

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY SEPTEMBER 22, 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

Absent: Joseph Kardum

Staff Present: Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Mike Angrove – 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 September 22, 2021 be approved.

Carried Unanimously

3. PRESENTATION

Community Planning presentation on the overview and process for the Government Street Refresh project.

Questions & Comments:

- Hornbeam trees can live up to 300 years, they look healthy and they're a signature part of Govt. Street. These trees have potential to be there for another 100 years. They shouldn't be extracted or tampered with.
 - The information that they are having issues is coming from our Parks department. The trees are growing in a contained environment and are showing some signs of distress. We have engaged an Urban Forest planner to look at all the challenges.
- Intersections are the areas that need most attention.
- I don't think the trees block the views and all efforts should be made to retain them
- Incredible opportunity- only improvements to be made. If we don't touch the trees, we can't do much with government Street. We need to find a way to make a compromise and it's the planters that the trees are in that are the real issue.
- Are there plans for free public restrooms along the urban thoroughfare?

- We are working on one for Douglas Street. This year we made a decision to include it in our yearly budget. We will be identifying other areas to keep adding. It is on top of Council's minds.
- Is there a summary of the survey you talked about?
 - Yes, we plan to make it public on the website shortly.
- There seems to be a misunderstanding between architectural heritage vs history.
 - Agreed, I look forward to following up on that.

5. APPLICATIONS

5.1 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00177 for 450 Dallas Road

The proposal is for a new seven-storey rental building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Erica Sangster	DAU
Rodrigo Rodrigues	Gauthier + Associates Landscape Architects Inc.
Bryce Gauthier	Gauthier + Associates Landscape Architects Inc.
Jonathan Lim	Reliance Properties
Jauan Pereira	Reliance Properties
Jon Stovell	Reliance Properties

Michael Angrove provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application.

Erica Sangster provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal and Bryce Gauthier provided information on the landscaping plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Can you confirm what the rear yard setback is?
 - The .7 is for the first-floor bike room at grade. Then above level one it steps up a little bit. It's at a 4m setback.
- Is there a winter shadow study?
 - Yes, I can show the Panel.
- Has there been any negotiating to have the access off Menzies Street?
 - We have had many conversations with Engineering, and they have made that a clear no. They said they would accept maintaining the access off Menzies, but we wouldn't be allowed to have an increase in traffic using that existing access point.
- Can you clarify that this proposal meets the requirements for a wood frame building?
 - It's 7 storeys by zoning standards because of the rooftop use. We are falling under the 6-storey category.
- Has it been confirmed that you can have a green roof with a wood frame building?
 - Yes, as far as I know.

- Will the trees sit in planters? How will they be protected from the elements being an ocean front property?
 - The soil volumes are limited anywhere they are on a slab or roof deck. It's the void that creates the walls.
- What kind of TDM's does the proposal in regarding parking ratio?
 - We have over supplied biking spaces, bike repair station, and bike cargo stops, along with two modo car share spots.
- What is the depth of the tree pits that are on the roof?
 - Generally, a minimum of 3ft.
- How many trees are on the roof?
 - I think there are about half a dozen.

Panel members discussed:

- High quality proposal
- Densifying
- Appreciation for the landscaping
- Great integration into the neighbourhood
- Appreciation for the proposal's neighbourliness

OPTIONS

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

Option One

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 00177 for 450 Dallas Road be approved as presented.

Option Two

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 00177 for 450 Dallas Road be approved with the following changes:

- as listed by the ADP.

Option Three

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 00177 for 450 Dallas Road does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined (and that the key areas that should be revised include:)

- as listed by the ADP, if there is further advice on how the application could be improved.

Motion:

It was moved by Brad Forth, seconded by Peter Johannknecht, that the Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00177 for 450 Dallas Road be approved as presented.

Carried Unanimously

The panel communicates to staff for consideration for relocation of the parking access from Lewis Street to Menzies Street recognizing the narrow two-way dead-end condition of Lewis street.

5.2 Development Permit with Application No. 00158 for 1042 Richardson Street

The proposal is for a new development consisting of a six-storey residential rental building with underground parking.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Christine Lintott	Christine Lintott Architects Inc.
Bart Johnston	Breia Holdings Ltd.
Chris Windjack	LADR Landscape Architects Inc
Bev Windjack	LADR Landscape Architects Inc

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

- Interface with Foul Bay Road
- Transition in scale
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Christine Lintott and Bart Johnston provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal. Chris Windjack provided a detailed outline of the landscaping.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Are there a number of permitter trees being removed?
 - Yes correct, 12 trees being removed.
- Have you explored trying to maintain the trees along the driveway entrance to the underground parking?
 - We could look at trying to save some but there will be root impact because of the slop down of the driveway. Because the ramp is dropped down in that location that the root systems won't be able to be safely retained.
- Is there any data to show that bike parking on every floor is a workable concept?
 - We are doing several projects where there is no vehicle parking at all, it's one of the reasons we have created the flow we have. Younger people and families are choosing bikes as their main source of transportation. We have tested the dimensions and they seem to work. All the corridors in the building are being treated as though it's an outdoor space.
- Does accessibility extend beyond only the oversized elevator?

- Yes, it does. Oversized doorways and accessible entrances. The bedrooms are generous sizes as well.
- Would the planters outside the screens be easily maintained?
 - They would be accessible from the interior courtyards. It would be a swing on the screen. We are not expecting residents to maintain those whiles on ladders.
- Can you comment on the institutional look of the stair tower?
 - It does have that feel because of the materials we are using. We are hoping the openness and visibility into the stairwell will have residents using the staircase as much as possible. From the street you will be able to see residents moving through the building.
- How will the lighting in the stairwell function, will it only be lit if someone is in the stairwell?
 - We will have to think carefully about that. It must be visible to patrons entering the building. Given surface treatments and how they are indirectly lighted, I think we can get those lighting levels achieved without being having to see the lamping.
- Have you considered a different pattern for the windows in the stairwell?
 - We are open to opinions. We were keeping it as a simple element, It is more dramatic as opposed to the articulation of the building.
- Have you considered any other locations for the stairwell?
 - We did look at several placements for the stairs. Having to have two exits separated by code limits us in what we can do with the elements.
- Have you considered any different materials or colour pallets for the building?
 - I think while it is a residential street it is a transitional street as well. This area is going to seem a lot of change in the coming years. We are being bold with suggesting something like this proposal. We played with textures and materials and landed on a high-quality cementitious material.
- Can you confirm the width of the drive isle to the parkade?
 - Yes, its 3.7m.
- That seems narrow, is that typical for a two-way drive isle?
 - It is only a one-way, and we are allowed that if we are less than 10 vehicles.
- Has a light signal system been considered for the driveway?
 - It is something we can look at. The bulk of the driveway is outside so visibility is high.
- Why does the grade need to drop at 15%?
 - To comply with the highway access bylaw. So, we are maxed out to get down to be underground.

Panel members discussed:

- Concerns with accessibility

- Concern with setback and future neighbours
- Exterior corridors are interesting
- Concern with the location of stairwell
- Intrigued with the functional moves internally
- Architectural expression is missing
- Variances are not supportable
- Site too small for what the developer is trying to achieve
- Architectural aspects and materials seem cold
- Building height is excessive
- Stair tower is stark would appreciate if it was softened
- Appreciation for exterior breezeways
- Appreciation for the bikes in the hallways
- Concern with material choices

OPTIONS

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

Option One

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00158 for 1042/1044 Richardson Street be approved as presented.

Option Two

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00158 for 1042/1044 Richardson Street be approved with the following changes:

- as listed by the ADP.

Option Three

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00158 for 1042/1044 Richardson 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:)

- Variances are not supportable. For example, the proposal has only 1/3 of the site area required in this zone.
- The architectural expression, particularly the stair tower has a more institutional than a residential expression as outlined in the guidelines.
- Open space requirement is 50% and the project proposed 28.7%
- Maximum site coverage required is 40% and the project proposed 60.02%
- Re-examination of the materiality particularly regarding the exterior cladding

Motion:

It was moved by Pamela Madoff, seconded by Devon Skinner, that the Development Permit with Application No. 00158 for 1042 Richardson Street be approved with the following changes:

Carried Unanimously

Ruth Dollinger and Brad Forth have recused themselves from Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00180 for 429 Hillside Avenue

5.3 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00180 for 429 Hillside Avenue

The proposal is for a new two-storey industrial building consisting of warehouse uses. The variance is related to parking.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Alan Lowe	Alan Lowe Architect inc
Tania Costillo-Pelayo	Alan Lowe Architect inc

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

- design of the front elevation and street relationship
- selection and application of exterior finishes
- fence and gate design
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Alan Lowe 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 going to be any use down the west side elevation between properties?
 - That is the neighbour's property. They use it as an exit and is not for our use.
- What kind of vehicles will be coming into that loading bay?
 - It will depend on what eventually goes into the building. There are loading docks on the other side as well.
- In your letter to Mayor and Council, you said there were no variances, was that a mistake?
 - Yes, that is an older letter. When we first submitted there weren't any.
- Will there be a gate or door on the lower left side?
 - There will be a gate there because there is one there currently.
- Why have you chosen chain-link for the fencing?
 - I think because the existing fence is already chain-link, we continued it on. We can always look into a different gate that is more complimentary.

- Why did you choose to use wood along the windows, doors and sills?
 - It was just a choice of material; we can look into something more durable.
- Is the roof overhang over property line?
 - Yes. An encroachment agreement will be required for any overhang to be put into place.
- Other options rather than lights in the soffit, spillover into public space
 - It was requested by staff to put the lights up to better light the surrounding area.
- Will the windows operable?
 - No, they are fixed.
- Can you point out where the hardy panelling is in the proposal?
 - It's the black portions you see on the renderings.
- Is there a functional reason for the angle of the roofline?
 - It was specifically an aesthetic choice.
- Will the west side stairs require hand railings?
 - Yes.
- Is the retaining wall rendered correctly?
 - No, on the site plan they are hardy panels, I know it looks like it's rendered as concrete but that was not the intent.
- Will it be hardy plank on the fascia as well as on the black areas on the lower front portion of the building.
 - Yes, confirmed

Panel members discussed:

- The necessity of a handrail on the west side stairs
- Colour choice and lighting
- Durability of materials where the building meets the pedestrian realm.
- Concern with roof angles
- Appreciation for the proposal
- No concern with parking variance

OPTIONS

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

Option One

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00180 for 429 Hillside Avenue be approved as presented.

Option Two

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 00180 for 429 Hillside Avenue be approved with the following changes:

- Confirmation of stair rail on the west side of the building
- Reconsideration of the roof and soffit colour and lighting concept
- Reconsideration of the detailing where the building siding meets the ground as it relates to the durability of the pedestrian realm
- Reconsideration of the proportions of the windows to be more consistent with the buildings on either side
- Reconsideration of the angle of the roof
- Reconsideration of the design of the gate to be consistent with the standards and guidelines

Option Three

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 00180 for 429 Hillside Avenue does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined (and that the key areas that should be revised include:)

- as listed by the ADP, if there is further advice on how the application could be improved.

Motion:

It was moved by Pamela Madoff, seconded by Peter Johannknecht, that the Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00180 for 429 Hillside Avenue be approved with the following changes:

- Confirmation of stair rail on the west side of the building
- Reconsideration of the roof and soffit colour and lighting concept
- Reconsideration of the detailing where the building siding meets the ground as it relates to the durability of the pedestrian realm
- Reconsideration of the proportions of the windows to be more consistent with the buildings on either side
- Reconsideration of the angle of the roof
- Reconsideration of the design of the gate to be consistent with the standards and guidelines

Carried Unanimously

6. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of August 25, 2021 was adjourned at 3:33 pm.

Marilyn Palmer, Chair