk-up entrance and rear parking lot area
- reconsider the privacy of ground-oriented suites
- update drawings to include a more consistent depiction of the proposal, including how the windows are detailed, the depth of the façade, shadow studies and 3D renderings
- consider the entrances in context of the public realm and streetscape
- consider the addition of balconies for the upper units.

Carried Unanimously

4. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of October 24, 2018 was adjourned at 1:35 pm.

Jesse Garlick, Chair