

**MINUTES OF THE  
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY JUNE 26, 2019**

**1. THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 12:08 PM**

**Present:** Elizabeth Balderston, Sorin Birliga, Brad Forth,  
Pamela Madoff, Jason Niles, Karen Sander, Stefan  
Schulson

**Absent:** Marilyn Palmer; Jessi-Anne Reeves; Carl-Jan Rupp;  
Roger Tinney

**Staff Present:** Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design  
Rob Bateman – Senior Process Planner  
Leanne Taylor – Senior Planner  
Alena Hickman – Secretary  
Katie Lauriston – Secretary

**2. MINUTES**

**Minutes from the Meeting held May 22, 2019**

**Motion:**

It was moved by Jason Niles, seconded by Karen Sander, that the minutes from the meeting held May 22, 2019 be adopted.

**Carried Unanimously**

**3. APPLICATIONS**

**3.1 Development Permit Application No. 000544 for 2 Paul Kane Place and  
Development Permit Application No. 000545 for 1 Cooperage Place**

The City is considering applications to amend previously approved Development Permits in order to add mechanical equipment and screening to both roofs, add a gas meter and screening to 2 Paul Kane Place and change several doors from glass to solid.

Applicant meeting attendees:

PETER DE HOOG

DE HOOG & KIERULF ARCHITECTS

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

- rooftop mechanical
- gas meter
- solid doors.

Peter de Hoog provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- where are the sightlines located, which were mentioned in the staff report and the letter to Mayor and Council?
  - the sight lines extend down from Lime Bay Park or from further up the hill, looking towards the water
  - the rooftop mechanical screening would not be visible from the Westsong Walkway
- what is the height of the spandrel glass around the gas meter?
  - it will be the mandated height as per Fortis BC, who also require that it be enclosed
- is there a public walkway between the two planters?
  - Rob Bateman noted that there is a Statutory Right-of-Way on the properties that creates U-shaped public walkways
- it appears that the equipment extends beyond the screens, and the screens interfere with the curved roofline. What options have been explored to minimize the visual impact of the screening and equipment?
  - the screening could be reduced slightly, but this would run the risk of not entirely screening the mechanical equipment
  - the applicants are prepared to consider reducing the size of the screening
- was it considered to relocate the mechanical equipment?
  - the equipment is pretty much locked into its current location, as there is limited flat-roofed area on the building
  - the equipment is sized to ensure that it is as small and low to the roof as possible, with minimal duct runs
- is it possible to enclose the mechanical equipment entirely with sound-dampening materials to minimize noise impacts?
  - this is theoretically possible and wouldn't greatly affect the design, but the equipment requires ventilation with open movers; this would defeat any sound-dampening benefits
- why is the equipment so much larger than the approved screening? Was the building initially designed for a use other than a restaurant?
  - it was not initially identified as a restaurant
  - this is essentially a TI issue; it was missed along the way
- are there only solid doors to street?
  - yes
- was there no plan for gas service at any earlier point in the project?
  - gas service was initially planned from Paul Kane Place, but the applicants didn't think it would be much of an issue
  - the gas servicing became problematic because of the location of the walkway and view corridor
- was the placement of the gas servicing part of the original approval?
  - not likely; servicing was identified on building permit drawings only
- what is the proposed height of the rooftop screen?
  - it is currently proposed at about 1200mm
- given that the existing screens already compromise some views, is there a higher depth of screen that would provide better enclosure from farther vantage points?
  - *the applicant showed before and after views of the proposed screening*

- there is minimal impact with greater screening
- was there an original landscape plan with the initially-approved development permit?
  - no, only planters were proposed
- was a landscaping treatment considered to obscure the gas meter, rather than spandrel glass?
  - this was considered, as shrubs are not an issue for the view corridor.

The Panel discussed:

- the screens making a significant improvement; preference for rooftop boxes rather than views of the equipment
- the possibility of designing the rooftop screening to better reflect the building design, e.g. cantilevering the screening or reducing square edges
- whether the rooftop screening is sufficiently tall
- the rooftop screening as a major oversight in the building's earlier design; the previously-proposed rotunda as far too small
- the need for a more elegant solution for mechanical screening; any proposal at this stage would be a band-aid solution and would take away from the initial sleek, light design
- concern for setting a poor precedent for future development
- support for the proposed, necessary changes to fix the roofline
- the sight lines are also compromised by the yachts
- the challenge of improving screening around the gas meter
- the gas meter screening as being in keeping with the existing building, but opportunity for improvement with landscaping
- no issue with the proposed door design
- questioning why no landscape was required with the original proposal
- opportunity to create a less harsh transition along the Statutory Right-of-Way and a more inviting public plaza
- soft landscaping within the public plaza would improve the area overall
- opportunity for the applicants to explore entering into an agreement with the City to improve the walkway.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Pamela Madoff, seconded by Elizabeth Balderston, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000544 for 2 Paul Kane Place and Development Permit Application No. 000545 for 1 Cooperage Place be approved as presented, recognizing that the screens detract from the curving form, symmetrical design and clear architectural composition of the buildings. Further, it is the opinion of the Panel that although the screening had to be accommodated after the fact, the approval of these applications sets a dangerous precedent for future development.

**Carried (6:1)**

For: Elizabeth Balderston, Sorin Birliga, Brad Forth, Pamela Madoff, Jason Niles,  
Karen Sander

Opposed: Stefan Schulson

The Panel discussed:

- the need for landscaping, even if only container plantings.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Jason Niles, seconded by Brad Forth, that the Panel recommend to Council that the owner of 2 Paul Kane Place and 1 Cooperage Place explore opportunities to improve the interface between the public and private realms.

**Carried Unanimously**

**3.2 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00115 for 605-629 Speed Avenue and 606-618 Frances Avenue**

The City is considering a Development Permit with Variances Application to construct a 14-storey and a 6-storey multi-unit residential building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

FRANC D'AMBROSIO	D'AMBROSIO ARCHITECTURE + URBANISM
ERICA SANGSTER	D'AMBROSIO ARCHITECTURE + URBANISM
TERRY KOPECK	D'AMBROSIO ARCHITECTURE + URBANISM
MARK ZUPAN	D'AMBROSIO ARCHITECTURE + URBANISM
KEITH GRANT	KEITH N. GRANT LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE LTD.
GREG GILLESPIE	MIKE GERIC CONSTRUCTION
RYAN GOODMAN	ARYZE DEVELOPMENT
JUSTIN FILUK	ARYZE DEVELOPMENT

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

- height and building mass of the fourteen-storey building
- circular windows on the west elevation of the fourteen-storey building
- application of building materials.

Franc D'Ambrosio and Erica Sangster provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Keith Grant provided details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- why are Juliet balconies proposed on Speed Avenue, rather than full balconies?
  - this was a direction from the owner, due to how the smaller building will be marketed
  - Juliet balconies will not interfere with the London plane trees along Speed Avenue
- what is the clearance between the 14-storey tower and the existing industrial building to the west?
  - 6.8m
- how tall is the neighbouring industrial building to the west?
  - approximately 1.5 to 2 storeys tall
- what is proposed for the first level of the of the 14-storey building at the west?
  - patios and landscape screening is proposed

- how will the balcony boxes be drained to avoid dirt build-up on the surface?
  - this has been considered and adequate drainage is ensured
- what is the design intent behind the lack of curvature in the building design?
  - this has been discussed at length, and the current design highlights the clean lines and form of the building
  - there are curvilinear forms in the landscape design
- how is the entryway along Speed Avenue designed for minimal impact to the London plane trees along the street?
  - the tree canopy is quite tall in this area
  - there is no underground parking at this location to protect the root zones
  - there has been much discussion to ensure that the trees are protected
- the 14-storey building has common area but the 6-storey building does not; was the 6-storey building's flat roof considered for use as amenity space?
  - this is not planned at the moment, but could be considered
- were options other than circular windows explored for breaking up the 14-storey building's massing?
  - the round windows add an element of whimsy
- do the applicants anticipate vehicular traffic cutting through the site from Douglas Street, and if so, how has this been mitigated?
  - it is impossible to get from Frances Avenue to Douglas Street without waiting for traffic, so this would never be a shorter route
  - the applicants have worked with the City's transportation staff to locate the parkade entrance
  - the vehicular traffic generated from the site will be managed with a signalized intersection
- is it an accurate statement that there are generally challenges with stepping back a timber-frame building, or are there challenges only in this particular context?
  - this is an accurate statement generally
  - the most significant challenge is in articulating the building's massing, while satisfying structural engineering requirements
  - the proposal can be seen as a prototype for using a timber-frame structure in the most efficient (and interesting) way possible
- what has been done to create a laneway rather than a parking lot?
  - the parking and landscaping layout ensures that there is never a 'shotgun' view of all the parked cars, and there are trees planted every three parking spaces to form a canopy
- is there a different surface material for the laneway?
  - yes
- the proposed 14-storey building would be significantly taller than any others in close proximity. What is the intent for this area?
  - Leanne Taylor noted that the current zoning allows for up to 12 storeys, consistent with the Official Community Plan and neighbourhood plan
  - there are no other applications at present for buildings of 12 storeys in this area, but the intent is for this area to grow with increased height as the Mayfair Town Centre
- is the only variance for height?
  - yes, and the proposal is under the allowable floor space ratio
- what is the rationale for the horizontal band across the east side of the 14-storey building?
  - the band divides the building into two horizontal, visually-digestible pieces, each higher than the average neighbouring building

- the band will visually reduce the impact of the building face
- what is the design of the separate bicycle parking structure, and why isn't this simply a room within one of the main buildings?
  - there is a schematic drawing in the plans for this building
  - the bicycle parking will aesthetically match the pavilion at the other side of the property
- what cladding is proposed?
  - either high-quality cementitious or composite panel will be used
- if composite panel is used, how would it be joined?
  - the joints would be concealed
  - metal composites and fibre cement composites are also being considered
  - the material will be smooth, white, lustrous, high-quality and fire-rated material.

The Panel discussed:

- there being many examples of well-articulated timber-frame buildings that are stepped back; the need to be honest about technical requirements vs. feasibility
- appreciation for the buildings' strong, clean architectural expression
- the success of the entry canopy on Speed Avenue in bridging between the public and private realms
- recognition that these units will not be affordable
- appreciation for the architecture and materiality
- opportunity to reconsider the whimsical circular windows
- appreciation for the proposed landscaping, internal laneway and Speed Avenue street tree retention
- concern that the tree canopy in the laneway will not fill out as proposed
- the extreme, imposing height of the proposed 14-storey building; desire to see it reduced to 12 storeys for a better aesthetic and contextual fit
- the need to respect the 12-storey zoning for the site
- appreciation for the need for higher-density buildings outside the downtown core
- opportunity to redistribute the density between the 14- and 6-storey buildings to reduce the taller building's height
- the 6-storey building's appropriate scale and the protection of the tree canopy
- the danger of setting a precedent for much taller buildings along Speed Avenue
- if the building were reduced to 12 storeys, it would still fulfill the policy goals of revitalization and would add a landmark and a sense of place
- the need for accessibility given the increased density on a site with challenging access.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Elizabeth Balderston, seconded by Pamela Madoff, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00115 for 605-629 Speed Avenue and 606-618 Frances Avenue be approved with the following change:

- that the project comply with the height limit as prescribed within the zone.

**Carried (6:1)**

For: Elizabeth Balderston, Sorin Birliga, Brad Forth, Pamela Madoff, Karen Sander, Stefan Schulson

Opposed: Jason Niles

### 3.3 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00104 for 1309 and 1315 Cook Street, 1100-1120 Yates Street and 1109-1115 Johnson Street

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit with Variances Application to construct a 13-storey mixed-use building consisting of residential and commercial uses and a six-storey, multi-unit residential building. There is also an existing five-storey office building on the site that will be retained.

Applicant meeting attendees:

HUGH COCHLIN	PROSCENIUM ARCHITECTURE + INTERIORS INC.
PETER CARTER	PROSCENIUM ARCHITECTURE + INTERIORS INC.
MEGAN WALKER	LADR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
DAVE CHARD	CHARD DEVELOPMENT
DANIEL EAGLING	CHARD DEVELOPMENT

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

- height and building mass
- application of building materials
- west elevation of the six-storey building
- west facing wall at the main entrance of the six-storey building
- balconies on the six-storey building.

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

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- there are land use and zoning issues with the proposed building along Cook Street, as the proposal does not comply with the Official Community Plan (OCP). How can the Panel review the building design with these issues outstanding?
  - Miko Betanzo clarified that the Panel is welcome to make recommendations on policy changes, and that in the absence of existing policy, that the Panel's commentary is still sought
- what is the development potential of the three buildings on the corner of Cook and Johnson Streets?
  - *a rendering of the allowable massing of the corner sites was displayed*
  - the first level of underground parking has knock-out panels adjacent to these sites so that if these lots were developed at a later time the sites could share parking
- what is proposed for access to the mews after business hours?
  - a connection through the site is required, but gates will be provided to close the mews after hours
- will the open hours for the mews be determined by the strata?
  - there are separate owners for the medical building and the strata; it will be determined by both as to what the hours are
- will there be a café in the medical building?
  - yes, the existing café will remain, as will the same number of offices and the pharmacy

- the medical building will be reoriented to the street instead of towards the parking lot
  - the café in the medical building will work well with the proposed restaurant use on the corner of Yates and Cook Streets
- is it confirmed that a daycare will operate in the building?
  - yes, that is the intent
  - the daycare use determined the depth of the patio
- will the owners be able to provide suitable rental costs for a daycare?
  - the applicants are prepared to include a ten-year covenant to ensure that the space be used as a daycare
  - the owners would have to ask for market rent, which is still to be determined
- are the owners prepared to subsidize the daycare's rent to ensure that a daycare can operate at this location?
  - the rent will be a market rate that is feasible for a daycare
- which trees along Johnson are retained, and which will be removed?
  - as per Parks' direction, the street trees along Johnson Street will be replaced and the cherry trees in front of the medical building will be retained
  - additional trees will be planted along Yates Street
  - a Horse chestnut tree is proposed for removal, and will be replaced with three other trees
  - the setbacks along Johnson Street are increased to accommodate a wide boulevard and street trees
- will the bus stop along Johnson Street remain at the same location?
  - it will remain at approximately the same location but will be renovated
- if the rental building is constructed, how will parking and drop-offs for the existing medical building be managed during construction?
  - this will be a phased project, and during each phase the parking requirements for the medical building will be met
  - in the event that construction occurs all at once, the applicants have secured sufficient parking across the street
- the west elevation of the rental building is very bare and visible from Johnson Street; have other measures been considered to respect the public realm and the possibility of future development at the corner of Cook and Johnson Streets?
  - the existing configuration is an wonderful opportunity to wrap the rental building in glass along the west side, but this would not work well for future development of the orphan sites
  - the proposed number of windows was calculated to reduce overlook between the buildings
  - the rental building's units are oriented towards the mews rather than the western lot
  - opportunity to play with materials or add a vertical element to improve the western façade
- how does the proposal fit into the context and area?
  - the proposal's design takes many cues from the medical building; for example, the concept of banding up and over the building as well as the rhythm of windows onto the canopy
  - the balconies continue the horizontal element from the medical building
- does the horizontal datum from the medical building align with the new 13-storey building?
  - yes, this was the goal of the design



- what is occurring on the south elevation on page A305, with the vertical banding offset at the eighth level?
  - there is a shift in unit mix at the eighth level and the floorplate changes
  - this is much more prominent in when looking face on (as on the plans), but will look much more uniform in reality and with the addition of balconies
- what are the parking allocations for the site?
  - the existing stalls for the medical building will be moved underground, and these spaces become available for residents after the medical office's hours
  - the proposed parking ratio of 73:100 is pretty good for downtown.

The Panel discussed:

- the need to add interest on the rental building's western elevation
- the rental building's rigid design
- opportunity for further architectural exploration and additional character without significant cost impacts
- opportunity for further articulation of the rental building's roofline and western façade
- questioning the use of the medical building as a model for the 13-storey building's design; opportunity for new architectural expression at this location
- alternately, opportunity to see a more pronounced reference to the medical building to provide more character for this prominent corner
- opportunity to upgrade the medical building as part of the precinct plan
- the design of the 13-storey building missing a spark
- opportunity for more playfulness in the 13-storey building's design and colour palette
- the suitability of the proposed 13-storey building's height, and the medical building's success in providing a good transition towards the neighbourhood to the east
- the suitability of projecting glass balconies, and whether this speaks to more of a downtown aesthetic
- the materials as being safe and inoffensive, but somehow lacking
- the need to comply with the OCP and its boundaries, as well as the Fernwood Neighbourhood Plan, in order to integrate well now and into the future and to transition into the neighbourhood
- the desirability of allowing the same building height on both sides of Cook Street
- the tension between considering the OCP as a living document and the recognition of the community input that went to creating policy documents such as the OCP, DCAP, etc.
- the dangerous precedent set by not complying with the OCP
- appreciation for the well-considered site plan, including patio systems, walkway connections and an urban agriculture component
- the need to move the proposed gates closer to the sidewalks for CPTED considerations
- opportunity to refine the proposed hardscaping by reducing the number of materials
- the need to consider shadowing impacts on the urban garden area.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Elizabeth Balderston, seconded by Brad Forth, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00104 for 1309 and 1315 Cook Street, 1100-1120 Yates Street and 1109-1115 Johnson Street be approved subject to:

- further consideration and refinement of the architectural expression, colours and materials of both buildings, in consideration of the prime location of the site, with particular attention to the north and west elevations of the six-storey building
- the completion of a CPTED review of the proposed site plan, with particular consideration given to the location of the gates.

**Carried (4:3)**

For: Elizabeth Balderston, Sorin Birliga, Brad Forth, Stefan Schulson  
Opposed: Pamela Madoff, Jason Niles, Karen Sander

**4. ADJOURNMENT**

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of June 26, 2019 was adjourned at 3:25pm.

---

Stefan Schulson, Chair