

MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY MAY 26, 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, Ben Smith

Staff Present: Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner. Urban Design
Alena Hickman – ADP Secretary

2. APPLICATIONS

2.1 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00163 for 235 Russell Street

The City is considering a proposal for a new industrial warehouse building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Charles Kierulf

dHK Architects

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

- how the building relates to and is viewed from the street
- the relationship to the heritage significant building to the south
- potential impact of adding a loading stall
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Charles Kierulf 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 a sidewalk in front of your building?
 - The adjacent property does have a sidewalk and we are proposing a sidewalk that ends at our property line. We were asked to provide a 2.7m SRW which we respectfully declined simply because all the other properties are right up along the property line and felt we would be keeping consistency that way.
- Can you speak to the design elevation in relationship to the context?

- There was discussion on what was an appropriate response and the main element was to create some vertical elements. We did not want to mimic or duplicate, but there was a desire to introduce something that was different and contemporary with adding the same verticality.
- The interior and light industrial are all black box spaces, correct?
 - Correct, there are no windows?
- Is there a drop off zone? And is there a need for another loading zone?
 - There is a large loading space in the back in the parkade which is just over 8ft in height. We are not going to get massive vans or trucks in but for small industrial uses it will be good.
- What are the projected industrial uses?
 - Hopefully, there will be some move overs from older buildings. We do know that it will be something that is not invasive and doesn't make a lot of noise for the neighbours, Craft cannabis could be an option, but it is hard to give you specifics.
- Are the side walls of the building smooth concrete block?
 - Correct. It won't be basic, we have been using the smooth face block with a finish, which looks better and helps with water issues.
- One wall is quite exposed, do you have concerns about graffiti?
 - I think unfortunately there is always potential for that, but I think the best way is to mural the side wall. So, I think there is potential to counter that graffiti with some type of artwork.
- Did you think about putting a green roof on the building?
 - We did but mostly for storm water, but we didn't propose it because depending on the tenancy, there is potential for machinery to go on the roof.
- Did you look at having windows on the upper levels to break up the walls?
 - We did go back and forth on that. Floors 2 and 3 do have windows but did not put them on 4 because we weren't sure what the use of the building would be.
- Do you have plans for how any rooftop mechanical would be accommodated?
 - We do, we have extended the parapet height to the maximum allowed and then depending on the scale and height, we would envision screening on larger units and if they are split, they would be about the same height as the parapet.
- Would that be covered in the planning document once this is brought forward to Council?
 - I think if we know the users and have that level of information before the building permit, we could include it in that stage. We can include accommodation for screening at the DP stage.

Panel members discussed:

- Appreciation for the expression of materials
- Visually pleasing from the street
- Façade and elevation are interesting
- Desire for some greenery or landscaping in some form to soften the building
- Appreciate the sidewalk
- Desire to see more windows
- No issue with the loading bay being under the building
- Desire for community input on a mural
- Satisfied with the designed solution proposed.

Motion:

It was moved by Devon Skinner, seconded by Pamela Madoff, that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00163 for 235 Russell Street be approved with the following changes:

- Consideration of green screening on the side walls
- Consideration for additional fenestration from the fourth floor
- Consideration of mural on exposed cement block wall
- Consideration of anti graffiti coating
- Screening details for rooftop mechanical details be provided at the DP stage
- Panel generally supports the variance request for loading because the applicant has made provision for internal loading.

Carried Unanimously

Marilyn Palmer, Sean Partlow and Matty Jardine recused themselves from Rezoning Application No. 00729 and Official Community Plan Amendment for 355 Catherine Street, 251-259 Esquimalt Road & 200-210 Kimta Road

2.2 Rezoning Application No. 00729 and Official Community Plan Amendment for 355 Catherine Street, 251-259 Esquimalt Road & 200-210 Kimta Road

The City is considering a proposal for a mixed-use district containing various commercial uses and approximately 1870 residential units in a tower and podium form.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Ken Mariash
Patrick Cotter
Chris Reiter
Jennifer Kay

Bayview Place
ZGF Architects
Bayview Place
Town-Square

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

- Increase in height and density
- General comments on the Design Guidelines and the impact on the built form
- Transitions between the new buildings and the heritage buildings and the new buildings and the adjacent neighbourhood
- Impact of shadows on internal public spaces and adjacent properties
- Impact on public views
- Proposed landscaping and public realm
- The edges of the site
- Other areas as ADP sees fit.

Ken Mariash & Patrick Cotter provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal and landscaping.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- What is the timeline for this development?
 - We tried under the old Zoning to get a permit for the first tower, and it took over six years, which was 10 years from the day we got our Zoning. Tenants also do not come to commit until construction in and around is complete. I think we have provided an overall framework plan that delivers a number of parcels that could be built in any sequence. The challenge is having to do the remediation of the site on site.
- How can we build rental buildings in adjacent to a future contaminated site, but we cannot build a commercial project on the same permitter?
 - We can. We would breakdown the building process into sites. It has less to do with the preferred timing of delivery, it has more to do with the complexity of that connectivity. the excavated material to create underground parking structure for building one would be removing that and would be stock piled and then reused. Not to preclude that if there was interest to move forward from tenants in a different building, this is a sequence that could accommodate that.
- Are you thinking of a buildout for housing, rentals and condos before any of the heritage stuff gets delivered?
 - No, each of the heritage buildings are as prime for adaptive reuse as retail as any of the of the other buildings. Really the question is, can the sequence of development sequentially deliver components of the rehabilitated heritage buildings. Right now, the rental market is driving more development than the condo market. Currently, the rental market is

delivering the housing the city is looking for. We want to adapt to ongoing market conditions.

- Have you investigated any ways to completely remove the contaminated materials from the site?
 - We have looked into it. Canada does not take it, so it would have to be shipped to the states. You are looking at 50 million dollars to move dirt. I would rather build homes for homeless than do that.
- When you speak on doing work on these parcels will you be doing the work on the towers concurrently or consecutive?
 - No, they are concurrent.
- Buildings #2, #3 and #4 cast deep shadows over the turntable plaza area, do you have a shadow study for the summer solstice, and can you comment on that?
 - What you are seeing is a balance between a lot of trade offs of decisions on the site, we look at 10am-2pm as prime day light hours. We pulled building #3 away from Esquimalt Road to not only be a backdrop to other buildings but to try to make sure during that 10am-2pm time frame we preserved the self shading on the plaza and mitigated the shading on Vic West Park.
- My concern is that the plaza will be less populated due to the heavy shadowing.
 - You can see what shadows are relevant to the building height. Yes, the shadow passes over the plaza from 6-7pm but it is in full day light the rest of the time.
- What kind of activity and use are you expecting around that time frame?
 - That is very hard to tell at this point, it could be any type of use.
- Can you explain how the design works between Building #4 and the raised back shop and back shop plaza?
 - There are technical drawings that show how this plan is resolved. Rather than distribute density and building forms through the entire site the intention was to focus on the two ends. There is an opportunity to celebrate that transition of grade from sidewalk back up to the existing building. There is an attempt to provide a limited footprint to a lobby entrance to building #4. When we get to a more detailed design, we will get a building form that fits in better. What we are focusing on right now is getting site lines to lower elevations. We have an opportunity to provide pedestrian walkways on both sides on the back shop. This is based on an experiential design.
- From the plaza looking out towards the back house how will you ensure that the design is well intergraded.
 - In addition to a functional role the elevation of the back shop and its design are to make sure that in the new location there is an interpretive history component to its original location in connection to the other buildings, also in terms of its architecture. They would be designed to be complementary to one another to have a sensitive interface and allow people to see the old and the new.

- If you are standing in the middle of the plaza looking south/southwest, can you give a sense of the buildings from eye level with some renderings?
 - The applicant showed renderings. What we were trying to do with the podiums is trying to pick up on the scale and proportion of mass timber masonry warehouse buildings with a very regular pattern with industrial window openings. It is really to say as you move around between buildings there is a rise and fall.
- Is there any possibility to shift building #4 to expose that area a bit more?
 - The building has yet to be designed and in it's form we will explore building design to fit in nicely and be complimentary.
- Can you explain the intent of the pattern of the turn table plaza?
 - The intent was to reinforce the radial geometry of the turn table. The intention was it would be in radial response to the turn table. The paving pattern does show up in our technical drawing and submissions.
- Is there opportunity to shift height and densities between towers?
 - Everything has been done intentionally and with great thought, for a rise and fall. There is a minimum density for this site. Density, height, and everything else has been done with a particular reason in mind.
- How will the sunken back shop be addressed from a loading perspective?
 - There is a set of technical drawings that show that by level. There is an entrance into the podium that will extend down into the elevated back shop and will start ramping down to underground parking on a level below. Service loading and access will happen to the Round House through this underground back shop portion. The plaza will have underground parking as well as underground parking for buildings 4 and 5 to connect the core of the buildings.
- Was there any consideration in taking building #4 and moving it to where the back shop currently is and then moving the back shop closer to Esquimalt Road and then maybe solving some of these strange juxtapositions between buildings?
 - Yes, we considered it but didn't go that route because we didn't want to elevate the back shop and to relocate it is just another step further from the round house. There is also the issue of tower spacings if we start moving things around.

Panel members discussed:

- Supportive of the increase in height and density
- Good location to develop large towers
- Concerned about non deliverables
- Concerned with shadowing cast from building #3
- Site visit was helpful and informative
- Concern for the time constraint giving with such a large application. Would like to see change to the process in the future on how the Panel reviews massive applications.

- Desire for more about diversity, inclusion and accessibility when it comes to design guidelines.
- Desire for more greenery.
- Concern of this project becoming sanitized urbanism
- The charm has historical value
- Concern that the images provided of these larger buildings aren't bringing in the authenticity. We need to ensure they are working harmoniously
- Satisfied with what is being presented in terms of transitions
- Concerned with the proximity of Building #4 to Esquimalt Rd.
- Concern with shadowing on the plaza
- Understanding of the concerns in terms of shadowing but sympathetic that this is a difficult balancing act for the developers
- No concerns with public views
- Concern that the view from the Songhees dog park is now completely gone
- Appreciation for the adaptability the developers have
- Recommend a typology of hard and soft landscaping so it doesn't feel so heavily urban
- Landscaping treatment might help to link transitions
- Desire to see a connection between this project and the park.

The following are three potential options that the Panel may consider using or modifying in formulating a recommendation to Council:

Motion:

It was moved by Ruth Dollinger, seconded by Ben Smith, that Rezoning Application No. 00729 and Official Community Plan Amendment for 355 Catherine Street, 251-259 Esquimalt Road & 200-210 Kimta Road be approved with the following changes:

- including the city of Victoria 2020 accessibility framework as part of the design guidelines
- Increasing green space in large paved areas. Balance between hard and soft landscaping
- Consideration of maintaining the authenticity and patina of the railway infrastructure
- Consideration to minimizing the impact of shadowing on the northeast portion of the turntable plaza from building 3 during the hours of 4-7pm
- Minimizing the impact of shadowing on adjacent public spaces including the skatepark and Vic West park
- If 4-8 storey podiums are proposed they should be set back from the face of the heritage buildings within the turntable area
- Location of building 4 has a negative impact on the views through to the heritage buildings
- Strengthen the green link and view corridor between the dog park and roundhouse buildings
- Views through to the Sooke hills and beyond will be compromised by the towers.
- Strengthening the visual and physical links between Vic West park and the Roundhouse project
- Consideration of additional seating

- Consider the preservation of natural features including rocky outcroppings particularly at the west end of the site
- Consider incorporating more soft and hard landscaping edges within the turntable plaza.

For: Ruth Dollinger, Ben Smith, Devon Skinner, Brad Forth, Joseph Kardum

Opposed: Pamela Madoff

Carried 5:1

5. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of May 26, 2021 was adjourned at 3:45 pm.

Marilyn Palmer / Pamela Madoff, Chair