

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY AUGUST 25, 2021**

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

Present: Marilyn Palmer (Chair), Pamela Madoff, Peter Johannknecht, Joseph Kardum, Devon Skinner, Brad Forth, Ruth Dollinger

Absent: Matty Jardine, Ben Smith, Sean Partlow

Staff Present: Charlotte Wain – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Mike Angrove – Senior Planner
Alena Hickman – ADP Secretary

2. MINUTES

Minutes from the Meeting held July 14, 2021.

Motion:

It was moved by Joey Kardum seconded by Devon Skinner, that the minutes from the meeting held July 14, 2021 be approved as presented.

Carried Unanimously

Peter Johannknecht recused himself from Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00173 for 822 Catherine Street.

3. APPLICATIONS

3.1 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00173 for 822 Catherine Street

The proposal is for a six-storey rental building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Carly Abrahams	Aryze Developments
Bianca Bodley	Biophilia Collective
Leigh Stickle	Aryze Developments
Pablo Batista	5468796 Architecture
Sasa Radulovic	5468796 Architecture
Colin Neufeld	5468796 Architecture

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

- measures that can be taken to further improve private amenity space
- transition to the west
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Colin Neufeld provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal and Bianca Bodley provided information on the landscaping plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Is there wheelchair accessibility to the courtyard from the inside of the building?
 - Yes, there is through the front entrance of the building. The back stairs are seen primarily as an exit but can also be used as an access point with a fob.
- Is there a possibility of adding a 4th tree on the south end of Catherine Street?
 - Yes, we can look into it. As long as there is enough room with all the utility lines in the area.
- How do you determine the building to be 3.5 stories?
 - The 3.5 storeys are a designation from the zoning description because the fourth floor is set back. It is a 4-story building by the building permits perspective.
- Is there a reason the parkade is above grade?
 - We are coming in at grade so that allows us to retain as many stalls as possible. A ramp on this site would ease us to use parking to get the grading into the site.
- Can you speak to the windows, and have you thought about how they would be cleaned?
 - The windows facing the west are not required windows and are additional for lighting. They would have exposed fasteners and as a rental, the building maintenance would have access to come remove the screens to have them and the windows cleaned. You could always do tilt and turn windows, but we think this is a better approach.
- What is the rain screen system and what is behind the perforated screen?
 - The perforated screen is just at the windows and then it transitions back to the shingle cladding.
- Was there consideration in dealing with the concrete wall facing neighbours?
 - We pushed it down as far as we could to maintain the parking. The adjacent property will not see a concrete wall, they will be looking at a fence or planting materials.

Panel members discussed:

- Appreciation for the landscape plan
- Extra density could be considered
- Monolithic
- Challenges with integration in the neighbourhood
- Concerns with materiality
- Concern with massing

Motion:

It was moved by Pamela Madoff, seconded by Marilyn Palmer, that the Development Permit Application No. 000173 for 822 Catherine Street and 304 Langford Street does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined.

- The application does not comply with significant policy areas found in the OCP, the 2018 Victoria West Neighbourhood Plan and the Design Guidelines for Development Permit Area 6A- Small Urban Villages.
- The proposal is inconsistent with the Victoria West Neighbourhood Plan which designates the property as Traditional Residential.
- The proposal also does not comply with the design guidelines for Development Permit Area 6A: Small Urban Villages which seeks to establish a strong orientation to streets, with front yard landscape, individual front entries, patios or porches and modulation of facades.
- The proposal does not create compatibility with the adjacent residential neighbourhood through a sensitive transition in building massing, siting and form. The building is monolithic and insensitive to its neighbours.
- The proposal, as presented, is in excess of the FSR allowance for both the Traditional Residential Sub-Area (1.86 FSR vs 1.0) and the Small Urban Village Policy (1.86 FSR vs 1.5)
- The proposal, as presented, is in excess of the total floor area allowance for both the Traditional Residential Sub-Area (1863.11 vs 1002.90) and the Small Urban Village Policy (1863.11 vs 1504.35).

Declined 2:4

For: Pamela Madoff, Marilyn Palmer

Opposed: Devon Skinner, Brad Forth, Ruth Dollinger, Joseph Kardum

Motion:

It was moved by Brad Forth, seconded by Devon Skinner, that the Development Permit Application No. 000173 for 822 Catherine Street and 304 Langford Street be approved with the following changes:

- Reconsider the density in keeping in line with the Small Urban Village, total floor area and number of storeys (1.5 FAR)
- Reconsideration of materiality to better suit the Vic West neighbourhood context
- Reconsideration of the screening method on the western façade
- Improve day lighting into the suites
- Reconsideration of the rear west setback
- Consideration of added 4th tree onto Catherine Street

Carried 4:2

For: Devon Skinner, Brad Forth, Ruth Dollinger, Joseph Kardum
Opposed: Pamela Madoff, Marilyn Palmer

3.2 Development Permit Application No. 000595 for 2848 & 2852 Shelbourne Street

The proposal is for a seven-unit town house building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Eddie Williams
Louis Horvat

Stellar Consulting
Zebra Designs

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

- site planning and street relationship
- building massing
- setbacks
- open space
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Eddie Williams provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Do you have a landscape architect on this project?
 - No.
- Will the house to the south have much overlook from this property?
 - I believe the houses on either side of the property were zoned in the OCP to be redeveloped as townhouses and we have been in consultation with neighbours on either side.
 - We tried to buy the property to the South unfortunately the owners did not want to sell. The current owners understand that in the future their property will become a townhouse. We have left enough space for a future development. We have tried to limit most of the overlook with landscaping.
- Were the neighbours okay with the upper windows looking down into their yards?
 - Yes, the upper most windows are bedroom windows that are for egress.
- Do you have a material board or is it just the rendering?
 - We do not have a material board, just the renderings.
- Is the size of both lots and number of units the same for each?
 - Yes, they are very similar.

- What is the final street section that the final SRW will turn into?
 - It's not yet determined. When the city asks for SRWs they are aimed at adding bike lanes and expanding boulevards. Chances are eventually, we will be left with a building that is 1.3 meters away from that interface. But I don't have a clear answer for what that adjacency will be at this moment.
- Was there any consideration during the design process to shuffle the building closer to the SRW to make room for more visitor parking at the rear?
 - That is a consideration or even splitting the building into two. But we were cautious about encroaching on that 7m setback.
- A question for the planner; how does engineering feel about the SRW?
 - This is a key consideration. Fewer driveway crossings are always encouraged. Engineering has a requirement for driveway crossings to be at a minimum distance from each other and this application meets that, so engineering isn't concerned.
- Is there a location on the property dedicated for recycling?
 - There is no dedicated space besides each individual garage.
- Where would you place exterior heat pumps?
 - The units would be placed on the south side patios. Alternately they could be placed on the roof.
- Was there any consideration given to moving the west entrance which is very disconnected from the street?
 - We did consider that and the orientation of the building considering that entry gives you a long corridor into that suite. We thought it would be more useful to use that extra space in the garage and have some articulation to that building face.
- Was there any discussion on the expression of the Shelbourne Street entry?
 - The intent for the entry was to always face Shelbourne Street. We felt that it brings that pedestrian corridor to the front of the building. Once you turn it to the side you lose the concept of losing a building face that is finished and ready for a few from the street.
- Is there something more that can be done to express that elevation?
 - Nothing has been considered.
- Can you clarify if there is any stonework on the building?
 - The stonework is on the columns for the canopies that cover the entries.
- Without a landscape architect, how do you ensure quality control to the City that the landscaping is done to the drawings and according to the nurse standards?
 - I don't think we need a landscape architect; I think an architect has the ability to do that.
- A question to the Planner; How does the City guarantee the quality of landscape installation on such a large volume project without a landscape architect?

- The Parks Department have required a certified arborist to be put on the project.

Panel members discussed:

- Reconsideration of east side elevation
- Concern for limited parking options
- Concern with lack of landscape architect

Motion:

It was moved by Devon Skinner, seconded by Joseph Kardum, that the Development Permit with Variances Application No. 000595 for 2848 and 2852 Shelbourne Street be approved with the following changes:

- Reconsider additional options on the east side elevation on Shelbourne Street to improve interface with the street
- Reconsideration of increasing setbacks to the west and south
- Reconsideration of the tree type on the south property line to favour an upright columnar type to provide more screening year round
- Consider finding space for visitor parking.

Carried 5:2

For: Devon Skinner, Brad Forth, Marilyn Palmer, Joseph Kardum, Peter Johannknecht
Opposed: Ruth Dollinger, Pamela Madoff

5. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of August 25, 2021 was adjourned at 3:15 pm.

Marilyn Palmer, Chair