

**MINUTES OF THE  
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 27, 2021**

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

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

**Staff Present:** Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design  
Charlotte Wain – Senior Planner, Urban Design  
Alec Johnston – Senior Planner  
Leanne Taylor – Senior Planner  
Alec Johnston – Senior Planner  
Alena Hickman – ADP Secretary

**2. AGENDA APPROVAL**

**Motion:**

It was moved by Pamela Madoff seconded by Devon Skinner, that the agenda for the meeting of October 25, 2021 be approved.

**Carried Unanimously**

**3. MINUTES**

**Minutes from the Meeting held August 25, 2021.**

**Motion:**

It was moved by Ruth Dollinger seconded by Pamela Madoff, that the minutes from the meeting held August 25, 2021 be approved as presented.

**Carried Unanimously**

**Minutes from the Meeting held September 22, 2021.**

**Motion:**

It was moved by Ruth Dollinger seconded by Pamela Madoff, that the minutes from the meeting held September 22, 2021 be approved as presented.

**Carried Unanimously**

## 4. PRESENTATION

Community Planning DCAP presentation.

Questions & Comments:

- Great to see the timeline on this is coming to completion.
- Love that this is addressing the growing pains and issues of a developing city. Particularly the focus on the public realm at the street level.
- How do you see the pressure on height will inform the DCAP further, where are the limits?
  - Key aspects of the process were looking at how the updated envisioned forms work with current policy regarding density and height. Generally, the densities and building heights laid out in DCAP can generally be achieved under these new building forms.
- Appreciation to Community Planning for coming back to ADP and closing the loop.
- Podium and tower composition cohesion are important and is something we are trying to achieve.
- Ensuring there is a cohesive language between the podium and tower compositions and forms.
- How do we ensure that new developments and applications are following the new set of guidelines?
  - The new guidelines each start with a statement of intent and described objective. It lets you know what the desired outcome is meant to be for each section.
- Relative to the buildings that are currently approved within Victoria, where does the 7000sq ft floorplates fit in?
  - Some of the taller projects that we have seen max out around that. Some shorter ones have gone above and beyond that floorplate.
- Would like to commend the City of Victoria for revising the floorplate size.

## 5. APPLICATIONS

### 5.1 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00178 for 2120 Quadra Street

The proposal is for a new four-storey, mixed-use warehouse building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Glen Wilson	Target Storage
Misra Pradip	Misra Architect Ltd.
Chris Windjack	LADR Landscape Architects

*Ruth Dollinger recused herself from Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00178 for 2120 Quadra Street*

Leanne Taylor provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application. Glen Wilson and Misra Pradip provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site, context of the proposal and Chris Windjack provided an overview of the landscaping plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Does Searidge own the property to the south and are there development plans to be aware of?
  - No, we do not own that property.
- Are there agreements in place for the proposed studios, and how can we be assured that these spaces will be used by artists?
  - We can't be certain as to the final use. But we have had some conversations with artists who have expressed great interest in the use of space.
- Is there a concept for exterior lighting?
  - Conceptuality yes, but there is nothing prepared yet.
- Is there discussion of having a covenant that those spaces would be strictly for artist studios?
  - Because this is a DP not a Rezoning we can request it, but the zone supports manufacturing uses and the studios have been designed with that in mind. We working to hopefully make that happen.
- What is the likelihood that the artists will occupy this space?
  - In the North Park neighbourhood there has been a desire for more of these types of local studio spaces.
- On Princess Ave does the fence jog back behind the landscaping to create a recessed front area?
  - Yes.
- Why didn't you choose to put a rain garden in the back where you have considerable space?
  - Yes, the original plan did have a rain garden in the back. Grading of parking lot and the drive aisle needed to go the opposite way so the garden needed to go on the other side.
- Can the applicant give us an example of where they have seen fake windows that have been handled successfully?
  - We have regular windows on the east side of the building. We wanted the same kind of architecture and panel system and that's what why we are providing the fake windows.
- What is the glazing material on the fake windows?
  - Grey tone on top of hardy panels and frame them into the aluminum framing.
- Is a high gloss paint going to be used on the hardy panel?
  - It will be a high gloss painting to match as best as possible to the existing windows. The side of the building to the south is on a property line so we cannot have windows there.
- Have you considered using spandrel glass panels as opposed to hardy panel?
  - We could consider that if the panel recommends it.

Panel members discussed:

- Concern with massing on this corner and how it addresses Princess Ave
- Concern with the fake windows
- Base podium doesn't feel commercial. Could use refinement as it gets lost in the design
- Desire to see spandrel glass in place of fake windows
- Materiality doesn't speak to a suitable standard
- Like the proposal and appreciate the uses of space
- Appreciation for the renderings that were done
- Like the landscape plan
- Pallet of the windows is interesting
- There is an opportunity for honest architectural expression about the industrial nature of the building, rather than looking like something it's not
- Simpler honest expression would work much better
- The corner of Quadra Street and Princess Avenue stands out and needs to have more of a street presence and public realm
- Would love to see some landscaping treatments on Princess Avenue.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Pamela Madoff, seconded by Peter Johannknecht, that the Development Permit Application No. 00178 for 2120 Quadra 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:)

- addressing the street frontage along Princess Ave and removing the blank wall
- reconsidering the fake windows and placement of windows on the entire building
- addressing the street corner in a more prominent way and a clear point of entry
- reconsidering materiality above the main floor
- reconsidering the character of the building ensuring the statement is legible
- developing an architectural expression that is reflective of the buildings use as an industrial building
- reconsider the location of fence to be in front of the landscaping in front of princess Ave to be more in compliance with CEPTD
- increase landscaping along princess avenue
- reconsider placement and design of signage concept

**Carried Unanimously**

**5.2 Development Permit Application No. 00065 for 808, 812 View Street and 1205-1225 Blanshard Street**

The proposal is for a ten-storey office building with ground floor commercial uses.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Erica Sangster  
Robert Jawl

D'Ambrosio Architecture and Urbanism  
Jawl Enterprises

Franc D'Ambrosio  
Tim Ogden  
Joseph Fry  
Kevin Klassen

D'Ambrosio Architecture and Urbanism  
D'Ambrosio Architecture and Urbanism  
HAPA  
HAPA

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

- the proximity of the proposal to the residential building to the east and the treatment of exterior wall at this location
- the proposed floor plate sizes
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Erica Sangster provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal. provided a detailed outline of the landscaping.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Is this Class A standard building?
  - Yes, that's our intention our objective is to be LEED platinum standard.
- Can you speak to the design pattern and how you came to the decisions of the east elevation?
  - We are looking at two colours of zinc and playing with different orientations of both. It is a difficult façade to view, we wanted to create something visually interesting but nothing so strong that the Yello building will have to live with something that seemed imposing.
- The tower massing seems to shadow the front plaza of the St. Andrews cathedral, is that correct?
  - We decided that we would take it from the south. This means we shadow in the morning. About 10am it's not on the steps of morning façade at all. We looked specifically wedding times.
- Was there more consideration in reducing the size of that floor plate and adding stories to the north side of the tower?
  - We did a lot of analysis with Jawl Properties and with that came results with the amount of floor space required for office spaces and things as such. We did countless iterations of office layouts. We think it's in demand in Victoria and we wanted to optimise it for the users. The proposed floor plate is smaller than the threshold for this height slice as provided for in the proposed updated DCAP guidelines which will come to council in the coming months.
- How will the interior lighting be managed and what thought has been given to the residential spaces to the east?
  - The portions with lighting components will have auto shut off which can then be overridden by manual issue after hours. We are working with a light designer for this as well will put into consideration window fixtures and lighting temperatures.
- What is the reason for the lack of landscaping along View Street?

- It's really to do with the functions and abundance of all the utilities along View Street and the tree bylaws. We will continue to try to push it with the Parks department.
- Is there only a decorative element to the vertical fins are they functionable?
  - We think they will be dynamic; they are part of the expression of the building. They help a with the west solar heat gain and give a texture and scale to the upper massing.
- Is there a way of having an above ground planter for cherry trees along View Street?
  - We will try to push and see if we can incorporate some, if there is an opportunity from the new tree bylaw.
- On the third-floor podium roof are you building up or recessing for soil levels?
  - We are building up and we changed the species to paper bark maples to meet the requirements of soil volumes of the new tree bylaw.

Panel members discussed:

- Concern that the tower is unfriendly to the pedestrian realm
- Height and context are appropriate
- The transition and gap to the Yello building is a hardship but the team has put forth a lot of effort to minimize that
- Three-story podium is the right height
- Love the dimension being given from the landscape
- Prefer the applicants work with the Parks department to overlook some of the soil requirements to get some trees in on View it would be appreciated.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Devon Skinner, seconded by Pamela Madoff, that the Rezoning No.00791 and Development Permit Application No. 00065 for 808, 812 View Street and 1205- 1225 Blanshard Street be approved with the following changes:

- For the City to work with applicant to accommodate trees along View Street.

**Carried Unanimously**

**5.3 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00185 for 1114/1116 McClure Street**

The proposal is for a six-unit houseplex and requires a Rezoning, and Development Permit with Variance Application. The variance is related to parking.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Keith Tetlow  
Tom Tanton

KILO Architecture Inc.  
Designer

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

- the balance of parking and landscaped space
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Keith Tetlow provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- What is the stair illumination monument?
  - It's a masonry monument to match the stone on the house and stairs and to illuminate the address sign.
- Do you plan to have lighting at the back of the property?
  - There will be house lights illuminating the rear parking area. We also have some low-level lights to help illuminate those areas.
- Electrical room located on the NW corner, has this been checked with BC Hydro? Is it an underground or over head connection?
  - We have an underground service proposed which is being discussed with BC Hydro currently. We are going to feed that rear electrical room underground.
- Would this be a part 3 as per building the code?
  - We are trying to keep it part 9. We are at step code 3 currently.
- On the back corner of the property where you have the sitting patio is it a fully enclosed fence area for recycling?
  - This isn't meant to be enclosed. It will have an optional gate, but yes, that spot is for the compost and recycling.
- Have you done studies for the turning radius on all the parking stalls?
  - Yes, we are in compliance with Schedule C. It might be something to fiddle with, but they are full sized stalls. It's the same layout as the building beside us but we do have the benefit of the visitor parking stall.

Panel members discussed:

- Beautiful project.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Devon Skinner, seconded by Peter Johannknecht, that the Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00185 for 1114/1116 McClure Street be approved with the following changes:

- Reconsider the rear patio recycling area as per the CEPTD comments mentioned by the Panel.

**Carried Unanimously**

## **6. ADJOURNMENT**

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of October 27, 2021 was adjourned at 3:33 pm.

---

Marilyn Palmer, Chair