

**MINUTES OF THE  
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY SEPTEMBER 25, 2019**

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

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

**Absent for a  
Portion of the Meeting:** Sorin Birliga, Marilyn Palmer, Roger Tinney

**Staff Present:** Jim Handy – Senior Planner  
Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design  
Katie Lauriston – Administrative Assistant

**2. MINUTES**

**Minutes from the Meeting held August 28, 2019**

**Motion:**

It was moved by Pamela Madoff seconded by Elizabeth Balderston, that the minutes from the meeting held August 28, 2019 be adopted as amended.

**Carried Unanimously**

**3. APPLICATIONS**

**3.1 Development Permit Application No. 000550 for 359-369 Tye Road  
(Dockside Green)**

The City is considering a Development Permit Application to construct three residential towers at Dockside Green. The towers would front Tye Road and increase in height from north to south, from 13 storeys to 16 storeys.

Applicant meeting attendees:

DIRK BUTTJES	BUTTJES ARCHITECTURE INC.
GARRY YOSHIZAWA	BUTTJES ARCHITECTURE INC.
JIM RALPH	BOSA DEVELOPMENT
SAMANTHA JAMES	BOSA DEVELOPMENT
MARIA WOOD	BOSA DEVELOPMENT
DARRYL TYACKE	ETA LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

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

- building massing and articulation, with particular emphasis on the 16-storey tower and the elevations of the 13-storey and 14-storey towers facing east, towards the greenway
- design of tower tops, with particular emphasis on the 16-storey tower

- design and prominence of street walls, with particular emphasis on the elevations facing east towards the greenway.

Dirk Buttjes provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Darryl Tyacke provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- will the proposed riverbed feature include water?
  - yes, it will be similar to the existing water feature at the adjacent properties at 373-379 Tyee Road
- would the water feature connect to the adjacent property's water feature?
  - the two water features will not connect, but they will be visually united
- how does the Galloping Goose trail connect to the proposed greenway?
  - the greenway extends to the north, where the regional trail connects to Harbour Road
- is the only access to the greenway from the main cascade stairs?
  - the cascading stairs are one entry; dockside crescent at the corner of Tyee and Esquimalt Roads provides additional access
- what uses are envisioned at the ground level units along the greenway and beside the stair?
  - amenity spaces including a social room and fitness room are proposed
  - residential units along the greenway have patio spaces fronting the waterway
- how can someone using a wheelchair or stroller access the plaza from the greenway?
  - there are access points to the north, and to the south towards the end of the building at 359 Tyee Road there is a connection up to the road
- is there no accessible route closer to the main plaza stairs?
  - no
- are there any time or use restrictions on the 16 parking spaces flanking the playground area?
  - there are no changes proposed to the existing parking, including the existing commercial spaces
  - a stair across the retaining wall will connect the playground to the parking
- what is the design rationale for the suspended lighting in the plaza, and how will the proposed system work?
  - the catenary lighting is inspired by a street in Kansas City, and will create magical, festive atmosphere with decorative pools of light
  - the lights are secured to the building edges to keep the ground clear of poles, and the power cables are separate from the suspension cables
- was it considered to complete the end plaza in this phase of development?
  - this was considered; however, the project phases are already approved and the plaza is part of a subsequent phase
- will the end plaza be completed with the townhouse block or with the next set of towers?
  - it will be completed with the commercial section, hopefully soon
- what parts of the buildings' design speaks to the sense of place?
  - the design guidelines are quite elaborate and many are specific to the site and to the neighbourhood

- the guideline for industrial and maritime materials are reflected in the buildings' metal trellis structures
- the material resembling corten steel references the shipyard and the old industrial character of the neighbourhood
- are there restrictions on the use of the buildings?
  - Jim Handy clarified that the permitted uses are defined in the site's zoning rather than through design guidelines
  - the intent of the zone is primarily for residential towers
  - limited retail is allowed on the Dockside site; however, it is primarily focussed at the corner of Tyee and Esquimalt Roads and is not intended to compete with the Westside plaza
- what uses are proposed which would activate the plazas?
  - there will be continuous circulation of many people living in Vic West; not only residents of the towers but also those looking to access downtown from Vic West
  - the commercial component will also drive some of this traffic within the plazas
- was additional storage space for units considered?
  - there is limited space per unit, but as much storage as possible has been provided
  - storage is limited due to the limitations on excavating the site
  - there is a substantial bicycle storage area that meets parking requirements
- is the intent to apply for building permits for all three towers at once, or will the tower construction be phased?
  - all three towers will be constructed at the same time, although they may receive occupancy at different times
- what is proposed for the tops of the towers?
  - one of the three towers has a different tenure and is treated differently from the other two towers; it has a more extruded tower form and does not step back
- are the materials for all three towers primarily concrete and glass above the podium?
  - yes, all three towers are primarily concrete except for their bases
- what is the vision of how circulation occurs on site, and in relation to future phases?
  - future phases are not part of this application but are detailed in the design guidelines
  - the future commercial component will have a large staircase with elevators connecting to the plaza.

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the proposed landscape plan
- need to ensure accessibility throughout the site, particularly for the main plaza, to allow for wheelchairs, bicycles, etc.
- concern for the lack of animation in the plaza
- opportunity for limited, mid-block commercial use to bring activity through the plaza
- the need for diversity of use to build community; opportunity to reconsider the allowable uses
- concern for the lack of storage for residents
- appreciation for view from plaza down onto the greenway

- appreciation for the greenway character and environmental aesthetic achieved with the proposed landscaping materials
- lacking a sense of completion with the proposed phasing of the plaza
- appreciation for the corten steel material, which harkens to some historical character, but its application is limited to the podium level
- desire for a more authentic materiality
- opportunity for a more lively colour scheme
- need to hold the rental building to the same level of design as the other two towers
- desire for a greater sense of place through an architectural language and materials palette that are informed by the design guidelines, particularly for the middle and upper portions of each tower
- opportunity for penthouse units by stepping back the towers' upper storeys
- opportunity for more progressive sustainability features
- lack of bold building manipulation
- the need for more than balconies to provide recesses and projections
- opportunity for the attention to detail on the podium level to be carried through to the rest of each tower
- opportunity to make a statement with a penthouse level
- the importance of the location and the towers' effect on the skyline
- desire to see the Dockside Green area continue in the same direction as the earlier stages of development.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Marilyn Palmer, seconded by Jason Niles, that Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000550 for 359, 363 and 369 Tyee Road does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined, and the key areas that should be revised include:

- a) clarify and architecturally express the sustainability objectives in function and design
- b) ensure a bold manipulation of building form through massing and articulation, with particular attention to the third residential tower
- c) ensure accessibility in the site circulation
- d) provide more storage for each residential unit
- e) provide more authentic use of materials, particularly at the ground level
- f) consider other uses allowable within the zone to animate the public realm.

**Carried Unanimously**

**3.2 Rezoning Application No. 00701 and Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 00236 for 1314-1318 Wharf Street**

The City is considering a Rezoning and Heritage Alteration Permit Application to construct a commercial redevelopment of two existing heritage buildings with a four-storey rental residential rooftop addition.

Applicant meeting attendees:

ADIRAN POLITANO  
SHANE OLSKSIUK  
JUAN PEREIRO

DIALOG  
DIALOG  
RELIANCE PROPERTIES LTD.

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 relationship between the public realm and proposed building rehabilitation and additions
- the overall massing and scale of the application as viewed from the water and as experienced along Wharf Street.

*Roger Tinney joined the meeting at 1:50pm.*

Adrian Politano provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- is the alleyway between the buildings accessible, and what CPTED features were considered?
  - the intent is for the alleyway to be open and accessible during business hours and not accessible when the businesses are closed
- why is no parking proposed?
  - public metered parking was considered for the site to the north, but this is City-owned land and its design is not yet finalized
  - if the neighbouring site to the north is developed, there would be a possibility to share underground parking
  - if there is any question of heritage retention vs. parking, heritage considerations take precedence
  - loading and unloading for the businesses takes place in two stalls by the Wharf Street connection
- what is the rationale for the size of the units, specifically the large 2-bedroom units and the relatively small family units?
  - the developer is working on a number of projects with compact layouts and moveable furniture; the size of the family units is reasonable
  - the three-bedroom units have wall beds for increased flexibility in the space, and the smaller size helps with affordability
- are the units market rental?
  - yes
- is any part of the green roof accessible to all residents?
  - no, but the four upper corner units have rooftop patio spaces
  - the use of the roof is limited by the height restriction as well as ventilation requirements for the food service envisioned on the main floor
- what is the design rationale for the material above the Fraser warehouse building?
  - over the last 10 years, nearly every permutation of materials has been explored; the materials are now quite neutral to have a wider appeal
  - a darker material is intended to make the building stand out without being jarring
- how will the patio along the back of the buildings function?
  - the commercial space on Wharf Street will connect through the atrium to the patio level
  - a two-storey space is carved out at the rear of the building to provide views of the heritage building's masonry
  - service facilities for the commercial space will be located along Wharf Street

- is the patio intended to be active during the day and restricted at night?
  - yes, the location of residential spaces above supports this intended use
- the buildings seem isolated; will the site to the north be developed?
  - it is unknown at this point whether the City would develop the property to the north
  - the intent for the south side of the building is to provide an active use and eyes on Reeson Park
- how close to the existing building could a neighbouring development be constructed?
  - the heritage building is located at the property line, so a neighbouring building could theoretically be built directly adjacent to the north; however, it is hoped that there would be sufficient distance left at the ground level to reveal the warehouse's heritage façade
  - the residential units' windows on the upper floors are designed to be nonessential, and can be closed off without significantly impacting liveability
- until plans for the adjacent site to the north are finalized, there will be a patio space that dead ends towards the water. Was consideration given to connecting the pathway around the site in the interim?
  - the interim conditions of the waterfront path and its connection to the site to the north are currently under discussion
- what is the reasoning for the relatively small residential units?
  - a number of factors have led to the current configuration, including density, proportionate spaces and liveability
  - the oddly-proportioned site limits unit configurations and lends itself to longer, narrower units
  - there is an emphasis on two frontages to minimize noise and to maximize views to the Inner Harbour
  - the balconies along Wharf Street also help to buffer street noise
- what is the size of the smallest unit?
  - the smallest unit is 403 sq. ft.
- will the building remain rental in perpetuity?
  - yes, a covenant is registered on title to ensure rental and to not allow short-term rentals
- where will residents store belongings, particularly those living in family units?
  - there is very limited space; however, the units provide as much storage as possible
- is there any opportunity for the commercial units to more directly interact with the alleyway, perhaps through carving out some of the wall?
  - new openings with direct access to the commercial units can be considered
  - there will be a lot of activity in the alleyway with the proposed design, as key functions require the use of the alleyway (e.g. garbage disposal).

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the architecture, creativity on the site, and clearly laid out plans
- appreciation for the heritage buildings being bookended by modern components, respecting the heritage components without being captive to it
- recognition of the success of the rear reveal to the heritage building
- need to ensure adequate drainage from residential balconies
- the proposal provides access to light, air, and views

- desire for further storage for residential units, so that storage does not spill onto the balconies
- opportunity for carshare arrangement for residents
- desire for larger residential units to improve liveability
- recognition of the success of the internal laneway and connectivity to waterfront
- need to ensure commercial tenants use the space as intended
- concern for the rooftop additions compliance with design guidelines
- opportunity for further separation between the additions and the heritage-designated Fraser building.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Carl-Jan Rupp, seconded by Marilyn Palmer, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Rezoning Application No. 00701 for 1314 & 1318 Wharf Street be approved with the following changes:

- consider maintaining the rooftop pediment of the Caire and Grancini warehouse by lifting the ceiling height of the ground floor addition above it
- consider increasing opportunities for individual, secure storage for residential units
- explore opportunities with the City for lay-by parking/drop-off, loading and off-site rideshare.

**Carried**

For: Elizabeth Balderston, Sorin Birliga, Brad Forth, Jason Niles, Marilyn Palmer, Jessi-Anne Reeves, Carl-Jan Rupp, Karen Sander, Stefan Schulson, Roger Tinney

Opposed: Pamela Madoff

*Marilyn Palmer left the meeting at 3:05pm.*

**3.3 Rezoning Application No. 00699 and Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances Application No. 00018 for 1306-1330 Broad Street / 615-625 Johnson Street / Parts of 622 and 630 Yates Street (Duck's Block)**

The City is considering a Rezoning and Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances Application for the rehabilitation a registered heritage building to be converted into a hotel along with the construction of two, six-storey additions at the north and south ends of the existing building. A rezoning and OCP amendment application is required to increase the density and height in order to facilitate the proposal in addition to the heritage alteration permit.

Applicant meeting attendees:

BYRON CHARD  
JEFF GRIFFITHS  
CHARLES KIERULF  
SCOTT MURDOCH  
BRUCE JOHNSON  
PETER KURAN

CHARD DEVELOPMENT  
CHARD DEVELOPMENT  
DHK ARCHITECTS  
MURDOCH DE GREEF  
RJC  
UVIC PROPERTIES

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 relationship between the ground floor and the pedestrian realm on Johnson Street in terms of activating that frontage
- the relationship between the fourth floor cornice line on the new south building addition and the existing entablature on the adjacent heritage building in terms of being complementary to the existing context
- the overall scale of the proposal in relation to the Old Town neighbourhood context and general fit within Broad Street.

Byron Chard provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal and Scott Murdoch provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- what is the rationale for the proposed architecture, particularly along Broad Street?
  - previous iterations were more conservative, almost derivative in their interpretation of the design guidelines
  - there are now some slightly bolder moves proposed
- the interface between the sidewalks and the commercial units appears less friendly to pedestrians; was different articulation considered?
  - the commercial units are not yet fully programmed out with the building operator
  - the corner unit is envisioned as a restaurant, but the slab is not at the same level as Johnson Street
- was the addition of public art considered for the southern façade of the new building?
  - this has been discussed but is not currently proposed

*Sorin Birliga left the meeting at 3:40 pm.*

- is the green roof accessible?
  - no
- what is the view from the upper units' rear windows?
  - these windows have views to the laneway and to the sky above
  - double-height windows open towards the garden
- Alley with rubble wall –is this flush with brick above?
- would the proposed upper wall be flush with the existing rubble wall?
  - a cornice would cap the rubble wall, and the new wall would be set back slightly from the rubble wall
- what would the original surface material have been for the laneway?
  - likely the lane would have been cobbled; however, it is presently stamped concrete
- is a gate proposed for the laneway?
  - no
  - the laneway is currently partially private, but through this application the City will gain the full right-of-way
- can vehicles turn around in the laneway?
  - yes, a small hammerhead space is available to turn around

- how would the use and safety of the laneway be ensured?
  - the laneway provides access to valet parking so hotel staff would have eyes on the street
  - lighting and separate surface treatment for pedestrian walkways are proposed for safety
- would hotel guests also use the laneway?
  - yes
- was the addition of street furniture considered along Broad Street?
  - seating was considered for the restaurant at the corner of Broad and Johnson Streets, but there is not enough room to ensure pedestrian circulation
- will public street parking be used for valet parking?
  - this would not likely be supported; instead, dedicated short-term parking is being considered
- was landscaping along the laneway considered?
  - this has not been considered
  - the laneway is only about 7.3m wide, which leaves limited room for landscaping in addition to separated paths for pedestrians and vehicles
- was an oriel window or hanging bay window considered at the corner of Broad and Johnson Streets?
  - this was considered in earlier iterations, where the corner of the building was chamfered to create a three-storey entry feature
  - a bay window approach is now proposed to wrap around the corner
  - further exploration of the bay window as an architectural feature can be considered
- were inset entries considered for the storefronts along Broad Street?
  - a continuous street frontage is desired.

Panel members discussed:

- the proposal's consistency with the design guidelines
- the proposal's conservative design, and opportunity for a bolder statement
- caution against blending into the context
- the design's success in showcasing the heritage building
- the importance of the material palette and attention to detailing for the new buildings
- no concerns with the proposed height or density
- opportunity for increased height at the corner of Johnson and Broad Streets, to mitigate the effect of one height across the site
- the success of the rooftop addition's setback in mitigating the effect of one height across the site
- the proposed hotel use eliminates earlier concerns for the liveability of suites
- opportunity for a more significant architectural corner feature at Broad and Johnson Streets
- need for a hierarchy of building entrances to visually clarify the hotel entryway
- opportunity to improve the relationship at ground level between the heritage building and the new building
- opportunity for a sidewalk café along Johnson Street to animate the street space and to soften the edge caused by the change in grade

- concern for the narrow sidewalk width along Johnston Street; need to ensure pedestrian flow and activity along the street
- opportunity for soft landscaping features along the laneway
- desire for further planted areas visible from the public realm
- opportunity for greater separation for the cornice from the rubble wall
- concern for the proposed stamped concrete, particularly in relation to the rubble wall
- opportunity to explore the addition of an iconic sign feature
- the restaurant could be relocated down Broad Street to help resolve the ground level design issues caused by the change in grade along Johnson Street

**Motion:**

It was moved by Stefan Schulson, seconded by Jason Niles, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Rezoning Application No. 00699 and Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances Application No. 00018 for 1306-1330 Broad Street / 615-625 Johnson Street / Parts of 622 and 630 Yates Street be approved with consideration to the following items:

- consider refining the architectural expression and windows at the corner of Broad and Johnson Streets to increase the building corner's street presence
- increase the visibility of the rooftop landscaping from the public realm, particularly at locations where the building steps back
- add an additional level of detail to the proposed additions to address the relationship at the street level between the storefronts and the public realm
- pay particular attention to the material choices and details to be consistent with the quality and design ethos commensurate with the heritage-designated Duck's Building
- reconsider the paving material in the alleyway and consider integrating soft landscaping.

**Carried**

For: Elizabeth Balderston, Brad Forth, Jason Niles, Jessi-Anne Reeves, Carl-Jan Rupp, Karen Sander, Stefan Schulson

Opposed: Pamela Madoff

**4. ADJOURNMENT**

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of September 25, 2019 was adjourned at 4:20 pm.

---

Stefan Schulson, Chair