

3.3 Development Permit Application No. 000508 for 926 - 932 Pandora Avenue

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to allow a ten-storey, mixed-use building with ground floor commercial and residential above.

Applicant meeting attendees:

CURTIS KNICHEL	HDR / CEI ARCHITECTURE ASSOCIATES, INC.
MEGAN WALKER	LADR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS
CARLY ABRAHAM	KANG AND GILL CONSTRUCTION LTD.

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

- overall massing and building bulk
- ninth and tenth storey balconies and clearance to side property lines
- application of building materials.

Ms. Abraham provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal and Meghan Walker 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 for not having green roofs at the southwest corner of the second floor?
 - desire to avoid having personal items cluttering the street view
 - it would be possible to green the roofs
- what is the inspiration behind the panel pattern?
 - spires were considered, but in the end greenery was the design inspiration
- what is the material of the perforated screens?
 - pre-finished metal cladding
- what is the rationale for the location of the garbage/recycling collection?
 - the proposed location results from lengthy discussions with City staff
 - a waste management service provider has advised that picking up off of Pandora Avenue would not be an issue as long as the paving surface was smooth
 - the only other option would be in the courtyard with access from Mason Street, but this would be more disruptive to residents
- why is the proposed landscaped island not closer to the crosswalk?
 - this could be moved
- were noise and vibration concerns considered with the proposed garbage bay location next to the lobby?
 - the proposed location is a secondary entrance point
 - these services are disruptive no matter what, but will be most disruptive to the townhouse residents if placed by the primary residential entry at Mason Street
- how will the amenity space on the first level be programmed?
 - the outdoor and tenant space will be used for social gatherings and tenants' parties
- what is the rationale for the main entrance not being visible from the sidewalk?
 - the applicants have done similar projects before and have found it difficult to situate the elevator lobbies at the best point in the building

- placing the main lobby off Pandora Avenue was explored, but the vehicular access location and the noise and grit of Pandora Avenue drove the decision to make the entry off of Mason Street
 - the entrance is not as visible from Mason Street, but entering through the courtyard is nicer, the canopy provides a visual marker and there is a very nice feel along Mason Street
- do the townhouses only have windows towards Mason Street?
 - yes; although the two western units have an opportunity for windows at the rear, these would face neighbours
 - the interior layout supports the proposed window placement
- would glazed windows be possible for the inbound townhouse bedrooms?
 - this can be considered, but would have to respect the fire code and work around the L-shaped tower
- how is the tenth floor roof deck separated from the adjacent unit's bedroom?
 - there is glazing situated at the northwestern corner of the unit and the hedge planting also helps with privacy
 - sound insulation could also be improved for this corner
- what is the reason for the change in the ground level canopy colour on the Pandora Street elevation?
 - the initial design had a break at this location
 - the change helps define the lower commercial floor, but the colour could be made contiguous
- do the top balconies have any canopy above, or are they exposed?
 - at the moment they are exposed, although it would be desirable to extend the glass canopy
- were live-work opportunities with Mason Street explored?
 - the primary focus of the mix of unit types is to attract families, but live-work opportunities could also be explored
- is there a bathroom for the tenth floor amenity patio?
 - this could be added inside beside the storage area
- are the townhouse patios on Mason Street at street level?
 - Mason Street is sloped, so some patios are at street level
- is there opportunity for a green roof adjacent to the sixth and seventh floor patios?
 - this is a possibility
- were the materials purposely selected to create a muted palette?
 - the proposed materials evolved from many samples; the lighter colours in the lower floors complement the nearby churches and the bluish tones echo the lighter blue spandrel panel
- was an independent CPTED analysis completed? In particular, were the benches in the landscape plans included in a CPTED analysis?
 - no independent review was completed
 - there is sufficient light and enough eyes on the street to mitigate security concerns
- have the proposed benches been approved by the City?
 - no, this is just at a conceptual stage at the moment
- will the landscaped island be maintained by the developer?
 - this has not yet been discussed with the City
- what is the rationale for the paving pattern in the driveway from Mason Street?
 - the pattern highlights the main point of entry.

Deborah LeFrank left the meeting at 3:00pm.

Panel members discussed:

- recognition of the importance of the site in setting the tone for the area
- the proposal's scale in relation to its current surroundings and the need to consider future development and guidelines
- opportunity to improve the building's mass and functionality by adding a balcony on the top level
- appreciation for the building's shifts in the ground floor aligning with potential adjacent open spaces
- the successful integration of the townhouses and the creation of a street wall
- potential concern for privacy, ventilation and light with windowless bedrooms in the townhouse units
- opportunity to create some detachment of the townhouses for distance, to create a more exciting volume and provide light
- appreciation for the townhouse concept and materiality
- need to refine the second floor canopy to avoid an arbitrary change in colours
- need to break up the continuous glass railing at the top of the building
- concern for the reflectivity of the building overall; the opportunity to add materials to reduce the shininess
- need to reconsider the spandrel glass cladding
- recognition of the proposal's overall success in addressing the large mass
- potential to create an amenity space in the courtyard off of Mason Street

Elizabeth Balderston left the meeting at 3:20pm.

- concern for the functionality of the garbage and recycling removal route
- the necessity of improvements to the public realm
- concern for the liveability of the western units labelled "2 bedroom A" on all floors above the second, if an adjacent building is constructed near the property line
- the need to focus on the pedestrian experience
- concern for the cold, hostile pedestrian streetscape and entrance at Pandora Avenue
- appreciation for the glazing at the ground level on Pandora Avenue
- opportunity to make a statement with the entry canopies and resolve the entryways
- lack of visual clarity for main entry off Mason Street
- opportunity to benefit the future street wall through recessed balconies or by revealing greenspace.

Motion:

It was moved by Sorin Birliga, seconded by Stefan Schulson, that the Development Permit Application No. 000508 for 926 - 932 Pandora Avenue be approved:

1. subject to the following recommendations:
 - a) introduce non-reflective materials in lieu of spandrel panels;
 - b) revise the 9th floor continuous balcony;
 - c) refine both Pandora Avenue and Mason Street streetscapes and entrances; and
2. with consideration to the following recommendations:
 - a) reconfigure the garbage and recycling removal route;
 - b) consider adding windows to the townhouse bedrooms;

- c) review the design of the amenity spaces to improve functionality, privacy and serviceability; and
- d) consider the Panel's comments as captured within the meeting minutes.

Carried

For: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Sorin Birliga; Paul Hammond; Carl-Jan Rupp;
Stefan Schulson

Against: Jason Niles

4. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of May 23, 2018 was adjourned at 3:45 pm.

Jesse Garlick, Chair