

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY MAY 27, 2020**

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

Present: Sorin Birliga, Pamela Madoff, Jason Niles, Jessi-Anne Reeves, Carl-Jan Rupp, Karen Sander, Stefan Schulson, Elizabeth Balderson

Absent: Marilyn Palmer, Brad Forth

Absent for a Portion of the Meeting:

Staff Present: Charlotte Wain – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Jim Handy – Senior Planner
Leanne Taylor – Senior Planner
Alena Hickman – Secretary

2. MINUTES

Minutes from the Meeting held February 26, 2020

Motion:

It was moved by Elizabeth Balderson seconded by Jessi-anne Reeves that the minutes from the meeting held February 26, 2020 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

3. APPLICATIONS

3.1 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00602 for 736 Princess Avenue

The City is considering a Development Permit with Variance Application for a six-storey, mixed-use building consisting of commercial and residential uses

Applicant meeting attendees:

LARRY CECCO

ARCATA CONSULTANTS

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

- blank walls on the north elevation
- relationship between walls and openings

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

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

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- is there any landscaping portion?
 - Only the landscaping on the terraces
- is the bike rack vertical?
 - Yes
- was there consideration that not everyone will be able to use a vertical bike rack?
 - No, that was not consider
- Is there anyway to reconfigure the accessible suite windows on the north west corner for better functionality to not interfere with properly furnishing the suite?
 - Yes, there is some flexibility to reconfigure
- On the north elevation there is a blank wall, why is that necessary?
 - It's on the zero-lot line its an unprotected opening
- Is it important for the building to have a double window rather than one large one on hat west side?
 - No, we can look at changing that
- Has there been any attention given to the construction of the building to minimize light industrial issues like sound transfer?
 - No, we don't see that there is a noise issue at all
- Is there any need for parking other than staff?
 - No
- Are you proposing to put any other vegetation on the roof deck besides containers?
 - No, just containers

Panel members discussed:

- Well thought out presentation
- Appreciation of proposed form and materials
- Compact and efficient spaces
- Concern about the cladding and the reflectiveness
- Displeased with the bike rack only being vertical
- Concern about the layout of accessible units
- Concern with lack of frontage street trees
- Concern about a zero-lot line putting pressure on future developments.

Motion:

It was moved by Sorin Birliga, seconded by Elizabeth Balderson, that the Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00602 for 736 Princess Avenue be approved as presented with consideration for the following comments.

- Consideration of revisions to the accessible North West corner suite
- Concern of introduction of residential units into an M1 Zone in terms of use and site planning

Carried Unanimously

Options

1. That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00602 for 736 Princess Avenue be approved as presented.
2. That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00602 for 736 Princess Avenue be approved with the following changes:
 - as listed by the ADP.
3. That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00602 for 736 Princess Avenue does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined (and that the key areas that should be revised include):
 - as listed by the ADP, if there is further advice on how the application could be improved.

3.2 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00080 for 701 Tye Road

The City is considering a Development Permit with Variance Application for the final phase of the Railyards development and is comprised of two residential buildings above a shared underground parkade.

Applicant meeting attendees:

STEPHANE LAROYE
MEGAN WALKER

LAROYE ARCHITECT INC.
LADR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Jim Handy provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application.

Stephane Laroye 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.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Previously the public plaza was primarily outside the bridge road easement and now is inside, can you comment on that and is it okay that it has moved?
 - The moving of the plaza is still going through its own approval process with the community
- What is the dimension of the open space between the current buildings and phase two?
 - Nine meters
- Did you have a different colour scheme for the smaller building?
 - Initially we wanted to go with charcoal because of phase one and phase two, but we decided to lighten it up with the white
- What is the thought process of how these two buildings come and together and what was your reasoning?
 - The developer believes the wood compliments the other building, but we can look at incorporating materiality better.
- If you illuminate the stairwell red, will it project into the units?
 - I think that is a very good point that they could cast some light across to units.
- Is there green roof?
 - Yes, there is a gathering terrace with resident planters and a dining area
- Between building two and the current property line there is a lot of space. Is there a reason it's not closer?
 - Yes, there is a setback line align that edge.
- Is there an option to ask for a variance on that setback or was there one requested?
 - There is a request for variance on some things, but it could be further discussed with the planning department.
- On the bay street façade plans, they read as flat. Do you envision it as flush or will there be some depth?
 - The developer found that as you cross the bay Street bridge, we anticipate the public being able to see the stairwell. We hoped to project in, with a different density of cladding, which will look significantly different.

Panel members discussed:

- Well considered presentation
- Concern of no termination aspect to the end of this project before the bridge
- Appreciation for the lighting towers
- Concern about the light tower's location
- Dislike of the saturation of one colour on the building
- Hoping the landscape aspect is well thought out
- Confusion of the Vic West entry courtyard and why it's separated
- Appreciation for the roof garden
- Missed opportunity to articulate bay street façade
- Would appreciate resolution of public plaza
- Concern the units will be uncomfortable
- Building two would benefit from have an angled component as to better connect it to Bay Street.
- Increasing courtyard size.

Motion:

It was moved by Carl-Jan Rupp, seconded by Stefan Schulson that Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00080 for 701 Tyee Road be approved with the following changes:

- Reconsideration of the expression of the end of the buildings as a gateway to Vic west and the railyard development, particularly the Bay street façade.
- Consideration of the overall use of materials and finishes, particularly the extensive use of dark colours on Building 2.
- Consideration of the overall architectural expression of the railyard development.
- Reconsideration of the unit layouts to take advantage of views, especially Bay Street and waterfront.
- Consideration of potential light overspill into residential units from the feature stairwell.
- Refinement of Vic West entry courtyard to be more contiguous of with the building entry courtyard.

Carried

For: Sorin Birliga, Carl-Jan Rupp, Brad Forth, Karen Sanders, Stefan Schulson, Elizabeth Balderston, Pamela Madoff

Opposed: Jessi-Anne Reeves

Options

1. That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00080 for 701 Tyee Road be approved as presented.

2. That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00080 for 701 Tyee Road be approved with the following changes:
3. That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 00080 for 701 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:)
 - as listed by the ADP, if there is further advice on how the Application could be improved.

4. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of May 27, 2020 was adjourned at 2:43 pm.

Stefan Schulson, Chair