

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY AUGUST 22, 2018**

1. THE CHAIR CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 12:08 PM

Present: Stefan Schulson (Acting Chair); Sorin Birliga; Deborah LeFrank; Jason Niles; Carl-Jan Rupp

Absent for a Portion of the Meeting: Justin Gammon

Absent: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Elizabeth Balderston; Paul Hammond

Staff Present: Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Leanne Taylor – Senior Planner
Rob Bateman – Senior Process Planner
Katie Lauriston – Secretary
Devon Cownden – Secretary

3.3 Development Permit Application No. 000522 for 210 Kimta Road

The City is considering a Development Permit Application to construct a 25-storey residential building with ground floor commercial.

Applicant meeting attendees:

JIM AALDERS	HDR / CEI ARCHITECTURE ASSOCIATES, INC.
JAMES PARTLOW	LOMBARD NORTH GROUP
KEN MARIASH	FOCUS EQUITIES

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

- the relationship of the ground floor to Kimta Road
- the building top.

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

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

- what is the rationale behind the building's orientation in relation to the street?
 - the site plan and building orientation are largely laid out within the design guidelines, to which this proposal must adhere

- the guidelines state that there must be a mews, as well as enforce the need to reduce shadowing on the heritage-designated roundhouse buildings and railway turntable
- why doesn't the proposal face Kimta Road to a greater extent?
 - the building's structure is built upon the below-grade parking layout, and its orientation is designed to maximize the two key views to the Olympic Mountains and towards the Inner Harbour
 - the building's orientation is dictated by the views, the structure, and the design guidelines
- is the site's master plan already completed?
 - yes, there is an approved Master Development Agreement (MDA)
 - the applicants have begun the process of drafting a new site plan to create fewer walls and further open up the site
- is the roundhouse, as the site's largest amenity, to be completed at the end of the project?
 - Mr. Betanzo clarified that the MDA states that the roundhouse must be completed in either the first or second phase of development; it will be completed next
- is the hardscaped façade towards the Lime Bay mews designed to accommodate emergency access?
 - there are certain width requirements for emergency vehicle access, but the detailing can be carefully considered to place some trees in this location
 - the mews design is based on creating a view corridor from the roundhouse to the water, and any trees added would have to maintain these views
- why does the pedestrian path divert into Sitkum Park before paralleling the E&N Rail Trail?
 - the pathway separates pedestrians from cyclists, and the pedestrian path has a pleasant diversion towards the centre of Sitkum Park
 - the pathway's general configuration is already approved as part of the design guidelines through the MDA
- was a range of market prices considered to increase diversity?
 - although there is currently no rental component, there is a broad range of residential purchasers
 - most of the units are priced at the top end to add diversity to the existing community
 - at the beginning of the project, the desire was for an affordable community but the project was refused by the City for many years and the project costs have since increased
 - the units are no more costly than those downtown, and there are rentals located at the other side of the railroad tracks, closer to the commercial components
 - the applicants see no possibility of recuperating the costs of the development; the desire is simply to complete the project
- is there a historical rail connection to the water, or is this new?
 - historically, there was a spur going towards the water but not in the mews location
- are only passive uses proposed for the park?
 - Garry oaks and native planting were initially proposed, but the Parks department wanted a continuation of the boulevard trees
 - the public use of Sitkum Park will be maintained, and it will be contoured for some elevation with the pathway sloping down from the Rail Trail
- how does the grade of the entry plaza compare to that of the park?
 - the entry plaza is at a lower level than the mews, and there is a grade change at the southeastern corner of the entry plaza
 - the pool is at the same grade as the townhouse patios, which is approximately 2m above Kimta Road

- what is the proposed programming for the plaza area east of the pool?
 - the patio will be secured but visually open, with a lawn pathway connection to Sitkum Park
- who will use the pool?
 - the pool will be for residents only
- what is the difference of elevation between the outdoor patio and Sitkum Park?
 - the lawn will rise about 2ft so that it is level with the patio, and a fence will be installed for security
- is lighting proposed for the raised walkway connection between the outdoor patio and the pedestrian pathway?
 - yes, LED lighting will be installed to demarcate the pedestrian pathway
- what is the necessity of the two parking spaces at the main entry plaza?
 - these spaces are desirable as they provide an easy pickup location for residents; they are not intended for parking
- what is the rationale behind the proposal's two townhouse units on the main floor; were more townhouses or an entirely commercial main floor considered?
 - the corner unit at the mews is in a prime commercial location, and helps set the tone for the commercial aspect of the mews
 - the townhomes are not experienced as being mixed with the commercial spaces, as there is access to the townhomes that avoids the amenity and commercial spaces
 - the location of the townhomes helps to animate the Rail Trail and avoids a 'back of house' to the building
- the townhouse patios cover the pedestrian pathway on some plans; is this correct?
 - this is an error in the plans; the patios are smaller than indicated
 - the landscape plan shows the correct proportions for the patios
- will the planters be smaller than indicated, or are the patios smaller?
 - the planters are smaller, and stairs will step down from the patios towards the pathway
- is there leeway within the MDA for a lesser division between the Rail Trail's pedestrian and cycling pathways?
 - Mr. Betanzo clarified that a green buffer between the cycling and pedestrian trails is specified within the MDA.

Justin Gammon left the meeting at 3:05pm.

Panel members discussed:

- recognition of the value of the proposal's narrative (i.e. rails to sails); desire for this story to animate the space
- appreciation for the level of detail brought into the proposal
- appreciation for the addition of commercial activity within the master planned development
- anticipation for an increased volume of pedestrians along the cycling corridor at Sitkum Park due to the significant diversion from the pathway
- concern that the order of development may be ill-suited to the health of the area; desire for the roundhouse, as the site's main amenity, to be completed first
- caution against creating an enclave for a privileged sector of society given the lack of affordable housing and rental options

- recognition for the importance of a cohesive master plan
- concern that Sitkum Park is treated as a leftover piece, when it should be a desirable amenity for the area
- the need to review the adjacencies between the entry plaza and Sitkum Park
- desire for more and better-integrated greenspace on-site
- the need for increased landscaping at the west side
- opportunity for urban trees within the mews
- desire to eliminate parking at the front entrance
- appreciation for the mews concept
- desire for refinement of how the building meets the ground on the south and west sides to improve the pedestrian experience
- the need to resolve the relationship between public and retail spaces
- desire for the mews to be narrowed to a more pedestrian scale
- the building's alignment to the mews and its lack of response to Kimta Road
- need to improve the articulation of the south façade facing Kimta Road to avoid having a 'back of house'
- opportunity to better respond to Kimta Road through the building's alignment or a reflection of the road's gentle curve
- desire for fewer building corners facing Kimta Road, to increase the building's engagement and appeal towards the public realm
- no concerns with the proposed materials
- the need to resolve the arbitrary termination of the terra cotta brick; opportunity to extend this material further up the elevations
- desire for increased consistency between the elevations, especially at the podium level of the south and west elevations
- the need to resolve the prominent podium level
- desire for increased consistency with the trellis and eyebrows at the building top
- the mechanical room as a lost opportunity for the top of the building
- need to refine the building top and canopies with a more elegant, tapered approach.

Motion:

It was moved by Sorin Birliga, seconded by Justin Gammon, that the Development Permit Application No. 000522 for 210 Kimta Road be approved subject to the following recommendations:

- introduce more vegetation throughout the site, particularly along the Lime Bay Mews
- reconsider and refine the relationship between the first three storeys of the podium and Kimta Road to create a consistent podium level expression with the Lime Bay Mews in terms of materiality, scale and detail
- increase the integration between the lobby entrance area and Sitkum Park
- refine the building top to better align with the design guidelines and to screen the mechanical rooms.

Carried Unanimously