

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY MAY 22, 2024**

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

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

Absent: Patrick Conn

Staff Present: Miko Betanzo- Senior Planner, Urban Design
Rob Bateman – Senior Planner
Geordie Gordon - Senior Planner
Alena Hickman – Planning Secretary

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion:

It was moved by Julie Brown, seconded by Peter Johannknecht to adopt the agenda as presented.

Carried Unanimously

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion:

It was moved by Peter Johannknecht, seconded by Tamara Bonnemaïson to adopt the Minutes of March 27, 2024 as amended.

Carried Unanimously

Motion:

It was moved by Bruce Anderson, seconded by David Berry to adopt the minutes April 24, 2024 as amended.

Carried Unanimously

4. APPLICATION

Peter Johannknecht recused himself from the from Development Permit with Variances Application No. 000641 and Concurrent Rezoning Application No. 00870 for 1885 Government Street.

4.1 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 000641 and Concurrent Rezoning Application No. 00870 for 1885 Government Street

The proposal is for a six-storey mixed-use building, with ground floor commercial uses and purpose built residential rental units above.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Sara Huynh – Cascadia Architects
Greg Damant – Cascadia Architects
Chris Windjack – LADR
Josh Anderson – Nicola Wealth
Nathan Ma – Nicola Wealth

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

- the awning height as it relates to the adjacent buildings on Government Street and in terms of providing adequate space beneath it to not become a hazard
- the building expression insofar as being compatible with its Chinatown cultural context and whether its design reinforces the values and status of this National Historic Site
- the relationship of the new building to the preserved existing building, particularly in terms of different approaches to celebrating the heritage value of it, either as a moment of discovery or as a prominent visible part of the whole implications and potential impacts of the proposed height variance.

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

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Can you please expand on how the parkade is integrated with the current build?
 - You can see the current drive isle on the plans and then essentially when we move to the parkade plan the way the access will work. You will enter through this parkade structure, turn around in behind and access from a point here on the site plan.
- What is the pinch point for the awning height?
 - 10'5ft would be the worst-case condition and 14'8ft clear would be the top. We have adjusted and it was raised to staff but not clarified with City staff yet.
- How will the residential courtyard circulation flows?
 - It will be open air patio space; we want to extend the experience inside.
- Are the double doors an extra security measure?
 - It's a weather vestibule for the residents.

Panel members discussed:

- Appreciate the project and integration
- Features are well done
- Differentiation between buildings is great
- In favour of the slight height increase
- Concern with the open space between buildings because of CPTED
- Blends together, new architecture isn't emphasizing
- Concern with bike parking clogging that moment of discovery of the heritage building
- Could patio switch to the street front
- Successful proposal
- Would like to see planter and parkade dropped
- Would like to see something more heritage like for the ground plane landscaping
- Supportable project
- No concerns with awning height
- Expression as it relates to Chinatown has been responded to well with colour pallet and the façade
- Relationship between buildings is done well
- No competing between buildings.

Motion:

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No.000641 for 1885 Government Street be approved as presented.

Motion: Colin Harper

Seconded by: David Berry

Carried Unanimously

4.2 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000248 for 1905 and 1907 Fort Street and 1923 and 1929 Davie Street

The proposal is for a 21-metre, six-storey mixed-use strata residential building with one level of parking underground and an outdoor amenity space on the fourth level.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Barry Savage - Three Shores
 Shamus Sachs – Integra Arch
 Rhys Leitch - Integra Arch
 Justin Jiongco – Integra Arch
 Michael Patterson - Perry+Associates

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

- transition to adjacent residential area

- frontage design
- balcony design
- materials
- design and amount of amenity space
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Rhys Leitch provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, Michael Patterson provided details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- What specifically was planning looking for regarding balcony design?
 - Guidelines specify recessed balcony design. So, looking to see if the Panel might have any other suggestions.
- Does the City requested that the boulevard be left as lawn?
 - This may be a question suited best for the Parks department but, raingardens are typically avoided on boulevards specifically because of maintenance. The applicants are still waiting for more information from Parks on this matter.
- Have you taken any design cues from around the neighbourhood?
 - Yes, that's how we came to choosing the brick with the warm wood. We did want to ensure the building is also taking a bit of a contemporary approach.
- Did you consider any other materials before choosing what are currently shown?
 - Step 3 is getting hard to achieve, deep inset balconies, wanting to be able to meet targets with rectilinear buildings.
- Why is the parking ramp so close to the property line?
 - We were instructed to move it to the south away from the Fort St and Davie St intersection.
- What are the purposes for the spaces on level one?
 - They could be meeting rooms, amenity space for strata. This is currently a placeholder and residential dedicated.
- Is there resident access to the rear or side yards?
 - No, we looked at bringing people through the bike area, but we couldn't meet the tree requirements going that route if we did that.
- Where is the closest park from the site?
 - Just on the corner.
- Are you saying you will be putting in permanent bike lane?
 - Things are being discussed with the City. We have a 15ft dedication.
- Do you have an envisioned use for the CRU?
 - Currently we are thinking something along the lines of a small coffee shop.
- Do we treat the Traditional as it should be met in terms of building as it is proposed or is the Urban Village driving what should be?
 - We are not looking for a clear delineation. There should be some kind of transition throughout the site.
- Do you have a rough idea of the dip level space
 - 774sq ft.

Panel members discussed:

- Appropriate location for this density

- Challenges with the overall building design and feel
- Don't think the building will age well as it already looks dated
- Would like to see thought given to the recessed balconies
- Would like to see more thought and articulation put into the façade and balconies
- Appreciation for the bike room
- Landscaping is underwhelming
- Buffer between the house and parkade ramp
- Better tree selection
- Appreciate the frontage along Davie
- Appropriate CRU
- Transition is not successful
- Increasing landscape buffer
- Upper amenity space it too small
- Struggling Aesthetically with the Fort Street frontage
- Problem with usage of materials
- Reducing the upper levels and replacing with more amenity space.

Motion:

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000248 for 1905 and 1907 Fort Street and 1923 and 1929 Davie 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:)

- Consider a more sensitive massing transition to adjacent residential areas
- Consider a landscape buffer between properties outside the parkade footprint
- Consider widening the Fort Street frontage
- Consider integrating recessed balconies
- Consider showing raingardens or landscape plantings in the boulevard
- Consider a unified materials palette
- Consider a more meaningful amenities space.

Motion: **Elizabeth Balderson** **Seconded by: Peter Johannknecht**

For: Elizabeth Balderson, Peter Johannknecht, Julie Brown, Tamara Bonnemaïson, Colin Harper, Bruce Anderson

Opposed: David Berry

Carried 6:1

4.3 Development Permit Application No. 000640 for 309-329 Belleville Street, 660 Oswego Street, and 330 Quebec Street

The proposal is for the addition of eight small buildings in the space between two existing commercial accommodation buildings.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Viki Csanicz
Silvia Bonet
Jay Stanley
Erin Cassels

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

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

Viki Csanicz provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, with details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Is the walkway shown public?
 - It will be mostly used by us and then the other tenant located beside us. It is not fully open to the public as it is our property.
- What security measures are you taking for public access?
 - You would have to walk through hedges and fencing to get through to the saunas.
- How low is the lowest height near the front?
 - It is 2.2m
- Can you walk us through how someone with accessibility issues will use the space?
 - The doors will be powered on the accessible saunas. The bathrooms are also accessible for all. Visitors could also be assisted.
- Is the washroom to be intended also as a change area?
 - Yes, it has a shower and changing functions.
- Have you considered any kind of tree canopy for privacy?
 - Yes, we have had conversations about putting more trees in and it is doable. However, we do not want to attach anything to the hotel itself.
- Is the entire space required to be accessible by building code?
 - Accessibility to all the saunas will be difficult. The slope of the site is also a challenge. But we will speak to the building inspectors.
- What is the white box on the renderings.
 - It is part on the hotel we cannot touch. Electrical.

Panel members discussed:

- Great project

- Wonderful use of space
- Materials are supportable
- Wondering about the accessibility, not clear if it is required or not
- A trellis would be nice
- Smart landscaping choices
- Some concern with the location
- Some string lights or cover would be nice to show some kind of ceiling
- Would like to see a green roof on this.

Motion:

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000640 for 309-329 Belleville Street, 660 Oswego Street, and 330 Quebec Street be approved as presented.

Motion: Tamara Bonnemaision

Seconded by: David Berry

Carried Unanimously

4.4 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00245 for 350 and 360 Douglas Street

The proposal is to construct a seven-storey rental residential building while retaining the two existing 13-storey rental residential buildings.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Kyle Bradshaw - Metafor
 Chris Windjack - LADR
 Jennifer Kay - TownSquare
 Josh Kaufman - Starlight
 David Woo - Starlight
 Justin Filuk - Starlight
 Kelsey Tyerman - Starlight
 Mathew McLash - McLash Development
 Mike Woodland - Metafor

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

- landscaping and parking
- street relationships
- massing
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

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

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Why couldn't the fire truck access be provided off Douglas Street?
 - There is existing fire access on two sides already. It may be able to be considered but there are some other requirements as well that are hardships.
- Did you consider options where you provided a building instead of parking?
 - Yes, we have had multiple options here throughout the years as there has been a lot of community push back from residents about town and row houses.
- Can the applicant clarify about the height of the parkade wall and the slope?
 - Yes, the wall is between 4 & 5ft. We want to keep the main floor slab consistent through the building. Something could be explored further.
- Do the patios connect to ground level?
 - Some on the corner connect and some are accessible through the interior pedestrian connection. None are directly accessible from the sidewalk.
- The previous scheme that had townhouses proposed, can you comment on how that fit into the OCP if it did or didn't?
 - I have not seen that scheme either, but at high level the OCP would support townhouses and would depend on how it was designed.
- Did you look at having the building massing be informed by the curved corner of the site plan?
 - There are a number of existing trees that we want to keep on that corner so that was a hardship.
- How did you come up with the number of parking spaces?
 - There were a number of factors. Trying to navigate the middle ground between existing residents and spots, parking study, as well as concerns from neighbours for lack of parking.
- Did you look at expanding the parkade at all and then put some kind of greenery in that parking lot?
 - We need to maintain access to that parking lot and the parkade is maxed out already at this point.
- Can you speak more to the materials?
 - The panelling could be James Hardy or other types of the same products on the market.
- Have you considered a future building on top of the parkade?
 - No, we haven't considered that at the moment.
- Where will residents park during construction?
 - That is in the works to provide offsite parking and shuttle service.

Panel members discussed:

- No issues with the building itself
- Would like to see warmer colours
- Major concern with the parking lot
- Material palette
- Land use isn't thought out
- Huntington units should connect down to the sidewalk
- Issues with the building expression
- Confusion with the pushback from neighbours on the townhouse

- Hardy panel with easy trim on small pieces is a cost saving measure that should only be used as a last resort
- Overall products aren't great
- No issue with the massing at this location.

Motion:

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No.00245 for 350 and 360 Douglas Street be approved with the following changes:

- It is strongly suggested to consider lower density housing along Huntington Place
- Consider a significant reduction in the surface parking.

Motion: Colin Harper Seconded by: David Berry

For: Colin Harper, David Berry, Tamara Bonnemaision, Peter Johannknecht, Elizabeth Balderson, Bruce Anderson
Opposed: Julie Brown

Carried 6:1

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn: Julie Brown, Seconded by Elizabeth Balderson

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of April 24, 2024 was adjourned at 4:27 pm.

Bruce Anderson, Chair