

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 26, 2022**

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

Present: Will King (Acting Chair), Ben Smith, David Berry, Sean Partlow, Colin Harper, Pamela Madoff

Absent: Devon Skinner, Peter Johannknecht, Tamara Bonnemaïson
Matty Jardine

Staff Present: Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Manasvini – Senior Planner
Patrick Carroll – Senior Planner
Alena Hickman – Administrative Assistant

2. AGENDA APPROVAL

Motion:

It was moved by Pamela Madoff, seconded by Ben Smith, that the agenda for the October 26, 2022 meeting be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

3. MINUTES

Motion:

It was moved by Pamela Madoff, seconded by Ben Smith, that the minutes from the meeting held September 28, 2022 be approved as presented.

Carried Unanimously

4. APPLICATIONS

4.1 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00201 for 2300, 2310 and 2312 Douglas Street

The proposal is for a four-storey, mixed-use self-storage building consisting of light manufacturing uses on the ground floor and self-storage above.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Helen Besharat – BFA studio architects
Chris Bradley – BG Douglas Ventures Inc.

Chris Windjack – LADR Landscape Architects

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

- building mass and composition
- building to street interface
- selection and application of exterior finishes
- north elevation
- landscaping
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Helen Besharat 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:

- Is there a reason you didn't go with the 5 storeys the OCP calls for and one level of parkade?
 - There is a maximum allowed height for the existing zoning, and that didn't let us go another storey as well we didn't have enough FSR.
- How do you get into the bike parking area?
 - Bikers can get to the building from the back over head door, in front of the oversized elevators, down one floor and the bike storage is right across from the elevator doors.
- How does the planning department view the lack of surface parking?
 - The planning director would have to inform on this. I believe they aren't concerned about parking.
- Are you confident with the level of parking availability for large vehicles to access and service the whole building?
 - We looked at 6 other sites to try to get the correct amount of loading bays and sizes. Our recommendations are based on that. The site requires 11 parking spaces which is quite a bit lower than the 19 that we are providing.
 - Two large van spots to accommodate Uhauls and fleet vehicles as well to the north is the largest spot which is about 10m long.
- Did you study the existing parking requirements of the empty lot and what impact a new building might have on removing that parking location from the neighbourhood?
 - No, that was not part of our scope, so we didn't look at the existing demands.

Panel members discussed:

- The building and specifically the north elevation are a bit bland
- Parking lots are rapidly developing
- No issues with north elevation
- Windows on the exterior are a nice touch
- More than what I was expecting for a storage building
- Building is suitable for it's use
- Building to street interface could have more glazing

- Consider using a darker cladding to further differentiate
- Would like to see a bit more landscaping but am aware it isn't required

Motion:

It was moved by Colin Harper, seconded by Ben Smith that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00201 for 2300, 2310 and 2312 Douglas Street does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be approved with the following changes

- Further differentiation between the ground and upper levels.

Carried Unanimously

5.2 Development Permit with Variance(s) Application No. 000204 for 1733-1737 Fairfield Road (concurrent with Rezoning Application No. 000821)

The proposal is to demolish three existing homes (1733, 1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road), consolidate three lots into one, and construct a 4-storey, 19-unit multiple dwelling development.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Greg Damant - Cascadia Architects
 Sara Huynh – Cascadia Architects
 Kim Tang– Biophilia Collective
 Elizabeth Balderson – Biophilia Collective
 Rob Starkey – Aryze
 Chris Quigley - Aryze

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

- surface parking impacts on greenspace, streetscape and buffering
- transition in scale
- sensitivity of design to neighbourhood context
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Chris Quigley & Sara Huynh provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Kim Tang provided a brief description of the landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- What were the primary reasons for no below grade parking?
 - Our experience across the road with the soil quality and clay for a project of this size would be a massive expense.

- There is a market driver for preference for future buyers wanting parking at grade.
- The landscape architects have developed a softened gentle approach to the at grade parking experience.
- What is the ratio for storage lockers to the number of residential homes?
 - The parking area does include some private garages with some storage.
 - In the main building it's 1 per unit.
 - We would like to find some more space if we can.
- There was comment of possibly extending the top floor to make a full floor, what would that do to the proposed roofline?
 - I think for overall height it wouldn't change. I think there is still some ability to have it push back from Fairfield Road but keep within the current height. Working on the Beechwood side a bit more to make it more like a three storey as it tapers down.
- Is there a reason why the street trees don't space out along Fairfield Road?
 - There are 7 trees, we made changes after the plans were distributed to the panel.
- A question for the Planner: Is this the first of similar visions to come in this neighbourhood or is this the only of its kind?
 - There is nothing to my knowledge and the existing documents that have been done to date that would indicate and envisioned increased beyond traditional residential densities and heights at this time.
 - There was a previous process around a new local area plan for the Gonzales neighbourhood, although I'm not aware of a completion timeline.
- Have you looked at the issues and comments by the City in regards to building type and character as well as the roof structure?
 - Yes, I think we will look at it again. The roof was a balancing game. We wanted it to be calm and controlled but liked that it broke down the massing of the building. Depending on our priorities, we will consider it and continue to do so.
- With regards to the level 4 floor plate, is it a requirement in your performance to make it viable and have some below market housing included in the project?
 - Yes. Currently the top floor is the penthouse type with a sizable unit. There could be a different path that would break it up and bring some efficiency to the building and have those affordable houses spread throughout the building.
- This building is kitty corner to the building Aryze just completed on Fairfield Road correct?
 - Yes.
- Is there also an existing three-story rental building just down the street?
 - Yes.

Panel members discussed:

- Share staff concerns
- Mindful that we plan a City it based on policy and planning
- Significant ask and what are the aspects of the plan
- Form, massing and manipulation
- Mansard roof sits proud and prominent and dominant
- Need more landscaping for lushness
- Enhancing the public and private realm

- No consideration to the Abkhazi garden
- Neighbourhood context matters
- Roof peak, aggressive look
- Similar to the Rhodo in terms of roofline, not out of place
- Underground parking in costly
- Building doesn't fit well into its context
- Not fitting with the character

Motion:

It was moved by Colin Harper, seconded by David Berry that Development Permit with Variance(s) Application No. 000204 for 1733-1737 Fairfield Road be approved with the following changes

- Consideration to simplifying the roof form to be more sympathetic to the neighbouring context.
 - **MINORITY REPORT:** Those that voted against believe the building is not consistent with the density, height and use envisioned for traditional areas in the OCP

Carried 4:2

For: Ben Smith, David Berry, Sean Partlow, Colin Harper
Opposed: Pamela Madoff, Will King

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn: Moved by Sean Partlow, Seconded by Ben Smith

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of October 26, 2022 was adjourned at 2:53 pm.

Will King, Chair (acting)