

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY NOVEMBER 22, 2023**

1. THE CHAIR CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 12:05 PM

Present: Bruce Anderson (Chair)
Colin Harper
Elizabeth Balderson
Julie Brown
Patrick Conn
Peter Johannknecht
Priscilla Samuel
Tamara Bonnemaïson

Absent: David Barry

Staff Present: Charlotte Wain – Senior Planner Urban Design
Geordie Gordon – Senior Planner
Rob Bateman - Senior Planner
Manasvini Thiagarajan - Planner
Alicia Ferguson – Recording Secretary

The Chair provided a territorial acknowledgement.

2. AGENDA APPROVAL

Motion:

It was moved by Julie Brown, seconded by Patrick Conn, that the agenda for the November 22, 2023 meeting be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

3. MINUTES

Motion:

It was moved by Priscilla Samuel, seconded by Tamara Bonnemaïson, that the minutes from the meeting held June 28, 2023 be approved.

Carried Unanimously

4. APPLICATIONS

Colin Harper recused himself from the deliberations on the following item at 12:14 p.m. due to a conflict of interest.

Elizabeth Balderson recused herself from the deliberations on the following item at 12:14 p.m. due to a conflict of interest.

Priscilla Samuel recused herself from the deliberations on the following item at 12:14 p.m. due to a conflict of interest.

4.1 Rezoning and Development Permit with Variance Application No. DPV00158 for 943 Collinson Street

The proposal is to construct a five-storey attached dwelling with five units.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Colin Harper – Colin Harper Architect
Bianca Bodley – Biophilia Design Collective
Olivia Lyne – Biophilia Design Collective
Elizabeth Balderson – Biophilia Design Collective

Manasvini provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application and the areas that staff are seeking advice on, including the following:

- street interface
- exterior finishes
- impact on adjacent properties
- open space.

Colin Harper provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Bianca Bodley provided a detailed presentation of the landscape proposal.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Can you speak to why there are limited windows in the unit facing Collinson Street.
 - We looked at different configurations for those windows and it came down to a balance maintaining the sculptural quality while providing windows. We have added an additional window.
- What is the window placement driven by on level three facing south?
 - Two things, one being the onlook to adjacent properties to avoid overlap. And two, we like windows located in the corners of the room.
- With a new building code coming does this address accessibility and adaptability issues?
 - This project began 1.5 years ago and was not designed adaptable or accessible. The typology of this 4-stoey building will not be for that demographic.
- What are you targeting for energy performance and is this influencing the design at all?
 - The target is step 3. We will be GHG free project. electric, no additional measures for solar shading but natural from shadowing of neighbouring buildings
- What other materials and colours were considered to your end decisions?
 - The plan was always stucco. We wanted to stay with the typical cladding of the neighbourhood.
- There are big conifers on site, what are the tree removal plans or are there plans to keep those trees?
 - Yes, we have a tree removal retention plan. Some trees need to be removed for the retaining wall allowance. This changes potential to allow for retention of more trees.
- Will the liquidambar trees get structural soil below them?
 - Appropriate for trees in planted areas to keep as viable as possible.

- Will there be additions to the three trees in the backyard given the space?
 - Changes to allow for greater tree retention.

Panel members discussed:

- Appreciation for the sculptural quality of the proposal and the design challenges associated with the lot shape.
- Lacking street interface maybe enhance landscape or additional windows.
- Privacy for shared stairway refinement maybe landscape screen
- No concerns of finishes or impact on adjacent properties, smart design.
- Design challenges associated with the lot.
- Orientation of units make sense.
- Lifting the building to respond to privacy concerns raising window placement.
- Fit of a townhouse proposal within neighbourhood.
- Communal space placement considerations consideration of removing the bbq area for retention of trees and relocation of bike parking and different use of background space for tree retention and useable space.
- Re-evaluating the window placements and consider liveability over privacy especially for the 2nd floor unit.
- Enhancing the communal space for greater usability.

Motion: Tamara Bonnemaïson **Seconded by:** Peter Johannknecht

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No.000632 for 943 Collinson Street be approved with the following changes:

- consider increased tree retention.
- consider privacy to Unit A from the walkway.
- consider a revised layout of Unit A for better street interaction.
- consider revisions to the window placement and geometry for better daylight.

Carried Unanimously

Colin Harper returned to the meeting at 1:00 pm.

Elizabeth Balderson returned to the meeting at 1:00 pm.

Priscilla Samuel returned to the meeting at 1:00 pm.

Tamara Bonnemaïson recused herself from the deliberations on the following two items at 1:00 p.m. due to a conflict of interest.

4.2 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00224 for 415 Parry Street and 544-558 Toronto Street

The proposal is for a six-storey multiple dwelling building on three lots which are proposed to be consolidated.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Chris Quigley – Aryze Developments
Paul Rigby – Faulknerbrowns
MDI Landscape Architects

Rob Bateman provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application and the areas that staff are seeking advice on, including the following:

- street relationship
- height and massing
- impact on adjacent properties.

Paul Rigby 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 textured material meant to represent?
 - It's a formed fiber cement.
- Does the building step down?
 - Yes, it does.
- How did colour selections arise?
 - We wanted something timeless and good backdrop to the treeline with something warmth and natural.
- Did you try an option that was fully recessed with the balconies?
 - We reviewed precedents but noticed depth created dark space, although fully recessed provides some separation and protection from the environment but half is the best of both worlds.
- There is an easement on east side, what is it related to for setback understanding
 - There isn't anything on the property from the City's perspective that impacts development on that side. You may be thinking of the neighbours property.
- Can you speak to the patio configuration and landscaping on that Parry and Toronto corner.
 - We took the view of Toronto Street as the approach for harder landscape and animated building entrance.
- Will the fiber cement be face mounted or concealed fastened?
 - We are looking at options but, looking at face fix it at the low point.
- With the hydro lines did you ensure you allowed for the proper blasting radius?
 - Yes.
- What was the intention of maintaining colour on lower level or was there consideration of a contrast in colours at the streetscape?
 - We didn't want it to stand out. We were hoping to blend in and allow the structure and grain to blend into street.
- Regarding the east mid level minimal windows. Are you trying to maintain consistency or was consideration given to reduce the number of windows on levels 5 and 6?
- We looked at the section at five and six because of the setbacks, you can't really see down to the neighbours property below their eye. So, we feel like it's controlled in that respect from privacy and then the windows at the lower levels, we just reduce the amount of opening. So, you can really only see it up rather than down.
- Are there any FSR concerns for zoning?

- Currently in the R2 zone but would like to rezone to a site-specific zone. Generally consistent with use density and height envisioned in the OCP but the zone itself will likely site specific.
- What were the driving factor to be so close to the property line?
 - Toronto Street will evolve and we think this will stand appropriately in it's context now as well as in 50-100 years along side other buildings being developed.

Panel members discussed:

- Whether the colour scheme and textures are complimentary to the design.
- East setback could configure lots to achieve bigger setback to east property line.
- Appreciation of form, massing, and scale.
- Communal open space, spacious and appreciation of narrow setbacks to allow for this.
- Texture and finishes and mixture of styling.
- Celebrating the corner better maybe landscape or art.
- Pedestrian connection Toronto to east side of property may necessitate slightly bigger setback and greater privacy to unit on corner.
- Reviewing setbacks and adjustments.
- Toronto street interface well done.
- Height massing with exception to tight east corner on Toronto setback.
- Privacy addressed window placements.
- See better accentuation on lower level of first story.
- Desire to see banding element or cornice on level 5 to be shown on roof line on level 6.

Motion: Julie Brown

Seconded by: Priscilla Samuel

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00224 for 415 Parry Street and 544-558 Toronto Street be approved with the following changes:

- reconsideration of colour choice for the top two floors.
- consideration to increase the east yard setbacks.
- Further accentuation at the ground plane specifically at the corner of Toronto St.

Carried Unanimously

4.3 Delegated Development Permit with Variances Application No. DP000634 for 1132 Johnson Street (Rapid Deployment of Affordable Housing)

The subject site spans the block between Johnson Street and Pandora Avenue (between Cook Street and Chambers Street) and is proposed to be redeveloped with two new buildings each ranging from four to six storeys for a total of 140 new (102 net new) affordable dwelling units.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Roya Darvish – Lowe Hammond Rowe Architecture
Paul Hammond – Lowe Hammond Rowe Architecture
Colin Merriam – Capital Region Housing Corporation
Melissa Lim – Murdoch de Greef Inc

Geordie Gordon provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application and the areas that staff are seeking advice on, including the following:

- transition to adjacent areas
- open space design
- Pandora Avenue frontage.

Roya Darvish provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Melissa Lim provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Is the material that looks like wood, intended to be wood grain pattern cementitious material?
 - Yes, non combustible fibre cement panel.
 - Additional considerations being considered must be cost effective
 - Corrugated metal to vary
- A question for staff regarding the Pandora interface and patio relationship, what is the concern when it comes to design guidelines? What is the preferred condition that planning is looking for?
 - A number of the patios do satisfy design guidelines but looking for comments on strengthening this.
- Can you please speak to how the onsite storm water is being addressed?
 - We anticipate managing roughly half of the roof areas in on site rain gardens and capture run off in modo parking stalls.
- Are the rooftops useable on fourth level?
 - Unfortunately, with this being a nonprofit housing model it can down to not being financially feasible. Especially since we are already providing the significant outdoor amenity area we have already incorporated.
- What is the rationale not connecting the Pandora side patios to street and courtyard connections?
 - Mostly in response to feedback we have gotten from existing tenants. They really wanted us to consider security issues and non-tenant access.
- How far do the windows in the smaller units open?
 - Currently there are just operable. We have been talking about converting them to sliders and be more like a Juliet balcony with glass guard.
- Would you allow for photovoltaic panels for the future?
 - I think the intention is to be solar panel ready for future connection. I would envision those panels to be higher up. Of course, budget pending.
- Is the path along the East frontage accessible to public and how is that managed?
 - Only accessible to tenants with secured access. The westside path will have access to underground parking.
- The setback seems quite substantial. Would it be possible for more housing and offset fourth floor to allow solar panel readiness or greener roof, other roof options?
 - With the Delegated DP we have to meet the OCP and we are maxed out on the 2:1 FSR for the OCP.

Panel members discussed:

- Enhancing the building without exceeding budget specifically fo-wood concerns, preference for a different material and in particular on large expanses, change of materials across facades that are in plane avoid changes in material where not significant change in plane, building appears.
- Making sure building step back and location of garden plots is good for sun.
- Increased setbacks for greater landscape buffer between neighbouring properties.
- Restricting parking to allow for soil for planting large trees.
- Revise in future for streetscape connection.
- South facing roof top making more accessible or future useability.
- Appreciation for security concerns but provide a connection courtyard and patio playground clustering benches together or a pathway for kids bikes to loop around.
- More affordable housing on site.
- Pandora frontage well done.

Motion: Peter Johannknecht

Seconded by: Priscilla Samuel

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to the Director of Sustainable Planning and Community Development that Development Permit Application No. 000634 for 1132 Johnson Street be approved as presented.

For: Bruce Anderson, Elizabeth Balderson, Patrick Conn, Peter Johannknecht, Priscilla Samuel

Opposed: Colin Harper and Julie Brown

Carried: 5-2

Tamara Bonnemaïson returned to the meeting at 3:02 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn: Julie Brown, Seconded by Priscilla Samuel

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of November 22, 2023 was adjourned at 3:03 pm.

Bruce Anderson, Chair