

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY JANUARY 13, 2021**

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

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

Absent: Matty Jardine

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

2. MINUTES

Minutes from the Meeting held November 25, 2020

Motion:

It was moved by Devon Skinner seconded by Ben Smith, that the minutes from the meeting held November 25, 2020 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

3. Discussion

Question brought forth from the Chair to City staff regarding the appointment of new ADP members with regards to the current vacancy and the cross over between ADP and HAPL.

- Leg services and City staff have made it clear that it is a priority
- ADP appointment is going to a closed meeting
- Panel members discussed if a cross appointment was necessary

Councillor Thornton-Joe: There is a late agenda item for COTW to decide to accept the late item with regards to filling vacancies on the ADP. Including a cross appointment from HAPL, an architect and alternates as outline in the ADP terms of reference.

Motion:

It was moved by Marilyn Palmer seconded by Ruth Dollinger, to postpone the second application to a subsequent workshop hosted by the City of Victoria planning department for members of the ADP to discuss the design guidelines associated with this application.

Denied Unanimously

4. APPLICATION

4.1 Development Permit Application No. 000580 for 780-798 Fort Street & 1106-1126 Blanshard Street

The City is considering the construction of a twenty-storey hotel with ground floor commercial and the heritage designation and upgrade of an existing, three-storey heritage building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

DAVID FULLBROOK	MERCHANT HOUSE CAPITAL
FRANC D'AMBROSIO	D'AMBROSIO ARCHITECTURE AND URBANISM
JENNIFER KAY	TOWNSQUARE PLANNING INC
SCOTT MURDOCH	MURDOCH DE GREEFF INC

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

- height impacts
- landmark building radius response
- building setbacks for the tower portion of the proposal
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

David Fullbrook 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:

- what is the dimension of the section of the building that sits closest to the eastern property line in terms of the setback?
 - 2.69m at the closest point.
- Can you please speak about the proposed height and massing of the tower and the intent as to how and why you can to those conclusions?
 - The homogenous massing is intentional and the accommodations we're asking for are to allow the floor plate to be shaped in a way that it will diminish its presence from different angles. The additional screening to take the parapets up to really make the top into something different gave us more height.
- In the winter garden, have you considered planting the large garden trees in larger areas or garden beds instead of small spots?
 - No, we haven't gotten into the finer details and will discuss this in further depth. Our strategy will be to have mostly hanging plants.
- Did you investigate the possibility of any viewing platform or area on the roof that would be accessible?
 - No, the size of the floor plates has restricted us in terms of the circulation. We cannot put in another elevator shaft to be able to grant rooftop access.
- Do you have an operator identified for this hotel?
 - There are discussions ongoing with two, no one has committed yet.
- Have you thought about dedicating floors to condo units?

- No, we are not interested in condos. We are interested in the concept of a neighbourhood within a building.
- Can you please explain your justification for a 6m height variance?
 - We required a certain useable sq. footage within the building to allow for the number of units that we are proposing to backflow into a financeable project. The height is a dictate of the viability to the building. If we don't achieve the height the project doesn't work.
- Can we see how the shadows will impact St. Andrews church around 1pm at the front?
 - The tip of the upper extended screen will cover the top corner. It's the tallest portion of the furthest point on the building so it will not be the full extent of the shadow.
- Has any consideration been given to the roof of the Montrose building?
 - It was discussed, but we are not doing a restructuring of this building.
- Did you consider larger openings into the atrium at street level?
 - We wanted to share it and the activity that a hotel may bring. We do have the potential to open to the sidewalk as shown in the plans.

Panel members discussed:

- Concerns for the design with regards to surrounding heritage buildings
- Appreciation for the project
- Comfortable with the height variance
- Contextually the angels and details are well done
- Good application and proposal for this corner of the City
- No concern with building setback
- Livability of units look well thought out
- Sidewalk interface is well achieved
- Concern with shadowing cast on St. Andrews church
- Montrose building's roof needs some visual attention
- Concern for livability for interior trees
- Appreciation for the timber frame structure
- Support for the massing and shape

Motion:

It was moved by Brad Forth, seconded by Marilyn Palmer, that Development Permit Application No. 000580 for 780-798 Fort Street & 1106-1126 Blanshard Street be approved with the following changes:

- Consideration of the treatment to the Montrose building roof with some type of roofscape
- Group tropical trees into larger planters for better chance of long-term survival
- Consideration of a through route for pedestrians to be able to enjoy the atrium

Carried Unanimously

4.2 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00150 for 903, 911 & 1045 Yates Street, 910 View Street and 1205 & 1209 Quadra Street

The City is considering a Development Permit with Variance application for a mixed-use building containing commercial, daycare and approximately 510 residential units in a podium form with two towers at 20 and 22 storeys.

Applicant meeting attendees:

DEANE STRONGITHARM	CITYSPACES
GWYN VOSE	IBI GROUP INC.
JOSEPH FRY	HAPA COLLABORATIVE
FRANC D'AMBROSIO	D'AMBROSIO ARCHITECTURE AND URBANISM

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

- comments on the Urban Design Manual with specific attention to the design objectives related to shading of the public realm, breaking up the massing and bulkiness of buildings and maximizing privacy and liveability
- the overall massing and distribution of density in terms of access to light, liveability, and building separation distances
- the pedestrian experience along all three streets at the perimeter of the subject properties
- building setback and street trees.

Deane Strongitharm provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal. Joseph Fry provided the panel with a detailed presentation of the landscaping plan.

Ben Smith recused himself from the remainder of the meeting.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- What is the materiality being used for the west elevation of phase 1 on 1045 yates and can you speak to more on the pedestrian realm there?
 - I believe you are referring to the side wall attached to the neighbouring property, we have been working with the neighbours to improve and create a landscape solution along that edge and to improve the materiality there. It is a two-story solid wall that is facing the neighbours parking access.
- Did you do a shadow study for this first phase to see how much of the courtyard would be shaded?
 - No, not directly for the courtyard. There is a shadow study for the overall site.
- This application seems to be eliminating the form and character of the city. Is this doing this because of the lack of variety in scale and use it presents?
 - We thought about this a lot, we went down many research roads with this project. We had to cross the viability, market demands and retail that had to be replaced among many things. If you look at the developments in the

area that conformed and were originated out of the DCAP guidelines where short towers with and without podiums are built, we are moving in the direction of towers. The development economy of the city is moving towards these kinds of densities. We tried to use the podium to fit in with the 19th century style.

- Is there a concoction between Yates Street and View Street?
 - No.
- Have you looked into having some kind of greenspace to breakup the space?
 - It would be challenging, but we can definitely look into this. There has been some concern from neighbours with regards to security is doing some kind of throughway.
- What are the towers materials?
 - They are spandrel clear glass and medal panel as well as the concrete elements for the balconies.
- Have you considered using any other materials?
 - It could be considered as long as they are cost effective
- What part of this building do you think the public will fall in love with?
 - The streets and retailers are things people will love.
- Is there a landscape amenity space that is open to the public?
 - On the 1045 Yates Street side there is some semiprivate space.

Panel members discussed:

- Concerned with challenges within this project and the context within Victoria
- Concern with the massing of the podium
- Would appreciate thought for a through way into the podium
- concerns related to presenting the design guidelines concurrently with an application that relies on the design guidelines. policies and guidelines should be approved first with designs following.

Motion:

1. It was moved by Marilyn Palmer, seconded by Brad Forth, hat consideration of the urban design manual is not to be considered as part of this motion and recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00150 (Phase 1) for 1045 Yates Street should be declined and that the key areas that should be revised include:
 - Breaking up the mass of the podium
 - Consideration of providing access to some public open space or connection between View Street and Yates street
 - More consideration of materiality of towers in terms of richness and variation

Carried 5:1

For: Marilyn Palmer, Brad Forth, Ruth Dollinger, Sean Partlow, Joe Kardum

Opposed: Devon Skinner

3. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of January 13, 2021 was adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Marilyn Palmer, Chair