

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY DECEMBER 14, 2022**

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

Present: Devon Skinner (Chair)
Ben Smith
Tamara Bonnemaïson
Sean Partlow
Will King
Colin Harper
Peter Johannknecht

Absent: Pamela Madoff
Matty Jardine
David Berry

Staff Present: Charlotte Wain – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Geordie Gordon – Senior Planner
Alena Hickman – Planning Secretary

2. AGENDA APPROVAL

Motion:

It was moved by Devon Skinner, seconded by Colin Harper, that the agenda for the December 14, 2022 meeting be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

3. MINUTES

Motion:

It was moved by Will King, seconded by Peter Johannknecht, that the minutes from the meeting held November 23, 2022 be approved as presented.

Carried Unanimously

4. APPLICATIONS

4.1 Development Permit with Variance(s) Application No. 000216 for 2540 and 2542 Shelbourne Street

The proposal is for a 13-unit townhouse development constructed in two separate three-storey buildings.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Alex McCumber – dHK Architects
Charles Kierulf – dHK Architects
Alexander Ray – Frame
Patrick Conn –Frame
Chris Windjack – LADR

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

- setbacks and privacy
- site planning and street relationship
- open space
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Alex McCumber provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Chris Windjack provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Did you consider breaking the ground floor slab to accommodate that grade change within the unit itself?
 - That is something we are looking at now. We didn't consider it immediately as it would put us offside in a number of spots in terms of overall storeys and height. Increasing that height is something we are trying not to do in consideration of our neighbours.
- Can you comment on the tree along Shelbourne Street being retained and the transportation plans for that corridor?
 - I think the intent is to retain that tree, although there are not any detailed design plans for the SRW development.
- For the west building, is the front door access through the garage?
 - There is suite access for the western building through the drive isle. There is also access at ground level from the backyard and patio of the suite.
- Can you speak to the SRW along Shelbourne Street.
 - It's a long-term Council strategy. There is intent to start securing the SRW along this stretch. As it stands it's likely outdated. This is a requirement that comes from transportation. Although the actual use of that corridor is not yet determined, it would not be for vehicle widening. The corridor would be for a multiuse pathway or something of that nature.
- Can you please go through the particulars of the variances and the rationale for them.
 - South setback variances, parking variances, we are providing parking on all 13 suites so are asking for a variance specifically on visitor parking.
- What would normally be requested for the south setback?
 - Required 8m setback and we are requesting 4m setback. They are quite significant when put against the guidelines.
- Can you speak to the usefulness of the garden amenity space and the recycling area.

- The recycling area will be serviced by a contracted pick-up. That area will be for some composting. The garbage pick up would be from in front of suits when the contracting company comes by.
- The garden amenity space is intended to provide the residence with space they wouldn't have otherwise to do some garden. The individual unit gardens are very small.
- Can you show us where the other 3 storey buildings are located nearby?
 - There are about 3-4 noted in the slides on either side.
- How is water management integrated with the scale of the slope on this site?
 - We are looking at revising the drive isle, so it doesn't slope. In terms of the centre drive access, there will be a trench drain at the bottom with landscape drains, and the garages will be slopping out into that drive isle to keep drainage centralized.
- What is the width building to building?
 - 8m. We have a 6m area reserved for the drive out specifically, but the maneuvering zone would be through 8m.
- Is the recycling area enclosed?
 - No
- Can you comment on the limited number of balconies?
 - Two units have Juliette balconies and rear facing balconies. We could consider more on other units.
- Is there any solar panelling on the roof?
 - No, we had not considered that. It would be a good thing to consider.
- Did you look at working the rain garden around that large Gary Oak?
 - There are a lot of unknowns as what the City will be doing in that area moving forward. The trees are a neighbourhood favourite and they want them to stay. Without knowing if there is a tree well going in there it's hard to detail. Realistically, we want to have the raingarden closer to the low point of the slope. It will probably be pushed off that tree and the low point is not next to it and we keep it draining away.
- Did you look at a garden feature instead of the garden amenity area?
 - We did look at that, we may have been able to get a couple of spots in there for people to sit, but from our experience they usually are not used. The amenity type space we have had success within our other projects.
- Where would the swale feature be taking its water from?
 - The sidewalk runoff. The sidewalk is graded right to the site in some spots. There is a 1.2m differential between the street and approximately 10m into the site.
- Can you speak to the natural grading of the site compared to the proposed?
 - Our site and grade proposals are following natural grade as best as we can right now. So, we wouldn't require any buttressing or retaining walls for adjacent sites. Currently, the adjacent sites have a steep drive isle. There would be some curbing up against their site.
- Is the swale only being fed by surface water, or will that include storm water from the roof?
 - It's picking up surface water and water off the sidewalk.
- Can you clarify the width of the typical unit?
 - They are about 13m wide, and there is some variation.
- What is the intent to accommodate some more storage into the units to be functional.
 - There are closets in bedrooms and space in the garages.

- Are there catch basins or water catchments?
 - The strategy would be a central low point in the drive isle and then fed into the municipal storm drainage system.

Panel members discussed:

- Concern for lack of yard and amenity space
- Units, parking and outdoor spaces are very cramped
- Concerns with the rain garden
- Quality of spaces could be improved
- Not a fan of the canopies and entrances
- Concerned with the density on site
- Certain spaces lack quality
- Would like to see more creativity.

Motion:

It was moved by Will King, seconded by Peter Johannknecht, That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000216 for 2540 and 2542 Shelbourne Street be approved with the following changes:

- Consider a reduction in lot coverage to increase the open area around the buildings
- Reconsider the front doors and pedestrian access to the western building
- Reconfigure the front rain garden to have less impact on the existing tree
- Consider enclosing the recycling area and review spatial requirements
- Reconsider the functionality and usability of the garden amenity area
- Consider solar readiness in the design

Carried Unanimously

4.2 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00198 for 1046 and 1048 North Park Street

The proposal is for a new five-storey, 39-unit long-term supportive housing building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Justin Gammon – Christine Lintott Architects Inc.
 Duane Ensing – Landscape Solutions
 Tim Shah – Watt Consulting Group

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

- neighbourhood context and street relationship
- building orientation and setbacks
- outdoor amenity space
- materials and finishes

- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Justin Gammon provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Duane Ensing provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

Ben Smith left the meeting 1:58pm

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Is there no covered outdoor space?
 - There is a covered gazebo outside. It's not completely enclosed but is covered.
- Can you speak to the PMT?
 - Hydro was difficult on this project. The solution was to bring in a transformer into the building under the building's ownership.
- What materials do you have in mind for the compact laminate panels for cladding? Are the joints open or covered?
 - The joints will be Trespa-laminate panel which has great flexibility.
- Can you comment on the exterior walkway on the east side of the building and what safety measures you're taking for that area?
 - There is a secure gate at the front. The only people that would be in there are people who are in that direct community.
- Is the custom rain gutter part of your massing and is there a real important functionality to it?
 - The rain liter at the bottom the design would be some folded steal. We want to celebrate this item.
 - Why are you using the Trespa?
 - We wanted a counterpoint to the warmth and hardness to the brick. We wanted to breakup something with texture.
- Did you consider adding more glass and treating the entrance differently to make it more successful?
 - Yes, we did. Access control is important and critical. Opening a larger window is something we can look at. We felt the gesture to the street are the plantings and street wall. We were looking to create a bracket with the brick and having a large amount of glazing seemed to take away the strength.
- What are the depths on the rooftop planters and what plants are being proposed?
 - At least 450mm of soil and the planting is really TBD, some ewe hedging and some boxwood possibly. We could look at increasing that volume.
- How are you looking to fasten the panelling?
 - Trespa has their own proprietary system that are not visible and embedded in the system, so they have a very clean finish.

Panel members discussed:

- Great looking and tasteful project
- Appreciate the changes made in panelling
- Could have more of a connection to the street with more glass and different fenestrations
- Functionally and usability has been appropriately accommodated

- Appreciate the outdoor amenities
- Materials and finishes are aesthetically pleasing
- Main entrance seems tight with the electrical room placing
- The frontage is a friendly and welcoming space
- Should reconsider the Yew plant as the females bloom toxic berries
- Desire for making some spaces bigger
- Increase landscaping on ground floor
- Increase soil volumes.

ATTACHMENTS

- Subject Map
- Aerial Map
- Plans date stamped August 8, 2022
- Applicant's letter dated November 14, 2022

Motion:

It was moved by Peter Johannknecht, seconded by Will King, That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 00198 for 1046 and 1048 North Park Street be approved as presented.

Carried Unanimously

ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of December 14, 2022 was adjourned at 1:45 pm.

Will King, Chair