

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 23, 2022**

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

Present: Devon Skinner (Chair), Pamela Madoff, David Berry, Tamara Bonnemaision, Will King, Colin Harper, Ben Smith, Sean Partlow, Joseph Kardum

Absent: Peter Johannknecht, Matty Jardine

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

2. MINUTES

Minutes from the Meeting held December 15, 2022.

Motion:

It was moved by Pamela Madoff seconded by Ben Smith, that the minutes from the meeting held December 15, 2022, be approved as presented.

Carried Unanimously

3. AGENDA APPROVAL

Motion:

It was moved by Pamela Madoff seconded by Ben Smith, that the agenda for the meeting of October 25, 2022, be approved.

Carried Unanimously

4. AMENDED MINUTES

Amended minutes from September 22, 2022. Development Permit with Application No. 00158 for 1042 Richardson Street.

Motion:

It was moved by Pamela Madoff seconded by Colin Harper, that the minutes from the September 22, 2022 meeting be approved as amended.

Carried Unanimously

5. APPLICATIONS

5.1 Rezoning Application No. 00797 for 11 Chown Place

The proposal is for the creation of a new master plan to guide future development of the site and to increase the number of residential units.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Barry Cosgrave	Number 10 Architects
Daniel Smith	Number 10 Architects
Chris Windjack	LADR Landscape Architects
Deane Strongitharm	City Spaces
Corey Brown	Island Engineering
Corrine Saad	Gorge View Society

Leanne Taylor provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application. Barry Cosgrave 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:

- How are you encouraging residents to engage and make meaningful connections with the outdoor landscaping and amenities?
 - Hopefully as we transition away from the car centric society this will happen naturally. Many of our residents are older and on a limited income so they move away from having cars. We feel the garden programs will help greatly in the engagement of the outdoor space. We have a community center we believe will also get residents out and moving through the site. Paths and walkways will be useful to people that are more mobile to get to and from public transportation. We think we can create a great active community here.
- What buildings are the parkades going under and how are they connected?
 - The underground parking is primarily under the footprints of all the buildings. We do go across the Meuse area on the east building because we don't want car traffic into the site.
- Is the community centre a single story building?
 - We are going to allow for a two-storey in the FSR. Unfortunately, funding is tricky for these types of builds so we may have to look at building in phases.
- Is there a dedicated area for drop of and buses?
 - We have designated visitor stalls that will be available. We can look at designating an area.
- How wide are the walkways going along the driveway?
 - 2m wide.

- Are there any other areas designated for rain gardens that weren't already mentioned?
 - Not, at this time because the site grading hasn't been fully worked out at this stage. We are looking to incorporate more of them where we can.
- Do you have any information on per capita community garden plots on the current site verses purposed per capita?
 - When we built the current building, we recreated the exact loss space onto the site. We also built new gardens for the 58 unit building which established approximately how many meters squared garden space per resident.
- Was there consideration to adjust the location and landscaping of Chown Place to achieve intentional alignment with that road that sits on the 4-storey building?
 - We intentionally designed that current building under construction to emphasise that main entrance. the visual connection all the way down to Balfour does occur. At the playground looking to the West, the path does go around to the site. We have moved the sidewalk on the front of that north side building to have it pulled out and create a much more semi-private area for those townhouse units. We are still working with existing conditions and placements of buildings have to work as different phases continue.
- Is this site meant to be at minimum code building standard?
 - It really depends on the funding we can get on this project. The society can't commit to anything until know what we can have in terms of budget.

Panel members discussed:

- Concern about future zoning
- Allocation of density is well thought out
- Concern with pedestrian connections
- Concern with sidewalks and pathways
- Prefer to see height increase in the building on the southeast
- Greenways could have more work
- Desire for designated community drop off
- Appreciation for the landscape plan.

Motion:

It was moved by Devon Skinner, seconded by Will King, that Rezoning Application No. 00797 for 11 Chown Place be approved with the following changes:

- Reconsider the pedestrian pathway system through the community particularly the north south and east west access routes. With the intent of improving the flow through the site.
- Consider additional programming from the parking areas to improve the functionality of the drop off areas to create hubs for the alternate modes of transportation and short-term loading zone.
- Consider widening pedestrian walkways where possible.

- Consider taller building heights to improve the building separation distances between adjacent residences, particularly in the SE corner of the site.
- Consider green buffer along Irma Streets north side.
- Consider sensitive integration of the utilities infrastructure.

Carried Unanimously

Tamara Bonnemaïson recused herself from Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00182 for 1030 Fort Street.

5.2 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00182 for 1030 Fort Street

The proposal is for a six-storey mixed-use building containing ground floor commercial and 30 market rental residential units above.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Robert Jawl	Jawl Enterprises
Karen Jawl	Jawl Enterprises
Greg Damant	Cascadia Architects
Sarah Huynh	Cascadia Architects
Scott Murdoch	Murdoch Landscape Design

Charlotte Wain provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application and noted the following corrections to the data table in the staff report:

- the allowable height in the existing CA-42 zone is 15.5m not 15m as stated in the report
- the staff report incorrectly noted that 27 stalls were required under the current CA-42 zone but due to the lot size no parking is required.

The areas that Council is seeking advice on including the following:

- street wall height
- building separation
- pedestrian experience
- materials and finishes
- landscape / shared amenity space
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Greg Damant provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal. Scott Murdoch provided a detailed outline of the landscaping.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- what is the material in the soffit?
 - It is cedar in a board and batten pattern and then we are using cementitious board and batten in the balconies so it can be maintained more easily.
- Is the concrete treatment also serving a structural purpose?
 - Yes. There is more than one way to carry the cantilever and that could be done without visual beams but, through discussion we saw an opportunity to use the structure that is required to do that.
- Can you please fully describe the colour of the terracotta, is it on par with the look of the Iron Works building?

- It is that dark colour like the Iron Works building, not on the lighter side. It is also a glazed finish.
- Is the building to the north a parkade that the ground floor is adjacent to?
 - Yes, we are mostly opposite the older building on View Street and partially adjacent to the Juke box. Both have raised ground floor covering their parking.
- Were the lightwells taken into consideration for future development on adjacent properties?
 - We considered that. They are substantial in size. We ultimately feel that even as four sided lightwells, they will be bringing daylight into the building and present an opportunity for air as well.
- Does the overhang of this proposed building sit flush to the neighbouring building?
 - To the west there is small gap. We are very close to flush to the neighbour and similarly to the east.
- The decorative columns that support the cantilever look slightly narrow. Have you looked and measured the rhythm and street frontages along Fort Street?
 - Yes, they're narrower. There isn't a strong consistent module along Fort Street, it really varies. That being said, we decided to terminate our upper level cleanly to grade.
- Did the wrapping of the façade carry up to the roof top mechanical screening?
 - Yes. We have a screen in the same metal. It is an inset box, and is the same material as the site panels.
- Did you consider any other street frontage landscaping besides the required street trees?
 - With bike racks, benches and other items, Fort Street gets very tight, so we wanted to keep it open.
- Have you thought about splitting up the commercial space into multiple units?
 - Our thought is that tenants will want that space as one unit and to have egress and easy access to utilities we felt this was the best option. Working with 1500sq ft is tricky and we want to create something that is character consistent with surrounding commercial units.

Panel members discussed:

- Desire to increase the height of the first floor to benefit the public realm
- Comfortable with the current proposal
- Great addition to the neighbourhood
- No concern with the proposed setbacks from the rear
- Would like to see change in the lightwells
- Appreciate and prefer the proposed colour pallet.

Motion:

It was moved by Devon Skinner, seconded by Pamela Madoff, that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00182 for 1030 Fort Street be approved with the following changes:

- Reconsideration to increase the ground floor height.
- Consider opportunities to better diffuse light in the light wells.

Carried Unanimously

6. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of February 23, 2022 was adjourned at 3:15 pm.

Devon Skinner, Chair