

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 24, 2021**

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

Present: Marilyn Palmer (Chair), Devon Skinner, Sean Partlow, Ruth Dollinger, Joseph Kardum, Brad Forth, Matty Jardine, Pamela Madoff

Absent: Ben Smith

Staff Present: Charlotte Wain– Senior Planner. Urban Design
Alena Hickman – ADP Secretary

2. MINUTES

Minutes from the Meeting held January 27, 2021

Motion:

It was moved by Ruth Dollinger seconded by Brad Forth, that the minutes from the meeting held January 27, 2021 be approved as presented.

Carried Unanimously

3. MISSING MIDDLE PRESENTATION

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Have you put any thought into how coach houses and laneway houses may fit into these typologies, or is that a separate initiative?
 - The houseplex challenges some of the key goals we have around the neighbourhood pattern of that backyard zone. We are depending as that backyard zone functioning as open space approving livability and is an important space for our urban forest. The objectives that it may help with is this heritage conservation objective. If council chooses pre-zoning for some of these forms, the concern is it then incentivizes people to demolish instead of designating a heritage building and convert. To try and counterbalance that incentive one of the things we are looking at is providing that additional opportunity, so they can designate and convert and in addition to that, allowing a garden suite in the back. We have limited laneways and obviously laneways offer an opportunity for access to those units.
- The graphic slides are of older inventory and it might give a more balanced picture if we could have slides on a current inventory, is that possible?
 - That is a great idea. I think that would be very helpful to show.

- As this evolves it will be interesting to see studies of how to ensure people who own homes as part of the heritage resources will do the conversions, rather than demolish and put up duplexes. When will we see some of these analyses emerge?
 - We are in the process of working through those analyses. We will use the information to have a very informed discussion with Council and a public community discussion in the coming months.
- Will there be an opportunity for this initiative to come back to ADP after it goes to Council and has public comment?
 - Yes.
- Have you thought about how you are going to incentivise this project?
 - That is the core challenge we are dealing with. We would like to incentivise and encourage. On the other hand, we also don't want to give away too much. We want to be careful about maximizing the benefit of the land lift. We have direction from Council to bring considerations for pre-zoning.
- I understand in the City's strategic plan there is reference to the evolution of a City Corporation, is that relevant?
 - That is a completely independent action.

Panel members discussed:

- Mobility challenges
- Demolishing duplexes
- Victoria's mix of housing types makes the city attractive
- Encouragement of adaptive reuse of existing buildings
- Step code and building code
- How to ensure that projects that are developed fall within the price range identified in the missing middle
- Inclusivity
- Accessibility
- Incentivising
- Sustainability
- Floor area and setbacks

Brad Forth recused himself from Application No.000587

4. APPLICATIONS

4.1 Delegated Development Permit Application No. 000587 for 1419 Mallek Crescent

The City is considering the construction for a four-storey, multi-unit residential building consisting of approximately 78 affordable seniors rental units.

Applicant meeting attendees:

BARRY COSGRAVE
EVAN LOCKE

NUMBER TEN ARCHITECTURAL GROUP
NUMBER TEN ARCHITECTURAL GROUP

BRAD FORTH
DAVID MCLEAN
PETER DANIEL

FORESITE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
KIWANIS VILLAGE SOCIETY
WOODBURN MANAGEMENT

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 and massing
- site circulation as it relates to the main entrance
- the building's relationship to Cook Street
- proposed roofline
- application of building materials
- any other aspects the ADP chooses to comment.

Barry Cosgrave provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal. Brad Forth provided the panel with a detailed presentation of the landscaping plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Are the bedrooms wheelchair accessible?
 - The accessible units are. We are using the District of Saanich adaptability housing standards for the rest of the units as well.
- What is the width of the walkway in the rain garden?
 - The walkway was purposefully made a bit wider; it is about 7ft. It is meant to feel generous because it's the main spine through there.
- Did you put more thought into a drop off/pickup or loading zone area with more of a seating area for people to wait?
 - We have provided a family care drop off space next to the main entrance. Because there is existing parking in front of the adjacent building, we didn't want to disrupt that. We didn't want to compromise pulling in off Mallek Crescent either, we wanted to keep that space simple. There is a loading tuck zone on the north side. I think it would be a good idea to put a raised covered seating area out there as well.
- Are the materials you referenced wood siding or vinyl siding with wood grain?
 - It is wood look vinyl siding.
- The parapet level has a very heavy dark band. Have you considered lightening up that colour?
 - Yes, we have been in discussion with the planner and have done another rendition with a lighter colour.
- Have the details been worked out on how to properly mount the guard rails on the cladding?
 - It is a heavy-duty vinyl siding and mounting through it with the railings won't be a problem.

Panel members discussed:

- Appreciation that this type of affordable housing for this demographic is much need
- Appreciation for the gardens
- Would like to see more for the handy-dart round about. Sheltered space should be included
- Prefer the lighter parapet instead of the dark rendering
- Desire for the drop-off area to be developed more
- Consideration in moving the garbage and recycling to the opposite side.

Motion:

It was moved by Sean Partlow, seconded by Joseph Kardum, that Delegated Development Permit Application No. 000587 for 1419 Mallek Crescent be approved be approved with the following changes following:

- Consideration for a lighter fascia at the top of the building
- Expansion of the drop off area and potential covered seating area

Carried Unanimously

4.2 Development Permit with Variances No. 00051 for 937 View Street

The City is considering a Development Permit with Variances Application to construct an 18 storey, mixed use building containing approximately 267 residential units.

Applicant meeting attendees:

CHARLES KIERULF	DHKA
CHRIS NELSON	OWNER
SCOTT MURDOCH	MDG LANDSCAPE

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 and massing
- building separation distances
- relationship to the street
- architectural expression
- through-block walkway
- any other aspects the ADP chooses to comment.

Charles Kierulf provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal. Scott Murdoch provided the panel with a detailed presentation of the landscaping plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- The podium seems very harsh as it relates to the pedestrian realm, what was the design concept from the architect's perspective with regards to that?
 - Our focus for the podium and units was to maximize the livability of the units. What is presented to the street is uniform and a clearly defined structural framework of housing units. You see that its several units overlooking the street and that was the intent.
- Has any other consideration been discussed to add canopies to create or minimize the harshness of the podium relative to the streetscape?
 - Yes, canopies have been mentioned along with overhangs, but more in relation to the main entrance. Our ground floor units already have weather protection so running a full canopy wouldn't make sense. I would like to have a slightly higher main floor; it aligns with the commercial type ground floor. We are not showing that because we want to keep our options open. But I think it would help differentiate the ground floor from the rest of that podium.
- Can you say what that floor to floor height would be?
 - Currently I think our floor to floor is 3.2m which gives us the most options. That may or may not change. We are working with steel and are trying to maximize the efficiency of that. We need that floor to floor height to make that work.
- Has there been any further development to the pedestrian through access on the side to make it look more pedestrian orientated?
 - We have not refined it as of yet. It is a patterned paver type of space which we think sets it apart but, we can look into different things to better define it as a pedestrian walkway. We are thinking about a mix of permeable pavement and colours. We don't want it to look like a road.
- There isn't much of a unit mix within this building. Has there been more discussion about this or is this something the City is specifically looking for?
 - It hasn't been the focus of the discussion. This project has zeroed in on the predominantly studio mix and anticipating a certain demographic that will be interested in this smaller type of unit and trying to address that need.
- Being that this building is mostly studio apartments and it really doesn't have parking, why wouldn't you deal with that through road space as a landscaped area.
 - Because unfortunately it is a road. It is a statutory right of way over this property from the adjacent property. So, we must keep that driveway open.

Panel members discussed:

- Appreciation for the materiality
- Desire for more visible amenity space, fitness area,
- Concern that the driveway is being sold as an amenity space and pedestrian walkway
- No issue with the height of the building
- Concern with the heaviness of the podium

Motion:

It was moved by Pamela Madoff, seconded by Marilyn Palmer, that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00051 for 937 View Street does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined (and that the key areas that should be revised include:)

- A shorter podium, in compliance with the guidelines, should be considered to respond to the narrow proportion of View Street and to create a more human scale. The podium should be clearly defined by a significant building setback.
- The DCAP guidelines for street walls requiring a 3m setback for buildings up to 30m and a 6m side yard setback for portions of buildings above 30m should be followed in order to address issues of privacy, create space between buildings and reduce impacts on adjacent buildings.
- The building presents a very austere facade at the ground level. The DCAP guidelines encourage an articulated facade at the base level with multiple entrances, extensive glazing, pedestrian-scale lighting and canopies and awnings to provide weather protection for pedestrians.
- DCAP guidelines stress the importance of a strong architectural expression of 'base, body and top' specific to taller buildings. The proposal does not respond to this guideline and this has resulted in a uniform, monolithic appearance.
- The monolithic appearance of the building is further accentuated by a lack of variety in fenestration, materials, colour, texture and architectural expression.
- The proposal does not provide the high-quality architecture, building materials, landscape and urban design response that it specified in DPA 7B
- Design development to enhance/refine pedestrian experience.

Carried 6:2

For: Pamela Madoff, Marilyn Palmer, Devon Skinner, Brad Forth, Matty Jardine

Opposed: Joseph Kardum, Sean Partlow

5. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of February 24, 2021 was adjourned at 2:45 pm.

Marilyn Palmer, Chairs