

**MINUTES OF THE**  
**ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING**  
**HELD WEDNESDAY MAY 9, 2018**

**1. THE CHAIR CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 12:10 PM**

**Present:** Jesse Garlick (Chair); Elizabeth Balderston; Justin Gammon; Paul Hammond; Deborah LeFrank; Jason Niles; Carl-Jan Rupp; Stefan Schulson

**Absent:** Sorin Birliga

**Staff Present:** Jim Handy – Senior Planner  
 Rob Bateman – Senior Process Planner  
 Noraye Fjeldstad – Administration Assistant

**2. MINUTES**

**Minutes from the Meeting held March 28, 2018**

**Motion:**

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Jesse Garlick, that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held March 28, 2018 be adopted as presented.

**Carried**

**3. APPLICATIONS**

**3.1 Development Permit with Variance No. 00055 for 415 and 435 Michigan Street**

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit with Variance Application to construct a four-storey multiple dwelling building containing approximately 24 dwelling units and to retain the two existing 13-storey multiple dwelling buildings on site.

Applicant meeting attendees:

DEANE STRONGITHARM	CITYSPACES CONSULTING
MIKE HUGGINS	BURROWES HUGGINS ARCHITECTS
PETER HUGGINS	BURROWES HUGGINS ARCHITECTS
PAUL DE GREEFF	MURDOCH DE GREEFF INC.
ASHLEY BURKE	STARLIGHT INVESTMENTS

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

- setback to the building and front steps
- height of entrance stairs to upper units

- depth of ground floor units below street level
- pedestrian access to the rear units
- privacy impacts on adjacent existing buildings and between proposed roof top decks
- exterior materials.

Mr. M. Huggins provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Mr. De Greeff provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

Questions of clarification were asked by the Panel on the following:

- is the swimming pool currently used by existing residents?
  - residents report that the pool is quite well-used. It is in very good shape and is clean, and the residents are happy to be able to keep this feature as an important amenity
- is there a wide apron around the pool edge?
  - the pool apron is quite large, which allows adequate space to accommodate new development while accommodating the existing pool deck furniture
- the parking study does not indicate that vehicles are unable to simultaneously pass when there are cars parked on both sides of road; when was the study completed?
  - the study was completed in September / October 2017, and measurements were taken at two different demand times
  - the applicant concedes that the road space is tight
- does the City anticipate needing a larger setback than what is proposed?
  - the City does not have immediate plans to widen the road outside of the current right-of-way
- have there been comparative studies for the setbacks in the area?
  - the applicant supplied the Panel with a diagram of the surrounding setbacks
  - at the west end of the block, there is a 3-storey building with a 9.3m setback, a 2.5 storey building with a 10m setback, and a 3 storey with 15m setback
  - the proposed setback is considerably greater than the surrounding setbacks that existed prior to the towers
  - the building must be brought to the perimeter of the site to allow for infill
- were other spaces on the site considered for infill?
  - a tower was considered for the site, but the applicants were advised against this option
  - the rear of the site were also considered; however, this would result in loss of needed surface parking
- what is the reason for limiting the height of the new buildings at three storeys?
  - front doors must be no more than 1.5m above grade to allow for walk-up housing to comply with building code
- is the walk-up housing why the ground level is sunken?
  - yes; depressing the building allows the upper stair to adhere with building code without impeding on the liveability of the lowest levels
- to what degree was the need for bicycle parking and storage for strollers, etc. considered?
  - adding additional storage space for bicycles is challenging as it would result in the loss of parking spaces

- the units are well closeted and the front porch may serve as additional storage
- was more greenspace considered for the pool deck?
  - not at this time, as the residents utilize the pool deck frequently and removing space would likely result in tenant pushback
  - the developer does not believe there is enough room for added greenspace
- will drainage be integrated into the roof forms on the Michigan Street elevation?
  - the slip in the building allows water to be taken laterally to the west side of the site and deposited into a rain garden
- are the stair elements comprised of wood and concrete? Has the durability of these materials been considered?
  - the stairs will be constructed of wood stringers with pre-cast concrete treads
  - the materials have been in use for many years and have an approximate lifespan of 25 years
- is the building behind the Charter House a new building?
  - yes, it will be new construction for a garbage storage facility
- is there an opportunity to incorporate stormwater management for the regent towers?
  - the applicants were not able to get the water to flow from the regent towers towards a direction where it could be managed
- does the parking study include all three buildings?
  - yes
- are the rock walls currently at the entrance of the site being retained?
  - no, they will be reconstructed and taken down to minimum height to increase visibility from the driveway
- is the property being consolidated?
  - the sites are already consolidated
- were more trees considered for the parking lot?
  - this was considered, but due to the high points of the parking lot and asphalt curves, it would be too costly to reconfigure the parking lot to accommodate rain water collection
  - the driving aisles and some parking space depths are currently non-compliant; there is not a lot of space to add additional trees.

Panel members discussed:

- the proposal's appropriate and well thought-out design response to staff concerns
- appreciation for sensitive infill
- desire to see a revitalization plan for the consolidated site, instead of an incremental plan
- desire to see more effort to promoting a car-free lifestyle through the provision of amenities for scooters, bicycles, etc.
- concern for the storage building at the rear of the east tower not being readily available to all units; a storage unit more specific to the new development should be considered and some of the pool deck space could be used to accommodate this need
- the need for bicycle storage in closer proximity to the new building
- opportunity to incorporate bicycle / scooter parking to the west of the pool by reducing the pool deck slightly
- opportunity to enclose front stairs to provide additional unit storage

- privacy concerns for the ground floor units, with the overlook of the upper stairs on the lower patios resulting in the lower units being unapproachable to the street
- the location of the lower unit entrances could be moved to be offset with the upper exterior stairs, which would allow for a clear view of all entrances from the sidewalk, enhance the privacy between units and could be refined to incorporate unit storage to increase liveability
- no issues with the proposed setbacks
- support for the building's proximity to the street and its engagement with the streetscape through the small pocket gardens
- the proposal's appropriate fit within the neighbourhood while adding character to the street
- preserving the landscaping by not having a second sidewalk is appropriate as there are adequate walkways throughout the site
- no units promote accessibility despite the building being on the street frontage
- opportunity for existing tenants to benefit from more greenspace being added to the proposal, which could be accomplished by adding more vegetation to the parking surface, greenspace to the east of the pool and additional tree planting
- the significant impact on the existing towers arising from the proposed tree removal
- desire for additional landscaping in the pool deck area
- opportunity to better take advantage of the site, but the options being limited with the location of the pool and the size of the pool deck
- support for a rainwater system infiltrating into the greenspace.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Elizabeth Balderston, that Development Permit with Variance No. 00055 for 415 and 435 Michigan Street be approved with the following recommendations:

- explore utilizing the vertical elements of the building for rain water leaders and storage options
- consider flipping the layout of the studio suites to offset the alignment of the front door and the upper exterior stairs
- consider introducing additional greenspace to the consolidated site
- review stair design maximize privacy, storage and liveability
- reconsider the design of the building's end elevations to respond to the massing shift in the building form.

**Carried Unanimously**

### **3.2 Development Permit No. 000525 for 90 Saghalie Road**

The City is considering a Development Permit Application for a five-storey seniors' living facility comprising independent living units, assisted living units and accessory facilities.

Applicant meeting attendees:

BARRY WEIH  
JAMES BARDLAN  
WENDY HO

WENSLEY ARCHITECTURE LTD.  
LOMBARD NORTH  
ELEMENT LIFESTYLE RETIREMENT INC.

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

- stepping the building back from Kimta and Tyee Roads
- articulation of building and roofline on the south façade
- the use of finishing materials.

Mr. Weih provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Mr. Bardlan provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

Questions of clarification were asked by the Panel on the following:

- what is the material for the long, thin roof overhang on 5th floor?
  - it is concrete, and the intention is to keep this as thin as possible
- is the roof terrace on level 5 intended to be communal space?
  - the terrace off unit 21 at level 5 is a private patio
  - there is already a lot of communal space proposed
- is the patio space at the south side of level 2 shared amenity space?
  - the south facing amenity deck is an extension of the level 2 amenity space
- is the smaller deck to the east on level 2 also an amenity space?
  - this is an error in the renderings; a care unit had to be extended and this is no longer an amenity / yoga room
- is the viewscape towards the City looking east being retained?
  - the walkway from the east has three sets of stairs that pretty well match the grade, so there will be no large structures to restrict the views
  - the views do get narrower as one moves down the path
- does the path at the north connect to the amenity space for Bayview 1?
  - there is a connection at the west end to the driveway of Bayview 1
  - a connection at the east end to the Bayview 1 amenity space was not looked into, as the patio is not at grade
  - the path is roughly at grade, which would facilitate this connection
- where is the E&N trail in relation to the proposal?
  - there is currently no trail connection at the railway
- who required the right of way on the south side?
  - the City required the right of way to service adjacent lot
- is the plan to have a central stair to the west?
  - yes, there is another right of way on the adjacent property to allow a pedestrian connection
- will there be a door on the two-level loading bay entry?
  - there is no door proposed
- what are the loading bay materials?
  - a combination of stone and longboard
- what is the maximum vehicle height envisioned for the loading bay?
  - 16" clearance allows for emergency vehicles
  - the loading bay also conceals garbage disposal
- how does the loading bay wall terminate?
  - this level of detail has yet to be determined; this end could be widened for a nicer termination

- could the loading bay noise (i.e. garbage disposal) affect the residences above?
  - R2 rated concrete floor will act as a good sound barrier, and landscaping for the outdoor spaces will also help with the sound insulation
  - more soundproofing can be considered.

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the scale of the project and strength of the horizontal elements
- recognize strength of the east elevation block with the curved arbour
- need to reconsider distribution of massing overall to respond to the unique site contours and context
- opportunity to take advantage of long, curved boulevard and historic rail line
- appreciation for the technical resolution of the building typology
- need to clarify design intent and present a coherent theme that is reflective of what is going on inside the building
- opportunity to improve the resolution of the central block on the south elevation to better respond to the curved street
- success of the elements on the north elevation in responding to the curve and changes in elevation; opportunity to bring this approach to the south elevation
- need to minimize the amount of retaining walls fronting the ground-oriented suites along Tyee Road to make the suites more inviting from the sidewalk
- the importance of having a strong pedestrian corridor
- need to consider obscuring views into the service entrance
- the need to redesign the service entrance materials and overall impact on the public realm
- commend the applicant's effort towards integrating and hiding services on such a complex site
- desire to see additional renderings of the pathways throughout the site
- no issues with the proposal's approach to stepping back
- opportunity for a green roof given the overlook onto the site
- the fifth level terrace would make a good community space rather than a private patio, especially as it is envisioned to be well-populated but only serves one or two units
- the need for permanent shaded spaces on the second floor outdoor amenity space.

#### **Motion:**

It was moved by Paul Hammond, seconded by Justin Gammon, that Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000525 for 90 Saghalie Road be approved subject to the following recommendations:

- reconsider the south elevation form and massing to be more in harmony with the site topography, context and the Core Songhees Development Permit guidelines
- reconsider the service entrance design including materials, screening, and overall impact on the public realm including future pedestrian linkages
- provide additional renderings to show the views throughout the site from the pedestrian pathways
- consider incorporating a permanent shading element on the second floor outdoor amenity space.

**Carried Unanimously**

#### **4. ADJOURNMENT**

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of May 9, 2018 was adjourned at 3:32 pm.

---

Jesse Garlick, Chair