

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY JUNE 26, 2024**

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

Present: Bruce Anderson (Chair)
Priscilla Samuel
Colin Harper
Tamara Bonnemaïson
David Berry
Julie Brown
Patrick Conn

Absent: Peter Johannknecht
Elizabeth Balderson

Staff Present: Miko Betanzo- Senior Planner, Urban Design
Rob Bateman – Senior Planner
Charlotte Wain - Senior Planner, Urban Design
Mike Angrove - Senior Planner
Alena Hickman – Planning Secretary

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion:

It was moved by Julie Brown seconded by Patrick Conn to adopt the agenda as presented.

Carried Unanimously

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion:

It was moved by Colin Harper , seconded by Tamara Bonnemaïson to adopt the Minutes of May 22, 2024 as amended.

Carried Unanimously

4. APPLICATION

4.1 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00272 for 837 Broughton Street

The proposal is for a six-storey mix-use building with a ground floor live-work unit facing Broughton Street and approximately 42 purpose built rental units.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Greg Damant – Cascadia Architects
Chris Windjack – LADR
Justin Gammon - Cascadia Architects
Suzane Bradbury - Fort Properties
Jayne Bradbury - Fort Properties
Anniek Wheeler – Cascadia Architects

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

- live-work unit
- rear yard setback
- private and common amenity areas
- the proposed mural on the west elevation
- Any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Greg Demant 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:

- Was there consideration to provide cantilevered balconies off the rear yard?
 - There was. With how balconies are used with common amenity space vs personal it seemed to be that personal balconies are used more for storage and we felt the finances would be put to better use in the common spaces.
 - We are also trying to promote the neighbourhood as an amenity space for occupants
- Was there consideration to provide more of a distinct top to this building as currently it reads as two parts.
 - We did look at that, we are trying to embrace the paired back and clean approach. We wanted them to feel volumetrically symmetrical. Being more pronounced at the parapet.
- In regard to the size of the amenity spaces was there a reason you setback the front to match the adjacent property and not the other?
 - The sidewalk isn't very generous, so we wanted to expand on that as a starting point. We will recess parts of the façade regardless. Approaching it from an architectural flat façade it made sense to setback the whole building.
- Is there any reason you went live-work instead of a standard commercial space?
 - We have seen this site evolve; we see it as a transition site which depending on the use at the time allows us to have a lot of creativity and flexibility in our leasing.
- Was there discussion on the inclusion of a rooftop amenity space?
 - We have been discussion it, there has not yet been a conclusion on it.
- Why two private amenity spaces rather than having the whole rear yard as a common amenity space?

- It stems from the quality of privacy for those two units. It was a natural biproduct of the geometry of the space.
- Did you consider repeating the Juliette balconies in the back?
 - There are, both front and back.

Panel members discussed:

- The live-work space was described well
- Mural is nice looking, no issues
- Amenity space in the rear has been done well
- Rooftop amenity space would be great
- Understand financial restraints with not being able to provide a rooftop amenity space
- I don't think it would be a detriment to the application if balconies were provided
- No issues with the setbacks
- Beautiful building that will integrate well into the neighbourhood
- More consideration for residential access
- Would it be possible to borrow yard space
- Door placements could change on storage space to make things more functional
- Consider the whole west façade for the mural
- Prefer the landscape as is, would sacrifice the frontage
- Lovely project

Motion: That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application with Variances No.00272 for 837 Broughton Street be approved as presented.

Motion: David Berry

Seconded by: Colin Harper

Carried Unanimously

Tamara Bonnemaison left the meeting 12:57pm

4.2 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00251 for 50 Government Street

The proposal is to construct a 4.5-storey rental residential building with 16 dwelling units. A concurrent Rezoning Application accompanies the Development Permit Application.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Will King – Waymark Architecture
 Sarah King - Waymark Architecture
 Mike Jones – Oeza Developments
 Bruce Gauthier

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

- open space
- street relationship
- form and massing
- impact on adjacent properties
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Will King provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal and details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Can you elaborate on the viewing angles and sight lines from the side windows effect the neighbouring buildings?
 - We have high ceilings, and raised the windows so the with windowsills you cannot get into position to be able to see down into neighbouring yards. This also allows for a lot of natural light. This still allows for sightlines to the mountains and taller trees.
- Can you speak to the overlook of the rear yards?
 - We have brought the windows up and have increased them. The trees will block views into neighbours' lots. Once you are outside onto the deck for the upper unit, the view to the mountains is the focus.
- For staff: Why is this one site designated Urban Residential?
 - Likely it would have been designated this when the OCP was created in 2012. Looking more future focused.
- What is the OCP designation for the neighbouring properties?
 - There is a mix when you look at the map, traditional residential, and this lot is Urban place.
- Regarding parking stalls, was the provision of two parking stalls on site a requirement by City staff?
 - The City did not advise to design a car free building. We had designed this for different uses. Having the carshare seemed like a smart thing to do for the car free building as well as accessible spot. Providing to live car free but still being able to have space for things like amazon and mail.
- Does the car share have to be accessible spots?
 - I'm unsure.
- Did you consider locating the bike storage in the rear block.
 - We did, but we didn't want to hide the fact that this is a car free building. The front block of the lobby needs things like mail rooms, so space was tight. Taking advantage of those rear yard spaces.
- Was the gable roof driven by trying to refer to the neighbourhood or what was the reasoning behind that decision?
 - We found the flat roof didn't seem to carry any small-scale building. The peak allowed for additional living space. Taking advantage of a bigger rental space.

Panel members discussed:

- Great presentation

- Ambitious, tough density on the lot
- Thoughtfully located open spaces for residents
- No concern with the Government St. setback
- Big building but most concerns have been mitigated
- Northeast side could use a bit more space for a landscape buffer
- Large building
- Innovative build
- Extremely well thought out with great creativity
- Neighbouring sites setback will be fine in the long run
- Street relationship at the ground floor – would like to see a residential use
- Move bike parking to the rear block
- Potentially reduce bike parking
- Prefer to see one parking space on site and have the space given back to the building.

MOTION:

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 00251 for 50 Government Street be approved as presented.

Motion: **David Berry** **Seconded by: Priscilla Samuel**

For: David Berry, Priscilla Samuel, Bruce Anderson, Julie Brown, Patrick Conn

Opposed: Colin Harper

Carried 5:1

Julie Brown recused herself from OCP Amendment, Rezoning No. 00873 and Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00269 for 603 Pandora Street

4.3 OCP Amendment, Rezoning No. 00873 and Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00269 for 603 Pandora Street

The proposal is for a twelve-storey hotel with ground floor commercial uses and requires an Official Community Plan (OCP) amendment, a Rezoning and Development Permit with Variances Application.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Erica Sangster – DAU Studio
 David Jacobson – Trace Projects
 Frank D'Ambrosio – DAU Studio
 Josh Harvey – DAU Studio
 Kevin Klassen – Hapa Collaborative
 Joseph Fry – Hapa Collaborative
 Francis Mairet – Owner

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 proposed height and density relative to the policies for the area and any implications or impacts departures from city policies may have
- The massing approach insofar as respecting, complementing and contributing positively to the historic context of Old Town to ensure that new buildings contribute and do not detract from the established character of the area, particularly with respect to the proposed use of pre-fabricated modules and the lack of setbacks above the seventh storey
- The proposed fenestration and window proportions in terms of the proposal's fit with the form and character of Old Town
- How the proposed structural bay layout and ground floor design contributes or not to the established street rhythm and historic streetscape pattern
- The proposed material selection in terms of meeting the design guideline objectives to use a variety of high-quality materials, finishes and details, which contribute to the visual character, texture, composition and charm of the streetscape, and the area's overall identity
- Any other aspects of the proposal the ADP wish to comment on.

Erica Sangster 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:

- Has a parking study been done and what is the reasoning for 4 levels of parking in that location?
 - It's actually a reduction from what they would typically request of that brand standard. We are trying to find a balance between not increasing costs and meeting the expectation of the brand standard.
- DCAP and OCP envision 5-storeys here and additionally where taller buildings are proposed that they do not exceed 3-storeys relative to their neighbours, so why does the applicant think a 12-storey building is appropriate?
 - The program has increased over the years in response to economic parameters for this project. To make this project viable we looked at many different massings. We are always working in at least 7-storeys as a fabric building. To meet the 200 room limit we settled on the 12-storeys looking at the inspiration of such buildings as the Belmont building.
- Can you please go over the materials specifically for the podium panelling?
 - We are hoping to use a medium density cementitious fiber-c. They don't have trim pieces over the joints. They can also take a level of different finish treatments.
- Is terracotta panelling what is on the upper levels?
 - It's a matte and not a painted finish which is what we were worried about with terracotta
- Why did you which to cementitious panels on the lower level?
 - It's the same product we just switched to the narrower panel.

- What is the reason for the blank wall?
 - It's a surface marker, more challenging to fit some windows.
- Was the choice of cementitious panel influenced by the modular construction?
 - It does make is more viable for a higher quality cladding. We were happy to select it.

Panel members discussed:

- No concerns with setbacks
- Materials and fenestrations have been handled well
- Design ties well with heritage context
- Concern for the height
- Appreciate the punched windows
- Plaza looks wonderful
- Redefining what this site might be
- Appreciate what the site might be is put into the context of what the site was
- Don't think a smaller building would fit in the context better
- Interesting to have a show piece building in that spot

Motion: That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 00269 for 603 Pandora Street be approved as presented.

Motion: Bruce Anderson Seconded by: David Berry

For: Bruce Anderson, David Berry, Patrick Conn, Priscilla Samuel

Opposed: Colin Harper

Carried 4-1

Tamara Bonnemaison rejoined the meeting

4.4 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00234 for 1055 Alston Street

The proposal is for a mixed-use building with one industrial unit and approximately 56 residential units and requires a Rezoning and Development Permit with Variances Application.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Alex McCumber
Charles Kierulf

dHKarchitects
dHKarchitects

Mike Angrove provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application.

Alex McCumber 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:

- Do you have a landscape architect on the project and do you have landscape plan you can show us?
 - Yes, 4-Site landscaping.
- What is the grade difference between the front and back?
 - It's a 10m differential, approximately 2 stories.
- What is the proposal for the ground units along Tyee Rd?
 - There is no user selected yet. It could be used for light industrial.
- Is this space meant for public access?
 - The entrance would be off Tyee Rd. There is no public entry on the window wall side.
- Are there specific areas that staff are looking for ADP to comment on?
 - Not specifically. This is Council directed so any comments are welcome.
- What is the material proposed for the Tyee frontage?
 - Similar to the upper, flat metal panel and corrugated metal panelling.
- What building code will this be under?
 - It will be decided at the time of application, we haven't gotten that far at this time.
- Will you make the application before the change over timeline for building code?
 - Yes, the intent is to make that application before that date.

Panel members discussed:

- Not much opportunity for greenspace which is understandable but disappointing
- Challenging with the street frontage along Tyee Rd, not sensitive to the neighbours
- Surface parking could go inside the ground level
- Frontage could use a different treatment

MOTION: That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00234 for 1055 Alston Street be approved with the following changes:

- Improve the street relationship between the Tyee industrial use space and the adjacent residential building, potentially by including more landscape treatment such as trees and raingardens and relocating surface parking.

Motion: Julie Brown

Seconded by: Tamara Bonnemaïson

Carried unanimously

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn: Colin Harper, Seconded by David Berry

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of April 24, 2024 was adjourned at 3:32 pm.

Bruce Anderson, Chair