

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY APRIL 24, 2019**

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

Present: Sorin Birliga, Jason Niles, Marilyn Palmer, Jessi-Anne Reeves, Karen Sander, Stefan Schulson

Absent for a Portion of the Meeting: Roger Tinney

Absent: Pamela Madoff, Carl-Jan Rupp

Staff Present: Andrea Hudson – Acting Director, Sustainable Planning & Community Development Department
Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Joaquin Karakas – Senior Urban Designer
Jim Handy – Senior Planner, Development Agreements
Leanne Taylor – Senior Planner
Alec Johnson – Senior Planner
Katie Lauriston – Secretary

2. MINUTES

Minutes from the Meeting held April 10, 2019

Motion:

It was moved by Roger Tinney, seconded by Sorin Birliga, that the minutes from the meeting held April 10, 2019 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

3. NEW BUSINESS

- Andrea Hudson and Joaquin Karakas provided an overview of upcoming municipal-led projects with a design component, to follow up from the Panel's December 19, 2018 motion. Items discussed include:
 - neighbourhood planning for the Fairfield Neighbourhood and draft Cook Street design guidelines, as well as upcoming neighbourhood plans for North Park, Fernwood, North and South Jubilee and Rockland
 - Council's request for a city-wide housing strategy
 - public realm projects including Ship Point, Centennial Square and the implementation of the bicycle network master plan

- The Panel asked:
 - how individuals could be involved in the engagement process for the bicycle network. Joaquin Karakas noted the upcoming public engagement opportunities for the Vancouver Street project

- whether core policy documents take their cues from Council policies. Joaquin Karakas explained that Ship Point was part of Council's latest strategic plan, and Centennial Square was a focused action plan from the Downtown Public Realm Plan adopted in 2017.

4. APPLICATIONS

4.1 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00074 for 1301 Hillside Avenue

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit with Variance Application to construct a six-storey mixed-use building with live-work units and long-term bicycle parking on the ground floor fronting Hillside Avenue and vehicle parking at-grade at the rear.

Applicant meeting attendees:

MICHAEL BACON	STUART HOWARD ARCHITECTS INC.
ADAM COOPER	ABSTRACT DEVELOPMENTS
SCOTT MURDOCH	NVISION PROPERTIES
	MURDOCH DE GREEF INC.

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

- the proposal's massing and density
- the provision of green and open space
- the building's street relationship.

Michael Bacon provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Scott Murdoch provided details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- has there been any reaction from the community in terms of the proposed increase in density?
 - overall the reaction to this version of the project has been mixed, but the community seems happier with the current overall design
 - there has been a positive reaction to seeing the height reduced
 - there is some confusion in the community over the parking requirements and how affordable units affect these requirements
 - there is no reaction to the proposed FSR per se, rather, the proposal is understood in terms of the overall unit count and parking provisions
- in what Large Urban Village is the site located?
 - Jim Handy noted that the Official Community Plan (OCP) identifies the site within the Urban Place Designation, which contemplates densities up to 2:1 Floor Space Ratio (FSR). Affordable housing is not excluded from the FSR calculation, and so the application would require an OCP amendment to allow the proposed FSR. In terms of density, the application is a better fit within the Large Urban Village designation; therefore, the question is whether the Urban Place Designation is amended or whether the site would be assigned the Large Urban Village designation.

- where do the applicants see the proposal fitting within the corridor and context?
 - the 'corridor context' speaks to the OCP which identifies Hillside Avenue as a major transit corridor as well as a high-density mixed-use corridor
 - the density along this corridor is increasing; although the proposed density does not conform to the OCP designation, its scale does conform as up to six stories are contemplated
- is the Cridge Centre secured with a covenant?
 - there are design guidelines within the OCP that apply specifically to the Cridge Centre and the adjacent Gary oak meadow
- Is the Cridge Centre property private or public?
 - as long as there is child care operating on the site, the open space must be maintained
- would residents be able to use the Gary oak meadow?
 - residents would not use this area, but the south facing units would benefit from views to the meadow
- could residents have a picnic in the meadow?
 - the area is semi-public, semi-private; there is a pathway traversing the site but no direct route from the proposal to the meadow
- how affordable are the 16 'affordable' units?
 - the program will be similar to that at the Vivid, which targets first time homebuyers at 10% below market rate
- what variances are requested?
 - the parking variance is the most prominent; the site is challenging as digging underground is not an option and the City envisions major housing at this location
 - the location aligns with a major transit corridor
 - there are also variances to the side yard
- how many parking stalls are required?
 - there will be approximately 50 units; 16 of which will be sold without parking as an opportunity to enter into the housing market, targeting people with a low-car lifestyle
 - the current parking calculation does not factor in the affordable units, as these are not yet secured as affordable
- are there variances to the setbacks?
 - yes; however, the current gas station zoning does not make sense for the project
- is a retaining wall proposed on the south elevation?
 - no; a set of stairs from the southwest corner of the property connects to the private terraces of the south units
- are the private terraces secured?
 - yes, each of the terraces is gated
- what is the height of the retaining wall in relation to the patios?
 - the top of the wall is level with the building's second level
 - the proposal will have the effect of a 5 storey building from the perspective of the Cridge
- how many different materials are proposed?
 - stack-on brick is proposed with a concrete cap on top
 - white cladding and grey cementitious panels, are also proposed, with a similar, linear appearance
 - natural wood is preferred for the wooden portion, but its combustibility needs to be evaluated and longboard may be used instead

- is stucco proposed?
 - no
- is the site's only vehicle access from the northbound lane of Cook Street?
 - yes, no southbound access is possible due to the median divider and three lanes of northbound traffic
- is the garbage room accessed from the parkade?
 - yes
- is there a provision for carshare?
 - not at this time
- is the retaining wall on the east elevation exposed?
 - some of the wall will be exposed, as the grade drops quickly at this location
 - the wall will be cladded in brick
- what do the stairs at the east side access?
 - it is another access to the building as well as an exit stair
- was a parking lay-by considered for delivery vehicles or visitors?
 - there are visitor spaces, and enough room in the apron for a vehicle to lay by temporarily
- would the affordable units be evenly distributed throughout the building?
 - yes, and a mix of unit types will be included
- is the intent for the units to be affordable or attainable?
 - they are better described as attainable, as affordable implies a deeper level of affordability
 - they are deemed affordable by the standards within BC Housing's affordable housing program
- what is envisioned for the other three corners of this intersection?
 - Jim Handy noted that a similar density is envisioned for the corner, with three storeys of residential and up to 2:1 FSR.
- should the Panel be concerned about the possibility of setting a precedent along the street for significant variances to parking and side yards?
 - Miko Betanzo noted that the proposal is evaluated against the most applicable standard. However, the ADP may consider how the variances might affect the context and how it relates to the adjacent properties, with consideration to future development.

The Panel discussed:

- the proposal as being in keeping with what is envisioned by the OCP
- appreciation for the challenges to build and access the site, as well as the inability to excavate due to soil contamination from the gas station
- support for the provision of affordable units
- support for higher density on the site; opportunity to further increase density at the building's corner
- whether the height is appropriate for Hillside
- the height as appropriate given the direction in the OCP
- lack of short-term vehicle parking on-site and in nearby areas
- the limited space for on-site vehicle movement for service vehicles and garbage collection
- opportunity for more movement on the north elevation
- the need for unity between the three distinct horizontal components on the northwest corner of the building at Cook Street and Hillside Avenue
- appreciation for the variety of building materials

- the design as busy, with too many languages utilized
- the strength of the south façade
- the corner ground level unit's appearance as more commercial than residential
- opportunity for further transition on the south side towards the Cridge lands
- the setback variances as reasonable for the context and surrounding Cridge lands
- opportunity to further define the live-work components along the north façade as separate from the residential spaces
- appreciation for the stairs at the back
- appreciation for the proposal's ability to take advantage of views to the adjacent Gary oak meadow
- concern for the Gary oak tree roots given the trees' proximity to traffic.

Motion (defeated):

It was moved by Roger Tinney, seconded by Jason Niles, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00074 for 1301 Hillside Avenue be approved subject to:

- further review of the north elevation, with particular attention to the northwest corner of the building
- further consideration to the parking functionality in terms of service, short-term and delivery vehicles.

Defeated (3:3)

For: Jason Niles, Jessi-Anne Reeves, Roger Tinney
Opposed: Sorin Birliga, Marilyn Palmer, Stefan Schulson

The Panel discussed:

- the need to state the building's presence consistently on the corners
- the design as too busy in terms of massing and materiality
- the need to revise the building's architectural expression and massing
- opportunity to resolve the functionality and ensure that the FSR is supportable.

Motion:

It was moved by Stefan Schulson, seconded by Jason Niles, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00074 for 1301 Hillside Avenue be approved subject to:

- simplification and refinement of the northwest building corner in terms of massing and materiality
- further consideration to the parking functionality, with particular attention to service and delivery vehicles and short-term loading.

Carried (5:1)

For: Jason Niles, Marilyn Palmer, Jessi-Anne Reeves, Stefan Schulson, Roger Tinney
Opposed: Sorin Birliga

4.2 Development Permit Application No. 000542 for 3020 Douglas Street and 584 Burnside Road East

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to construct a six-storey, mixed-use development consisting of residential and commercial uses.

Applicant meeting attendees:

PAUL HAMMOND	LOW HAMMOND ROWE ARCHITECTS
DEANNA BHANDAR	VICTORIA COOL AID SOCIETY
SCOTT MURDOCH	MURDOCH DE GREEFF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

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

- the massing and interface with nearby properties
- the entryway and ground level relationship to the street
- the façade articulation and materials.

Paul Hammond provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, Deanna Bhandar provided a background on the Victoria Cool Aid Society, and Scott Murdoch provided details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- are there renderings that illustrate the northern elevation from Douglas Street, and how the change in grade towards Burnside Road East is achieved?
 - *a rendering from the corner of Finlayson and Douglas Street was shown to the Panel*
 - the two buildings have different floor to floor heights in order to be perceived as the same height
- will the proposed building fronting Douglas Street be completed in Phase 2?
 - yes, this building will also be six storeys
- were balconies considered for the units along Burnside Road East?
 - Cool Aid has made the decision to not have balconies on its projects for programming reasons
 - Juliet balconies are proposed for the larger 1, 2 or 3 bedroom units, and the studio units have operable windows
- will the public right-of-way from Douglas Street to Burnside Road East be secured in Phase 1 or Phase 2 of the project?
 - Leanne Taylor clarified that there would be a blanket easement as a part of the Rezoning Application to secure the provision of the right-of-way; this would allow for the alignment to change slightly and be fully secured at the Development Permit stage
- is there a possibility for a ramp across this right-of-way, or are stairs required due to the change in grade?
 - a ramp is not possible at this location, so a publicly accessible escalator is proposed
 - it is also proposed to have two storeys closer to the street level, with the majority of the building massing stepped back to avoid a 'canyon' at this location
- what are the proposed plantings at the south side?
 - Red maples for the larger trees, with smaller columnar trees between

- given that the deciduous trees in the plaza will be bare in the winter months, were further features considered, such as trellises or a green strip, to further define the plaza edge?
 - this can be considered
- what is proposed for the large white windowsill on the southern portion of the building long Burnside Road East?
 - the metal sill will be raised and sloped, with a gutter and concealed rainwater leader
 - the design defines this edge and builds on the building form
 - an earlier iteration envisioned a planter at this location, but the viability of plants was problematic
 - fritted or patterned glass is being considered to reduce the sunlight into the stairwell
- what is proposed for the roof next to the fifth floor units along Burnside Road East?
 - a roof is proposed at this location, which will provide a better transition to the single-family dwellings across the street
- how are the materials assembled; what is proposed for the joints?
 - the joints are shown in some plans, but are not included in the renderings because the joints come out far darker in renderings than they will be in reality
 - the joints and fasteners will be painted the same colour as the panels, so that from a distance the reveals blend in and there are only hairline joints
- what material is proposed for the white panels?
 - a metal hardie panel system will be used, which will be a similar product to a longboard.

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the thought process provided
- appreciation for the inclusion of a rain garden
- the proposal as elegantly executed, and a good combination of simplicity with expression
- appreciation for the process and level of community engagement
- understanding for the cost efficiency of hardie panel.

Motion:

It was moved by Sorin Birliga, seconded by Stefan Schulson, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000542 for 3020 Douglas Street and 584 Burnside Road East be approved as presented.

Carried Unanimously

Roger Tinney left the meeting at 2:20pm.

4.3 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00106 for 1700 Blanshard Street

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to construct a twenty-three storey, mixed use building containing 235 market rental residential units with ground-floor commercial.

Applicant meeting attendees:

GERDA GELDENHUYS
DAVE ENGLISH

MUSSON CATTELL MACKEY PARTNERSHIP
TOWNLINE

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

- the massing and interface with nearby properties
- the entryway and ground level relationship to the street
- the façade articulation and materials.

Gerda Geldenhuys provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- how will the Hudson Bay blanket landscaping feature be maintained?
 - the multicoloured sedums only need weeding and fertilizing once or twice per year and will be irrigated
 - this system has been successful on other projects that the applicants have completed
- how will residents get food to the rooftop harvest table?
 - there is a kitchen on the roof and food can be brought up to this location
 - the harvest table is intended as an indoor-outdoor space with a party table
- what features make the residential portion more homey?
 - the entrance courtyard creates interest with a walkway and sense of discovery
 - there is a very welcoming main entrance to both components with a lot of brick and warm materials
- the rooftop feature where the frame extends beyond the roofline draws attention to that area; is that rooftop area accessible?
 - there is a double-height amenity space at the top level with large windows
 - the area below the rooftop feature is not accessible, but there is outdoor rooftop amenity space
 - the open frame feature continues the mass while visually fading into the sky and allowing glimpses of the sky through the frame
- is there anything else on the roof with the rooftop feature?
 - there is a partially obscured mechanical room on this roof
 - the adjacent rooftop is for the amenity space
- was it considered to align the volume of the tower facing Blanshard Street on an angle, in line with the street?
 - this was not considered; the proposed design uses the angle to Blanshard Street to reduce the impact of the building height at the street level
- where does the pedestrian link lead?
 - the link provides a circuitous route to wander through the site, from Blanshard Street to the interior laneway
- where is the waste management located for the commercial and residential units?
 - these services are incorporated into the rear of the southeast tower, accessed through the internal laneway

- what variances are proposed?
 - the upper corner of the podium facing Herald Street encroaches just over 2m into the setback, and the upper portion of the building facing Blanshard Street also encroaches by just under 8m
 - the height of the open frame feature also extends beyond the height.

Panel members discussed:

- the full wraparound balconies as being excessive for the building, especially considering its height
- the proposal as being of a different typology than what is found in the rest of Victoria
- whether keeping the building square to Herald Street is beneficial, or whether it should be shifted to align with Blanshard Street
- desire for further design features that would counteract the additional massing caused by the setback variance
- the lack of a distinct middle of the building
- concern for the proposed height variance along Blanshard Street, with the building's significant massing and strong skeletal structure
- the building's significant presence and massing to the street
- the building as having the details of a smaller building (i.e. many projecting balconies)
- opportunity to simplify the building expression and make its elevations more sleek
- appreciation for the effort made in creating a sense of slenderness
- no concern with the overall height at this location; however, the Jack Davis plaza will be shadowed
- opportunity to further explore the Blanshard Street façade so that the top is less prominent and the tower is still well-articulated to the bottom, and so that all the components better articulate to each other
- appreciation for the design of the plaza, the corner of Fisgard and Blanshard Streets, and the material choices
- the materials as giving a rugged, formal appearance that is more commercial than residential
- concern that the rooftop mechanical room may be visible from Hudson Place I
- desire for further rationale for the extended frame building top feature, whether there is precedent elsewhere in Victoria, and what it is meant to draw attention to
- whether the concrete frame feature is necessary or should be removed.

Motion:

It was moved by Jason Niles, seconded by Sorin Birliga, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00106 for 1700 Blanshard Street be approved with the following changes subject to:

- addressing the articulation and expression of the Blanshard Street façade
- reconsideration of the building top
- simplification and refinement of the building body, with particular attention to the volumetric expression towards the Blanshard Street elevation
- ensuring the overall aesthetic consistency of the building.

Carried Unanimously

The panel recessed at 3:20 and reconvened at 3:25pm.

4.4 Development Permit Application No. 00613 for 829-899 Fort Street & 846-856 Broughton Street

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to construct a ten-storey mixed-use building containing independent seniors rental uses, market rental apartment units, commercial office, childcare, music school and commercial uses on the ground floor.

The application was previously presented to the Panel on April 11, 2018.

Applicant meeting attendees:

HELEN BESHARAT	BESHARAT FRIARS ARCHITECTS
PATRICK SCHILLING	PARC RETIREMENT LIVING
ANDREW WILLEM	PARC RETIREMENT LIVING
BRUCE HEMSTOCK	PWL PARTNERSHIP

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

- the massing and interface with nearby properties
- the entryway and ground level relationship to the street
- the façade articulation and materials.

Helen Besharat provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Bruce Hemstock provided details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- what is the anticipated resident demographic and market for the proposal?
 - a very active, independent demographic, with an average age of 88
 - many residents will move in for independent living, and 20% may need assisted living services which can be provided by third party caregivers
- the walking paths are a more passive use, and are sometimes used in memory care; how does this fit with the active demographic envisioned?
 - there are residents who feel more comfortable being active within the building, and the walking paths provide an opportunity for a walk without going down to the street
 - the open lawn with artificial grass is designed for active games for residents, grandchildren and children to enjoy
 - the community is also interested in community gardens and urban agriculture in the outdoor areas
- what materials are proposed for the screened garage doors on Broughton Street?
 - the doors are custom-designed corten steel, which will weather in time
 - red brick and exposed concrete are also used at the ground level
 - the landscaping over the parkade entrance will cascade down over the parking entry
- what is between the two garage doors?
 - there are two exit doors, which are emphasized with a vertical element

- why are there two separate garage entries?
 - the right entry is for loading/unloading, and the entrance to the underground parking is to the left
 - two bays are required so that loading does not obstruct the movement of cars for residents
- what are the distances between the towers?
 - sheet A013 includes detailed dimensions
- were short term parking spaces considered along the street for picking up or dropping off residents?
 - short term parking along Quadra Street is being considered
 - the underground parking will be like the entry to a hotel, with short term parking close to the elevators
- are there variances for the height or the floor space ratio (FSR)?
 - Alec Johnston noted that this Rezoning Application would create a new, site-specific zone with a maximum height of about 31.6m, which is slightly above the maximum recommended within the Downtown Core Area Plan (DCAP). The setbacks could be written into the new zone or could be treated as variances; this is yet to be determined.
 - the applicants noted that the encroachment is minimal and helps modulate the façade
- there are discrepancies between the hand-drawn sketches and the plans; do the sketches accurately reflect the proposal?
 - both versions are artistic representations of the building, but the hand-drawn renderings are correct while showing the spirit of the proposal
- what is the intent with the mosaic portions of the sidewalk along Fort Street?
 - the intent is for a modern mosaic that does not mimic the tiled heritage entryways along Fort Street
 - a slip-resistant tile is proposed for the sidewalk areas.

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the changes made since the proposal was last reviewed by the Panel; the Fort Street elevations in particular have been revised to consider the Panel's recommendations
- the proposal's more residential, inviting feel as compared to the last submission reviewed by the Panel
- appreciation for the hand-drawn sketches and the architectural model
- appreciation for the tiled urban pockets along Fort Street
- Quadra Street needing as much liveliness as possible, and the proposal's successful approach along this street
- concern for the future of this end of Broughton Street, with this proposal's two parking entryways and the upcoming redevelopment of the YMCA building
- desire for a rooftop or common area to take advantage of the view to Pioneer Park
- appreciation for the proposal's LEED-level certification and sustainability features
- desire for more of a nod to the future of the next block of Fort Street, specifically at the corner of Fort and Quadra Streets
- the need to protect the character of Fort Street, with slowed traffic
- need for more energy and further expression as a landmark on the corner of Fort and Quadra Streets.

Motion:

It was moved by Marilyn Palmer, seconded by Jessi-Anne Reeves, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000516 for 829-899 Fort Street and 846-856 Broughton Street be approved with consideration to:

- revising the corner at Quadra and Fort Streets, from grade to building top, to enhance the pedestrian experience and provide some urban prominence.

Carried Unanimously

5. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of April 24, 2019 was adjourned at 4:25pm.

Stefan Schulson, Chair