

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 26, 2020**

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

Present: Sorin Birliga, Jessi-Anne Reeves, Carl-Jan Rupp,
Karen Sander, Stefan Schulson, Elizabeth
Balderston, Brad Forth

Absent: Marilyn Palmer

**Absent for a
Portion of the Meeting:** Pamela Madoff, Jason Niles

Staff Present: Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Charlotte Wain – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Leanne Taylor – Senior Planner
Alec Johnston – Senior Planner
Alena Hickman – Secretary

2. MINUTES

Minutes from the Meeting held January 22, 2020

Motion:

It was moved by Karen Sander, seconded by Jason Niles, that the minutes from the meeting held January 22, 2020 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

Note: Discussion to bring in Adam Fox in for the next Meeting to review Design Panel Guidelines.

3. APPLICATIONS

**3.1 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00133 for 1124
Vancouver Street, 941 and 953 View Street**

The City is considering a Rezoning application for a 6-storey rental apartment building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

ROBERT CICCOZZI
SANDRO MANCINI
PETER KREUK

CICCOZZI ARCHITECTURE INC.
CICCOZZI ARCHITECTURE INC.
DURANTE KREUK LANDSCAPING

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

- built form, massing and building separation
- façade articulation and finishes

- the raised residential entrances and activation of the public realm
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Robert Ciccozzi provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Peter Kreuk provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- is there more information on the crust layer mentioned under the parkade?
 - there is a crust level approximately 3ft below the surface. Below that, there is a level of unstable soft fill. The proposal would stay above the crust level, which is another reason for the wood frame building, it is much lighter
- what was the thought process behind the internal windowless bedrooms?
 - the internal bedrooms have a sliding glass door to bring in more light from the unit
- was there an option to have fewer, large units?
 - the intent was to keep units smaller to keep them affordable
- are there any provision to deal with storm water?
 - storm water would be managed within the public realm
- can the landscaper confirm the species of the tree replacements?
 - it's usually up to the City of Victoria Parks Department to determine placement of the species
- because future development can't be predicted, is the assumption that the courtyard will be "sunny" until it is not?
 - yes
- are there accessible units on the ground floor?
 - yes
- are those accessible units on the south side of the courtyard?
 - yes
- do the accessible units differ in spec from the rest of the units?
 - yes, because they are designed specifically for accessibility, but they have all the same finishes
- are Modo memberships going to be transferred over to residents?
 - that remains to be seen
- will the Modo cars be strictly for residents use or will there be neighbourhood cars as well?
 - that has not been discussed.
- what is the height of the building across on Vancouver street that is currently being developed?
 - ten storeys
- why did the architect decide to go with a smaller building?
 - for geotechnical reasons. We really wanted to stay with the wood frame building
- what is the site coverage of this building?
 - 87%
- are there renderings of a street view from inside of one of the units?
 - not currently
- is the bike storage glass or mixed materials?
 - it is mixed materials. Metal panels and mesh so it is a lightweight structure, with gates on both sides
- please explain the sun control on the balconies.

- there is a small metal frame that comes out along the sides of the balcony
- is there any idea of how much sun control you will get out of that thin structure?
 - from the east in the morning it will give the unit a small amount of shadow. Creating some character was important, but the panels cannot protrude too far
- where are the access points to the courtyard for tenants?
 - the entrances at the end of each corridor, they are on grade to the courtyard
- is this a market rental building?
 - yes
- how is the term “affordable” being defined?
 - it’s defined by having small units
- where is the building storage, how will families be expected to store their belongings?
 - they would have to keep everything in their units
- what type of material is being purposed for your cladding?
 - aluminium composite panelling
- how many units in the building, and how much parking?
 - 154 units and 41 parking stalls

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the detail and effort put into integrating the street and raised balconies
- appreciation for the rain garden on View street
- concern for a lack of open public space
- disappointment in not utilizing roof space
- appreciation for the unique amenities that are provided
- lack of concept, configuration and design are confusing
- lack of storage and parking
- lack of urban agriculture
- concern with lot coverage being too high at 87%
- need for pedestrian experience
- lack of commercial space
- how the design is not in keeping with Greater Victoria.

Motion:

It was moved by Pamela Madoff, seconded by Jason Niles, that the Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00133 for 1124 Vancouver Street, 941 and 953 View Street does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined as presented with consideration for:

- built form, massing and building separation
- façade articulation and finishes
- the raised residential entrances and activation of the public realm
- livability of units
- the overall programing of the amenity space, with a need for quality spaces.

Carried Unanimously

3.2 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00135 for 43, 45 & 55 Gorge Road East and 2827, 2829 & 2831 Irma Street

The City is considering a Rezoning Application to increase the density and construct a five-storey, mixed-use building consisting of ground floor commercial and residential uses above.

Applicant meeting attendees:

BARRY WEIH
MEGAN WALKER
CHRIS KARU

WA ARCHITECTS
LADR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS
PC URBAN

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

- relationship with surrounding context
- height and building mass
- building transition
- design of the commercial façade
- application of building materials
- location of garbage and recycling room
- mezzanine for long-term bicycle parking
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

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

Jessi-Anne Reeves left the meeting at 2:00pm

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- was there consideration of storm water treatment with the landscaping?
 - yes, there are permeable spaces
- is tree number 28 on the landscape plan being removed?
 - yes
- why aren't there individual patio openings to the courtyard?
 - to create a safer and more secure courtyard
- please explain the logic around orientation of the courtyard
 - the geometry is narrow in one direction, so we needed to be able to turn that southern corner. The architect had to develop a functioning space.
- what is the relationship with the hospital?
 - currently we don't have one
- would there ever be an option to make the courtyard open to the public?
 - it's best if the courtyard is for private use of the building's residents
- is the Gary Oak on the north east side existing?
 - yes
- has the configuration of the building been constructed to save the Gary Oak tree?
 - yes
- please elaborate on the materials and finishes of the Gorge road and Irma street corner?
 - it was meant to be a focal point and break up the building mass. The material choices were influenced by surrounding buildings. The architect wanted some commercial expression
- what are the grey and white materials on the commercial corner?

- they are the same cementitious panel but different colors.
- was there consideration for a continuous large overhang on the top floor on Gorge road?
 - yes, it felt too large. It looked better to have a small low-profile overhang
- which setback is referred to as the rear?
 - it is the 2.93 meters which is adjacent to the hospital
- is there any street parking in that area?
 - there is some off Irma street
- how does transit tie into the proposal with reduced parking?
 - there are a pair of bus stops on Gorge road and more near Jutland road
- why is there no layby on Gorge road?
 - Gorge is considered a major bicycle route; the plan doesn't support parking along there. The transportation department would need to speak further on that
- is there commercial parking?
 - no. Our intent is that there is overlap in our visitor parking. There will have to be a covenant to ensure that the visitor spots could be used for commercial purposes as the spots are associated with residential uses
- is it one continuous balcony for all units?
 - yes, but there will be privacy screens between units
- please clarify the 6 storeys vs 5 storeys wording
 - yes, the parkade is technically considered a storey

Panel members discussed:

- consideration of the adjacent hospital, and opportunity for commercial institutional use
- desire for the development to have more of an urban village if that's what it's being referred to as
- concern of the quality living space
- appreciation for the courtyard and design
- thoughtfulness of the cafe design
- consideration for more parking on Gorge Street
- concern with the setback variance
- need for space geared towards locals.

Motion:

It was moved by Stefan Schulson, seconded by Karen Sander, that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00720 for 43, 45 and 55 Gorge Road East and 2827, 2829 and 2831 Irma Street be approved with the following considerations:

- Concern about the future success of CRU's with the absence of dedicated parking and layby
- Minimal variance on the rear yard setback and impact on future development

Carried Unanimously

3.3 Development Permit Application No. 000561 for 777 Douglas Street

The City is considering a Development Permit Application for exterior changes to the existing building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| ALAN LOWE | ALAN LOWE ARCHITECT INC. |
| DAVOUD MORADPOURHAFSHEJANA | ALAN LOWE ARCHITECT INC. |
| FRANCIS MAIRET | DOUBLETREE HILTON |

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

- balcony addition and relationship to patio area below and the sidewalk
- cladding material selection and application
- approach to accessibility
- general design approach in terms of adding cohesion to this area
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Mr. Lowe provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- what is on the surface of the roof?
 - it's a flat roof with some rooftop units
- will pedestrians see the units from the street?
 - not any more than they currently do
- was there any attempt to put a ramp on the back side of the proposal?
 - no, because it is very easy to access through the lobby of the hotel
- will there be irrigation in the green wall?
 - yes
- was there any consideration to bring the green wall all the way down to the sidewalk?
 - initially yes, it's not a problem to bring it lower
- what is below the patio?
 - a slotted opening to bring light to the Bartholomew's patio below
- how do all the materials create a cohesive assembly, from a viewpoint on Humbolt street?
 - the brick and stucco tie together behind the trees. The concrete band will stay as is because that is the floor level
- why did the architect decide on a green wall?
 - there was some want to bring some greenery around to Douglas street since there is so much of it on the Humbolt street side
- is there a long-term strategy for the green wall?
 - yes, there is a small one the inside of the hotel to test this out. They are self-contained and we will always have maintenance to care for it
- who is maintaining the fountain on the corner?
 - the hotel

Panel members discussed:

- need to consider a simplistic architectural design

- could be a great opportunity and is missing the mark
- concern with signage
- appreciation for location
- configuration of shape is great and helps circulation
- views from patio are welcoming
- disconnect between materials
- green wall is nice addition
- desire for better building expression
- appreciation of interaction between venues
- desire of knowledge in accessibility from hotel
- need for finishes and materials to be further developed
- consideration for a green roof to appease the eye

Motion:

It was moved by Pamela Madoff, seconded by Karen Sanders, that Development Permit Application No.000561 for 777 Douglas Street does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined. Areas of consideration include:

- Consideration of materiality, it's proportions, relationship to the building and its urban context.

Carried Unanimously

Pam Madoff left the meeting at 3:24pm

3.4 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00140 for 1114 Rockland Avenue

The City is considering a Rezoning Application for a five-storey multi-unit residential building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

HEATHER SPINNEY
CONRAD NYREN
MEGAN WALKER

PRAXIS ARCHITECTS INC
MAGELLAN HOLDINGS LTD
LADR LANDSCAPING

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

- integration with context
- street relationship
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

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

Pam Madoff returned: 3:35pm

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- the neighbours to the west have a 10m separation setback from properties. Why is there not a greater setback on the proposed property?
 - the site is extremely narrow so to have the units be functional we have made it so that we have equal setbacks on either side
- what are the items down the side of the building?
 - they are a form of separation to create privacy between balconies
- is there any proposed use of the backyard area?
 - no
- what material is being used for the privacy screens?
 - metal with a wood pattern
- what is the detailing on the top level (north elevation) at the back units? how is that detail going to work?
 - it's currently to be determined, maybe a framing system.

Pam Madoff and Jason Niles left the meeting at 3:55pm

Panel members discussed:

- concern the proposal is not neighbourly
- concern with on grade parking and bike repair area not being a safe area
- appreciation of the roof garden
- strong building form
- concern with the expression of the building
- concern with liveability
- appreciation of the thoughtfulness put into units
- the unique aspect of this site regarding the heritage houses beside
- appreciation of the architecture at the front entry
- need for better renderings for context
- appreciation of wonderful sustainability aspects

Motion:

It was moved by Sorin Birliga, seconded by Carl-Jan Rupp that Development Permit Application No.000140 for 1114 Rockland Avenue does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined.

- Due to setbacks

Carried

For: Sorin Birliga, Jessi-Anne Reeves, Carl-Jan Rupp, Brad Forth, Karen Sanders
Opposed: Stefan Schulson, Elizabeth Balderston

4. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of February 26, 2020 was adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Stefan Schulson, Chair