

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY MAY 24, 2023**

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

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

Absent: Peter Johannknecht
Matty Jardine

Staff Present: Charlotte Wain - Senior Planner, Urban Design
Rob Bateman – Senior Planner
Justine Wendland – Planning Secretary

2. AGENDA APPROVAL

Motion:

It was moved by Pamela Madoff, seconded by Colin Harper that the agenda for the May 24th, 2023 meeting be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

3. MINUTES

Motion:

It was moved by Pamela Madoff, seconded by David Berry, that the minutes from the meeting held April 26, 2023 be approved.

Carried Unanimously

4. APPLICATIONS

4.1 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 000590 for 1514 and 1520 Foul Bay Road

The proposal is for two four-unit townhouse buildings on two lots which are proposed to be consolidated.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Wayne Foster - Norm Foster Properties, Developer
Rus Collins - Zebra Design Group, project designer
Bianca Bodley - Biophilia Design, Landscape Architect
Chase Collins - Zebra Design Group
Miles Craig - Developer
Devin Hutchinson - Hutchinson Contracting, builder

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

- Street orientation and interface
- Impact on adjacent properties
- Open space
- Accessibility
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Wayne Foster provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Bianca Bodley provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- This proposal is not meeting the zoning requirements of Missing Middle Design Guidelines such as there are no accessibility units or secondary suits, how will this be mitigated? The proposal was designed prior to Missing Middle and the new requirements of Missing Middle including accessible units. On a corner lot there is more opportunity to apply the guidelines but having a driveway down the middle of the townhomes, provides a safe space for families, and less paving. Lots of neighbourhood support and went with this design that the neighbourhood supported. Regarding secondary suites, those were not included, and accessibility was a challenge with this design, that the garage at the end would need to be larger to accommodate an elevator. The units with lower rooms could be made accessible.
- Missing Middle policy would recommend a houseplex at this site, it is hard to gauge what the developer would have been looking at pre- Missing Middle and now what staff are recommending based on new missing middle regulations. The Missing Middle Design Guidelines now apply to this proposal. but there is high-level overlap of policy goals between the guidelines that previously applied and the new Missing Middle Design Guidelines.
- What are the sizes of the trees? The height of maturity and spread, the location will allow the deciduous trees to achieve full heights.
- Clarify that any residential site is eligible for Missing Middle, this proposal is compared against Missing Middle, is the applicant not allowed to apply for a site specific rezoning? The proposal meets the definition in the Missing Middle DPA in the OCP, and no exemptions apply, therefore a development permit is required and the Missing Middle guidelines apply. Is the project not still under Multi-Family Design Guidelines which is what they would have been referring to pre- Missing Middle? The mutli-family guidelines no longer apply. Although the proposal is being compared to the Missing Middle regulations, if it is approved it would require a site-specific zone.

- What applications are being vetted against Missing Middle policy? This is one of the first ones, but the guidelines may apply to other active applications. We have not received a new application that is doing Missing Middle housing yet.
- Where does the rain water garden at the back of the site get its water from? Water drains from the hard surfaces to the back and goes to rain garden then to storm water.
- Did the applicant consider making the ground floor of the rear unit an adaptable secondary dwelling unit and making the two-storeys on top another non-adaptable unit? Personal elevators were examined, the two-story unit arose as the concern of neighbours not be as tall of a building beside their property line.
- Were interlocking modules looked at on the upper floor to allow 3-bedrooms? Yes, but the rooms would be too small.

Panel members discussed:

- What is applicable to this proposal? Staff have indicated where the proposal does not meet the current Missing Middle Guidelines. The applicant designed the proposal based on the pre- Missing Middle guidelines. The policy piece will be left with staff and focus on how the panels feedback from a design standpoint. The street orientation is supported, and the proposal seems more optimal than what Missing Middle allows. The Missing Middle Design Guidelines apply, but Schedule P does not apply to the proposal.
- It is important to note that this proposal was substantially proposed prior to Missing Middle, but does meet the intent and spirit of the OCP and missing middle by proposing townhomes, the scale was thoughtfully done, fits with the density of the neighbourhood, the applicant had significant engagement and consultation with the neighbours and tried to accommodate the feedback into the proposal, as well as storm water management integration and 4:1 inclusion of replacement trees. It would not meet the Missing Middle because it is not including more specific missing middle criteria such as a secondary suite or accessibility requirements.

Motion: David Berry

Seconded by: Devon Skinner

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000590 for 1514 Foul Bay Road be approved as presented.

For: David Skinner, David Berry, Pamela Madoff,
Sean Partlow, Colin Harper, Ben Smith,
Will King, Tamara Bonnemaision (8)

Opposed: 0

Carried Unanimously

4.2 Development Permit Application with Variance No. 000623 for 1900 Richmond Road, 1921, 1929, 1931/1933, and 1935 Ashgrove Street

The proposal is to construct a seven-storey seniors rental building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Charles Kierulf, Architect – dHK Architects
Sean Leogreen, Landscape Architect – LADR Landscape Architects
Donald Milliken, Chairman - Milliken Developments
Kate Milliken Binns, President – Milliken Developments
James Milliken, Vice President – Milliken Developments

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

- The transition to the adjacent lower density residential areas
- The separation space between Phase 1 and Phase 2
- The entryway details and landscaping
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Charles Kierulf provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Sean Leogreen provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

Tamara Bonnemaïson left the meeting at 1:18pm

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Is there a reason why a step-down a level on the north end to 4 stories instead of 5 would not be possible? Cannot relocate the exit staircase, any time a floor is removed, it reduces the number of units. The goal was to maintain original premise and maximize the number of units on the site.
- Do you have an image of current conditions on Ashgrove Street compared to what you are proposing? Not in the presentation but a streetscape context is included in the package of material for ADP.
- What are the shadow impacts of the building on the north end? In the spring, the north neighbour is impacted by shadow with 3-4 hrs of sun, and summer there is no shadow in the neighbour property. The orientation could be moved more south to increase the separation from the neighbouring property.
- Why is this building a higher FSR and height compared to the other buildings? The applicant is consolidating several properties, the proposed building is six stories with a roof top amenity to bring it to seven stories.

Ben Smith left the meeting at 2:00pm

Panel members discussed:

- This building will transform the neighbourhood. The densification of the city should pay attention to the acknowledgement of the location of the building and the points staff outlined in their report to consider.
- Height of the building and transition, step backs are not preferable and don't necessarily achieve the desired effect. Prefer articulation in the massing as a design approach and this building looks like its in between.
- Concerns with shadowing for neighbours on the north but otherwise a great, thoughtful project.

- Six stories should be the minimum for buildings to address current and future concerns.
- Concerns with the messaging that new construction sends. Transition matters and existing buildings do matter to ensure the city remains a livable place.

Motion: David Berry

Seconded: by Devon Skinner

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000623 for 1900 Richmond Road, 1921, 1929, 1931/1933, and 1935 Ashgrove Street be approved as presented.

For: David Berry, Devon Skinner

Opposed: Pamela Madoff, Sean Partlow, Colin Harper, Will King.

Motion: Failed

Motion: Will King

Secunder: Pamela Madoff

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000623 for 1900 Richmond Road, 1921, 1929, 1931/1933, and 1935 Ashgrove Street be approved with the following changes:

- Recommend approval with revisions to address the transitions to the lower density neighbourhood.

For: Devon Skinner, Will King, David Berry, Sean Partlow

Opposed: Pamela Madoff, Colin Harper

Carried 4:2

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn: Pamela Madoff, Seconded by Devon Skinner

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of May 24, 2023 was adjourned at 2:34 pm.

Devon Skinner, Chair