

**MINUTES OF THE  
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 9, 2019**

**1. THE CHAIR CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 12:00 PM**

**Present:** Brad Forth, Pamela Madoff, Jason Niles, Jessi-Anne Reeves, Carl-Jan Rupp, Karen Sander, Stefan Schulson (Chair)

**Absent for a Portion of the Meeting:** Elizabeth Balderston

**Absent:** Sorin Birliga, Marilyn Palmer, Roger Tinney

**Staff Present:** Michael Angrove – Planner  
Leanne Taylor – Senior Planner  
Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design  
Katie Lauriston – Administrative Assistant

**2. APPLICATIONS**

**2.1 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00122 for 330-336 Michigan Street**

The City is considering a Development Permit with Variances Application to construct for a new four-storey affordable rental building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

ROB WHETTER	DHK ARCHITECTURE
CHRISTOPHER WINDJACK	LADR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

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

- the ground plane, including individual entrances for the ground floor units and the main entrance being located under the overhang
- cohesive design, including rooflines and fenestration
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

*Elizabeth Balderston joined the meeting at 12:05pm.*

Rob Whetter provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Christopher Windjack provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- is the proposed variance for site coverage?
  - yes

- is any on-site stormwater management proposed?
  - there is no way of managing stormwater because of the underground parkade
- how do the patios relate to the adjacent sidewalk given the 2m difference in elevation from east to west?
  - the lower side is bermed up and there is a maximum 1.2m difference in elevation from the patio to the sidewalk
- was sunlight considered in determining the playground location?
  - the driving factor was to ensure visibility to the playground from both buildings, as a shared amenity with a private feeling
  - another possibility was where the community garden is now proposed, but the gardens cannot be in a fully shaded area
  - the goal was to maximize the amount of amenities
- what is happening at the location of the proposed Hornbeam trees?
  - the landscaping in this rear area will be predominantly shade-loving plants, and is not intended to be accessible
  - the space would be ameliorated from its present, compacted condition and would provide screening to the adjacent properties
- is the parkade open towards this rear area?
  - the parkade will be daylighted through this project
- are there security concerns for the shaded area at the rear, with an opening to the parkade?
  - this area is currently visible but not usable; the objective is to create a similar but improved condition with low fencing
- why is increased height not proposed?
  - adding a fifth storey does not work economically given the additional weight
  - the proposal fits well into the neighbourhood and still provides densification
- was there consideration to changing or manipulating the height across the building for variability?
  - this concept was explored in early design iterations, but this impacted the accessibility of the ground floor suites
  - the ground level is more accessible by leveling out the main level and aligning the patio grades with the sidewalk
- what is the proposed roof finish?
  - 2-ply SBS
- are mechanical systems required on the roof?
  - these will be minimal; typically units have HRVs in each suite
- What is the Capital Regional Housing Corporation's policy on electric vehicle charging stations?
  - typically at least 4 or so stations will be installed but there is no policy
- is the heritage building on the site excluded from this application?
  - Michael Angrove noted that the application does not include the heritage building and that a heritage alteration permit application would be required
  - the applicants noted that the heritage house is in excellent condition with useable layouts, and a heritage application at a later date will allow greater focus on the current application
- what is proposed on the corner of the west building?
  - there is a 2hr fire separation on this corner
  - since the application was submitted, the applicants have considered adding a vertical strip of windows to bring light into the main entryway corridor

- was breaking up the plane considered?
  - yes, a vertical strip of windows would serve this purpose well
  - high horizontal windows could also be considered for the bedrooms
- is there a chimney proposed on the east and west ends of the building?
  - no, this is part of the fire wall
  - these could be moved to the other side of the wall
- what is the wall assembly?
  - 3-4in exterior insulation.

Panel members discussed:

- the building's contemporary architecture and how to appropriately respond to the context
- opportunity to include the Superior Street portion of the project in the same project
- the need for on-site stormwater treatment or rain gardens
- the applicant's letter includes a proposal for rain gardens, but no rain gardens or stormwater treatment is proposed in the plans
- potential for rain gardens in the side yards
- need for prominent and inviting building entrances to address the street and create a sense of neighbourliness
- opportunity for more building entrances along Michigan Street, including individual unit entrances where possible, to respond to the existing rhythm of regular entrances
- need for more animation at the main entrance so that it is more inviting
- desire for further articulation along Michigan Street
- need to break up the building's massing, possibly by having the building read as two separate buildings with colour separation or slight changes in detail
- need to consider the experience of the building and its massing from the street
- opportunity for articulation in building height
- CPTED concerns with the pathway leading to the rear of the lot
- appreciation for the playground and garden location
- concern for the garden's shaded and sloping location
- desire for a proposal of this scale and at this location to provide a community amenity
- appreciation for the proposed landscape plan.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Jason Niles, seconded by Elizabeth Balderston, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 00122 for 330 - 336 Michigan Street does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and policies and should be declined, and that the key areas that should be revised include:

- increase interaction with the street as well as the addition of individual entrances with direct connections to the public sidewalk
- strengthen the entry features at the main residential entry
- address the on-site stormwater management (i.e. rain gardens) as indicated in the applicant's letter
- consider reducing the overall visual impact of the proposal.

**Carried (7:1)**

For: Elizabeth Balderston, Brad Forth, Pamela Madoff, Jason Niles, Jessi-Anne Reeves, Karen Sander, Stefan Schulson (Chair)

Opposed: Carl-Jan Rupp

## **2.2 Heritage Alteration Permit with Variance Application No. 00016 for 1050-1058 Pandora Avenue and 1508-1518 Cook Street**

The City is considering a Heritage Alteration Permit with Variance Application to retain 50% of the existing heritage-registered building and construct a new four- and six-storey mixed-use addition consisting of ground floor commercial uses and residential above. The applicant is proposing to heritage-designate the existing building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

MICHAEL GREEN	MGA MICHAEL GREEN ARCHITECTURE INC
MARIE-CLAIRE BLIGH	MGA MICHAEL GREEN ARCHITECTURE INC
JESSICA GIBSON	DISTRICT PROPERTIES

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 relationship between the heritage building and new addition
- the application of building materials
- the parapet height
- any other aspects of the proposal on which ADP chooses to comment.

Michael Green and Marie-Claire Bligh provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- was more of a reveal between the heritage building and the new addition considered?
  - a variety of approaches were considered, but the proposal feels the cleanest, most appropriate solution
  - the true view line and pedestrian experience were paramount
  - the simplicity of the proposed design is its strength
- why do no balconies face the park?
  - Juliet balconies face the park to relate to the Cook Street façade
  - the four-storey portion was deliberately simplified
- are no balconies proposed on the four-storey building?
  - correct
- is the new building's roof a green roof?
  - no; the sedum roof is only on the heritage building roof
- was a different use considered for a more public/private transition onto Franklin Green, for more eyes on the street and park?
  - other uses were considered early on, but they presented considerable challenges
  - the community feedback has shown desire for 24hr activation, which is not readily satisfied by a commercial component
- is the connection to Franklin Green accessible?
  - yes, pedestrians would descend the vehicle ramp to the garage level then ascend to the park level
  - the ramp is very gentle and the site is accessible throughout
- how are rooms labelled as dens regulated by the City?
  - Leanne Taylor noted that the City does not regulate buildings' interior layouts

- what relation is there between the number of units and number of required vehicle parking stalls?
  - Leanne Taylor clarified that the application proposes a significant parking variance, and that the OCP does support parking variances for applications which include heritage conservation and preservation
- are parking requirements tied to the number of bedrooms?
  - no
- is the heritage building restricted in how much additional weight it can carry?
  - the heritage building will require seismic upgrading regardless of its existing structure
  - the proposal will not put a new load onto the roof
- what is the rationale for the building entry location?
  - earlier iterations proposed the new addition closer to Cook Street; however, the response from the heritage community was to push the addition as far back as possible and to save as much as possible of the heritage building
  - with four public faces to the building, many factors are considered in selecting an entry point; the proposed entry is at a logical mid-point
  - the entry location creates an interesting space with a café component
- are the buried units on the second level the best solution?
  - there are challenges with the depth of the building coupled with heritage retention
- portions of the mews are 2.9m wide; what is the proposed use in this location and was additional accessibility considered?
  - the mews will be fully accessible and open during the daytime, and gated at night only for residents' use
  - the existing brick wall will be rehabilitated
- does the brick wall need to be preserved as a blank wall?
  - this was desired from a heritage standpoint
- will all the units be rental?
  - yes, they will be secured as rental.

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the restoration of the heritage building
- need to resolve the relation between the proposed additions and the heritage building
- support for an increased building setback along Pandora Avenue
- the proposal would benefit from an additional 2 storeys facing Pandora Avenue for a more interesting articulation of building massing
- the four-storey portion facing Franklin Green is very simple, with a big-city feeling
- appreciation for the inset windows relating to the existing heritage windows
- opportunity for balconies or outdoor space on the four-storey building
- appreciation for the six-storey building's articulation and balconies
- concern for the liveability of the two second floor units facing the mews and for the many units with closets as bedrooms
- concern with the interior angles created by the proposed balconies, which may limit the useable interior space
- appreciation for the proposed sedum roof
- opportunity to add a green roof component to the top roof as well to improve views from adjacent buildings and to help conceal the rooftop mechanical equipment
- missed opportunity for a common amenity space for residents on the stepped roofs

- need to fully resolve the materiality; opportunity for an additional level of materiality
- appreciation for the proposal's minimal design
- desire for a richer material on the lower building to lend a more solid appearance
- CPTED concerns with the narrow laneway and with the recessed entries along Pandora Avenue
- the need for the laneway to remain clear of clutter from planter boxes, seating, etc.
- need to resolve the building's northern façade facing Franklin Green
- appreciation for the two access points to the park
- need to avoid locking Franklin Green in the middle of the block.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Jessi-Anne Reeves, seconded by Elizabeth Balderston, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Heritage Alteration Permit with Variance Application No. 00016 for 1050-1058 Pandora Avenue and 1508-1518 Cook Street be approved with the following changes:

- increase the building setback facing Pandora Avenue to 4m from the street
- revise the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor units that face the mews to improve liveability
- reconsider the windowless interior dens and bedrooms
- resolve the proposed materials
- consider adding usable roof spaces
- consider revising the articulation of the four-storey building's façade facing Franklin park, and consider the addition of balconies or juliets
- reconsider the width of the alleyway (mews) to increase accessibility.

**Carried (5:3)**

For: Elizabeth Balderston, Brad Forth, Jason Niles, Jessi-Anne Reeves, Stefan Schulson  
(Chair)

Opposed: Pamela Madoff, Carl-Jan Rupp, Karen Sander.

**3. ADJOURNMENT**

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of October 9, 2019 was adjourned at 2:20 pm.

---

Stefan Schulson, Chair