

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY JULY 22, 2020**

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

Present: Marilyn Palmer (Chair), Brad Forth, Joseph Kardum, Devon Skinner, Sean Partlow, Ben Smith, Ruth Dollinger, Trish Piwowar

Absent: Matty Jardine

Absent for Portion: Marilyn Palmer, Trish Piwowar

Staff Present: Charlotte Wain – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Chelsea Medd – Planner
Alena Hickman – Secretary

2. APPLICATIONS

2.1 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00130 for 1150 Cook Street

The City is considering a Development Permit with Variance Application for a 16-storey, mixed use building with ground-floor retail and residential above, including 129 dwelling units.

Applicant meeting attendees:

DANIEL ROBBINS	SAKURA DEVELOPMENTS
TOM STANISZKIS	ARCHITECT
MICHAEL MARCUCCI	TALBOT MACKENZIE & ASSOCIATES

Sean Partlow recused himself from Application No.00130 for 1150 Cook Street

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

- building separation distances
- relationship to the street
- building setback and street trees
- overall expression of the building, with particular attention to the roof termination
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Tom Staniszis provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Why do some of the smaller units have no balconies?
 - All units have Juliette style balconies, the two-bedroom units have balconies
- Did you considered planter boxes on some of the smaller roof decks to contain trees?
 - Yes, but there is very limited access for that to be maintained by the strata, there is no direct access to that level from the core.
- Are you adding new trees on View Street?
 - Yes
- Was it purposeful to have no colour incorporated into the building?
 - Yes, the colour pallet is deliberate
- What drove the decision for the amenity space to be on the south west corner?
 - That space was available. It was a good location because we have exposure to a lot of sunlight. This gives opportunity for planting options as well.
- Are you concerned about bird safety on the roof because of your choice of glass?
 - The glass is translucent not transparent so there should not be an issue.
- What thought was given to the treatment of soffit at street level?
 - We have the concrete curb and the painted white panels, the under side of the soffit there is about 15ft wide. The transformer needs to be accessible from the street. We will also have planters along the edge will also help break it up.
- Did you look at other types of materiality other than the glazing for the top of the roof and screening purposes?
 - We spent a lot of time dealing with this element. There is a roof behind it, we didn't want to step it back. There are only so many different types of materials to use, we could possibly extend the glazing, that is an option.
- Did you consider safety issues around the bike locker space on the ground floor?
 - Each room is separate which is typical, this limits the amount of people and bikes per space. There will also be surveillance cameras in all public spaces. We could glaze these walls for more privacy.
- Can you speak to any sustainability components?
 - We are using the Juliette balconies to limit concrete slabs. Other balconies are elevated and supported by steal brackets, so we are able to insulate building edges and add exterior insulation to walls.
- There are some direct interfaces, are there windows on that buildings east facing wall?
 - Yes, a couple small windows.
- Has there been any thought given to that south unit and that south interface, since there may be another development come up in time?

- We would expect that they would require the same setbacks as we have, the space is not unreasonable.
- Have you looked at other ways of highlighting the termination of the building given that you are requesting the building be so much taller?
 - We did explore several options; the only other reasonable option would be to step it back.

Panel members discussed:

- Concern with termination at the top of the building.
- Concern with extension of the building structure and the parapet.
- Appreciation for the design of the building.
- Concern with the colour pallet.
- Satisfied with the streetscape.
- Would like to see some tree planters on the amenity room patio.
- Appreciation for the massing of the podium.
- Would like to see the amenity room moved to Cook street side.
- Lack of texture on the podium.
- Like the corner with upgraded paving of the landscaping and would like to see to stretched further.
- Better integration with neighbourhood.
- Concern with the trees facing units on level two and three.
- Consider the re-design of the bike area.
- Further design refinement.

Motion:

It was moved by Brad Forth, seconded by Ruth Dollinger, that the Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00130 for 1150 Cook Street be approved with the following changes:

- give further consideration and refinement to the detailing of the parapet railing, overall brightness and better integration to the overall building design.
- consideration for safety of ground floor and design of bike rooms.
- reconsideration of amenity space and locating it to help animate the Cook street frontage.
- consider the addition of trees in planters on the amenity room patio.
- consider revisions to paving to help enhance entrance.
- the applicant to ensure the accuracy of the street trees to ensure their successful retention.
- further review and relaxation of setbacks to the south to improve livability of the south facing units to give them a balcony or an oblique view.
- additional consideration for mechanical room to be integrated into overall building design and materiality.
- regulate or standardize the size and pattern and colour of the metal panels.

Ruth Dollinger recused herself from DDP00139 for 2800 Bridge Street

2.2 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00139 for 2800 Bridge Street

The proposal is for a raw materials receiving and storage facility (silo).

Applicant meeting attendees:

STEPHEN HAY	RALMAX
CHRIS FOYD	BO-FORM (DESIGNER)

Charlotte Wain (on Leanne Taylors' behalf) provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application and the areas that Council is seeking advice on, including the following:

- building height and viewscales across the harbour
- light art display on north elevation
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Stephen Hay provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Did you research the ombre perforated panel systems?
 - No, we were encouraged to embrace the industrial aspects.
- Will the LED's be on timers?
 - We are currently working with the designer, there will be a cut-off point. We don't want to create light pollution, but it is TBD.
- What is the structure inside that will support the cladding?
 - It's a steal structure that also holds the roof.
- Does the cladding start above ground?
 - Yes, for a visual aspect.
- Did you look at having more openings in the screen? Or is there reason for the complete closure.
 - The way these are assembled are not pleasant looking. We only have control of the outside of the prefabricated metal, which is why.
- What is the finished material?
 - Prefinished aluminium, with a light grey metallic finish.
- Is there any control of what could be done in the future with the lights?
 - This lighting system can really do anything so there are a lot of options once it's in place.
- Is this considered signage, or are there restrictions with these lights?
 - Yes, before it goes to Council, I assume the City would make some documentation on it.

- Is there a reason why the shrouding became a box?
 - Yes, it's not a round silo like most, it's rectangular.
- Have you reviewed this proposal with the neighbourhood?
 - Yes, it was the neighbourhood and Burnside/Gorge Land Use Committee that came up with the light idea.
- Is there opportunity to use the same material on the east and west sides?
 - Yes, but there is a massive added cost and we wanted to stick with those specific sides to tell a story.
- How will you manage the slope of the roof and the rainwater?
 - The rainwater structures are on the inside of the structure. You will see one pipe through the perforated panel.
- Was there any consideration to not having it fully screened?
 - The designer lifted the skirt at ground level to allow visibility. The perforated screens were also chosen for that reason.

Panel members discussed:

- Ensuring limited hours of light operation.
- Would like to see more angles to the wall and other aspects to make the proposal more interesting.
- Redesign of openings and exposure on screen.
- Appreciation for the care and attention put into this project.
- Appreciation for the idea of it being celebratory during events within the City.

Motion:

It was moved by Devon Skinner, seconded by Trish Piwowar that Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00139 for 2800 Bridge Street be approved as presented:

Opposed: Brad Forth, Joe Kardum

For: Marilyn Palmer, Devon Skinner, Trish Piwowar, Sean Partlow and Ben Smith

Carried 5:2

Marilyn Palmer & Ruth Dollinger recused themselves from DDP000532

2.3 Development Permit Application No. 000532 for 496-498 Cecelia Road and 3130 Jutland Road

The proposal is for a five-storey, mixed-use building consisting of ground floor community-oriented uses and residential uses on the upper floors, and a four-storey, multi-unit residential building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

CHRISTINE LINTOTT
BEV WINDJACK
LAUREN ANTIFEAU

CHRISTINE LINTOTT ARCHITECTS INC
LDR LANDSCAPING
TL HOUSING SOLUTIONS

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

- heritage context
- design of the ground floor of the mixed-use building
- community and residential entryways
- private amenity space for residents
- application of building materials
- open spaces and landscaping
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Christine Lintott provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal. Bev Windjack provided the panel with a landscaping overview

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Has the parking been run through the fire department?
 - Yes, the fire access route is completely outside of that parking area and meets access requirements for the BC building code.
- Was any consideration given to additional glazing or articulation to the North Elevation of building A and the lower ground floor on the West elevation?
 - With the lower elevation there are space separation requirements that we must meet. Because we are exiting down, we must protect that exit path. The North face has an overlook and is adjacent to the South elevation of building B so we were careful with our placement of windows. Plantings were also introduced to both.
- Was there ever any thought to bringing the five-storey building up to six storeys?
 - One of the things that was considered was the heritage asset and how the massing of the proposal provided would fit. We could have done six storeys but think that five storeys work best.
- How are the fiber cement panels attached, and are the reveals between them going to be the same colours?
 - They're hidden fasteners. Yes, the colours will all be the same.
- The adjacent walkway to the gate at the children's play area is not separated, is there an opportunity to add a buffer?
 - We have a screen for a visual barrier but wanted to keep that screen as open as possible.
- Was there discussion to any shading in the children's play area?
 - No, we haven't. It will be customized to the provider for whatever they decide.
- There is a perforated guard, do you presume you will have any issues with children trying to climb this?
 - The perforations will not be climbable.
- Would you consider increasing some of the lawn area and reduce the mulch beds?
 - Yes, it could be considered.

Panel members discussed:

- Appreciate the thoughtfulness of the project
- East side of the play area is uncomfortable without a buffer
- Concern with no shading in the south facing daycare play area
- Appreciate the though put into the fiber cement panels
- Accent colours are nice
- Screens have great thoughtfulness
- The path on building B could have more landscaping
- Maybe a community garden bed between the fruit trees

Motion:

It was moved by Joe Kardum, seconded by Devon Skinner that Development Permit Application No. 000532 for 496-498 Cecelia Road and 3130 Jutland Road be approved with the following changes:

- Provide a landscape buffer between public walkway and daycare play area.
- Provide shading to the daycare play area compatible with landscape plan and building architecture.
- Additional landscaping along the side of building B.
- Increase lawn area and reduce mulch bed with consideration for community gardening boxes.
- Planters along side of building A to soften appearance of plaza space.
- Consideration for additional materiality of ground floor and inclusion of warmer, natural materials with richer textures around building focal points.

Carried Unanimously

2.4 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 000569 for 2440 and 2448 Richmond Road

The proposal is for a two, three-storey multi-family residential buildings with 11 rental units in each building (22 units' total).

Applicant meeting attendees:

CAM PRINGLE
JOE NEWELL

CADILLAC DEVELOPMENTS
JOE NEWELL ARCHITECT INC.

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

- fit with existing and future context
- landscaping
- ground floor windows

- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Joe Newell provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- How are the cement panels attached?
 - The panels are flush nailed and then filled and painted over, no exposed fasteners.
- Were you asked to use specific colours?
 - The accent panels were our original design, City staff asked us to put the accent colour on the front doors.
- Is there a reason the rooflines are cut-off?
 - It was done to reduce the overall height and in keeping with building B on the south side.
- Why did you decide to go with the roof projection over the doors?
 - To protect the doors from the elements.
- Why did the developer decide on two buildings instead of only one?
 - They wanted to go with two smaller buildings to be in keeping with the neighbourhood. The client also wanted to keep the buildings on two separate properties.
- Why don't the sleeping areas of the ground floor units have windows?
 - There are corner windows for each ground floor units. We could put piano windows to add more light and as well as keeping privacy. We are also very limited on space, so that plays a role.
- Can you explain the intended demographic for these buildings?
 - Workforce, anyone that works nearby. They could now live in the area they work. There are a lot of hospital employees that currently live out of town because that is what they can afford.
- What are the rental rates per square foot?
 - I'm not sure.
- Can you identify the mailbox location?
 - Yes, the mailboxes are surface mounted on both entrance doors.
- What is the clearance for someone with mobility issues in that adaptable suite on the ground floor?
 - The bed area and kitchen would have to be changed out to make it accessible.
- In between the buildings what will the rock garden area be made from?
 - It is intended to be river rock with some driftwood.

Panel members discussed:

- Concern about glazing of ground level windows
- Appreciation for the landscaping design
- Appreciate the Juliette balconies
- Desire to see a pitched roof
- Dislike of colour palate on both buildings
- Desire to see this as a one large apartment building, instead of two smaller ones.

Motion:

It was moved by Joe Kardum, seconded by Ben Smith that Development Permit Application No. 000569 for 2440 and 2448 Richmond does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined and that the key areas that should be revised include:

- The project as presented does not fit the current or future character and context of the neighbourhood.
- reconsider the massing and two-building approach to better utilize the site while providing meaningful landscape options. If a two-building approach is pursued, then it will require a different expression than what was presented at this current meeting.
- Reconsideration of the rooflines of the project.
- Increase the landscaping between the west side of the site and the existing neighbours.
- Ensure adequate accessible handicap parking.
- Increase the glazing to improve the livability of ground floor units.

Carried Unanimously

3. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of July 22, 2020 was adjourned at 5:12 pm.

Marilyn Palmer, Chair