# MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY JUNE 23, 2021

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

**Present**: Marilyn Palmer (Chair), Devon Skinner, Sean

Partlow, Brad Forth, Pamela Madoff, Ben Smith,

Matty Jardine, Peter Johannknecht

Absent: Joseph Kardum, Ruth Dollinger

Staff Present: Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design

Leanne Taylor – Senior Planner Alena Hickman – ADP Secretary

#### 2. MINUTES

Minutes from the Meeting held May 26, 2021.

#### **Motion:**

It was moved by Devon Skinner seconded by Ben Smith, that the minutes from the meeting held May 26, 2021 be approved as amended.

**Carried Unanimously** 

#### 3. APPLICATIONS

## 3.1 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00176 for 458 Cecelia Road

The proposal is for a one-storey, including a mezzanine level and industrial building consisting of warehouse uses.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Hans De Goede
David Lunt
Hans De Goede
T-Squared Designs

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
- treatment of blank wall along the east elevation
- selection and application of exterior finishes
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Hans De Goede provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal and landscaping plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- How did the applicant address the staff guidelines?
  - The existing trees block the front of the building, and it is set back 6.5m from the sidewalk. It will also be parged with stucco to be a simple finish that fits with the neighbourhood. On the east elevation there is a mix of concrete block patterns that alternate between a split block and flat block in three bands. Aiming to not be extravagant because this is a simple industrial building.
- What type of stucco are you proposing, and can you describe the approach?
  - It would be acrylic, aimed to break up the large expanses of the wall with a
    pattern and trying to dress up the frontage with stucco. We looked to similar
    buildings that added a simple pattern and tried to express this in the
    proposal.
    - Perhaps consider adding precedent images because it is difficult to decipher exactly what is being proposed in terms of materials and finishes.
- Were the trees pruned and how do you see these trees being retained and or impacted?
  - The trees will be in the road right of way. They are mature trees that have been pruned up about 12ft. The trees are to be retained as per conversations with the City of Victoria.
- How will you access the loading bays and garage entries? Can you describe the operations as the space looks tight for vehicle movement?
  - These will mostly be used for forklifts and there is approximately 7.6m between the garage door face and the property line.
- How have you thought about what this building contributes to the community?
  - There is an eclectic mix of things along this street. I was not looking to match any other buildings. The proposal was to do a warehouse and to make sure it was not just another concrete block building. I think it cleans up and fits in well beside the temple.
- Will the trees be affected by the building? It looks like it encroaches on the critical root zone.
  - o No, the arborist has reviewed the plans and did not indicate any issues.
- What is occurring with the existing tree at the east side of the property? An arborist report was not included in the package.
  - These trees were removed some time ago.
- Front door access and drive aisle seem to present aa a potential point of conflict, was a different access option explored?
  - Moving the front entrance would result in a reconfiguration that would remove the vehicle parking for the site.
- Why is there a need for three loading bays if there is only one occupant?
  - It was an ask by my client.

- Do you want to subdivide?
  - That is always an option.
- Has the arborist review the relationship between the proposed building and the potential impact on the existing trees on the road frontage?
  - o Yes, and there were no concerns.

#### Panel members discussed:

- Concern of encroachment into the critical root zone of trees
- Desire for a more honest and authentic frontage
- Concern this application does not meet the Design Guidelines for neighbourliness and neighbourhood context.
- Would have liked an arborist report to be provided
- No issues with the landscaping in the front
- Desire to see a more split face block on the front instead of stucco
- The face should push back to the other building and not encroach on the trees
- Desire for an art piece or mural
- · Lack of design and detail
- Desire for better street articulation
- Desire for better window placements
- Appreciate the utility build, but not the correct context.
- No mention of the Community Centre
- Not support of this project

#### **Motion:**

It was moved by Peter Johannknecht, seconded by Marilyn Palmer, that Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00176 for 458 Cecelia 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:)

- Reconsider exterior finishes, the front and east elevation to be more neighbourly and to contribute to the public realm.
- Landscaping between the parking stalls and the property to the east to soften the relationship between properties.
- Increase the overall site landscaping with he potential of additional trees.
- Include the arborist report and the details around exterior finishes.
- Further consideration of the east elevation wall, which is currently a large blank windowless and featureless wall which is visible from the street.
- Design of the front elevation and street relationship requires further development to improve the street relationship, contextual fit and neighbourliness.

### **Carried Unanimously**

5.	ADJOURNMENT
The Ad	visory Design Panel meeting of June 23, 2021 was adjourned at 2:15 pm.
Marilyn	Palmer, Chair