

- appreciation for the townhouse massing
- desire for the townhouse design to be clearly expressed as residential from the public realm, through a reconsideration of the materials
- the need to redesign the blank townhouse wall overlooking the parking lot
- opportunity to redistribute bicycle parking to avoid bottlenecks in tight corridors
- the desire for additional renderings and supporting documentation to show the details of the pedestrian realm and through-block pathway
- opportunity to improve the shape of the balconies to better integrate within the building massing.

Motion:

It was moved by Elizabeth Balderston, seconded by Sorin Birliga, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00059 for 605-629 Speed Avenue and 606-618 Frances Avenue be approved subject to the following recommendations:

- enhance the pedestrian link and experience through the corridor by increasing greenspace and soft landscaping, paving patterns and textures
- provide significant landscaping enhancements at the ground level
- redesign the second storey including the south elevator adjacent to townhouse block with consideration of CPTED principles, circulation, natural daylighting and distribution of amenity that is reflected in exterior elevations
- provide additional renderings and other supporting documentation for the pedestrian realm and through-block pathway
- integrate the north and south balconies into façade design.

Carried Unanimously

2.3 Rezoning Application No. 00618 and Development Permit Application No. 000519 for 1712 and 1720 Fairfield Road

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to allow for a three-storey multi-unit residential development.

Applicant meeting attendees:

ALEC SMITH	SHAPE ARCHITECTURE
DWAYNE SMITH	SHAPE ARCHITECTURE
MATTHEW HARTY	SHAPE ARCHITECTURE
BIANCA BODLEY	BIOPHILIA DESIGN COLLECTIVE
LUKE MARI	PURDEY GROUP

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

- the height and roofline within the existing context
- the transition with Hollywood Park
- site planning around the rear block of townhouses.

Alec Smith provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Bianca Bodley provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

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

- what is the materiality at the ground plane?
 - a single, large picture window for each unit, with pebble dash stucco, significant glazing and wood panelling above
- how do the roof forms emulate the topography of the site?
 - the hip roof has been modified to match the site's topographical lines
- are there open volumes within the habitable spaces?
 - yes, the open volumes are above the top floor
- is there an accessible alternative to stairs to enter the plaza?
 - no, as townhouses do not have the same accessibility requirements as other residential typologies
- would it be possible to incorporate ramps to accommodate strollers and children on bicycles?
 - this is something that could be addressed if recommended
- what is the distance between the corner of Block 3 and Block 2?
 - 6.2m
- how close to the proposal is the tennis court?
 - the proposal is approximately 3m away from the property line, and the tennis court is another 3m from the site
- was breaking up the massing facing Fairfield Road considered?
 - the renderings may not do this justice, but each entry point set back from the road and each has a bench
 - designed with consideration to shading and light conditions
 - there is a flat massing, but it is articulated where it will engage with public spaces
- what is the height of the guard wall separating the courtyard and the parkade?
 - 3.5 ft / 42"
- South point block 3 – contemplating angled end unit
- was angling the south corner of Block 3 considered to add more distance between blocks and add light to the courtyard?
 - it was considered both ways, and the architect found purity of form in the proposed configuration
 - density is beneficial to this project; with the overall spacing right, density creates magic, lane-like conditions
- what are the proposed passive house / environmental standards?
 - striving for high-performance, double-glazed or vinyl windows and a high R-value roof
 - electric baseboard heating provides the lowest carbon impact
 - considering solar panels
- are there thick walls?
 - not at this point
- is there sufficient slope for the proposed standing seam rooves?
 - the standing seam would wrap around all sloped rooves, and the flat portions would likely be a membrane
- what is the root mass for the large trees in the planters?
 - the root wall depth is a minimum of 3' wide and 24" deep

- how much soil would be in the planters?
 - 2' x 3'
 - the trees will be dwarfed by the planters but will be an appropriate size for the area
- was the fencing in the backyards included in the first design concept?
 - Block 3 was up at plinth level in the first iteration, and has now been pushed down to grade as a result of discussions with the City
 - this has helped to unify the project
- is it only the height triggering the Official Community Plan (OCP) amendment?
 - yes; the OCP does not envision three storeys along Fairfield Road
 - urban residential zones would allow the proposed height
 - the proposal is within density requirements, it is just the number of storeys triggering the OCP amendment
- does the draft Gonzales plan envision the proposed height?
 - Mr. Johnston clarified that the draft Gonzales plan does support three-storey buildings along Fairfield Road; however, Council recently moved to limit opportunity for 3-storey apartment buildings
 - this guideline may change through the consultation process
- is the site not designated as a small urban village?
 - Mr. Johnston noted that the site is zoned commercial. Although there has been previous discussion to change its designation, it is not being considered at this point
- are there skylights on Block 3?
 - yes, above the stairwells
- why not include skylights on the other buildings?
 - skylights will be included on all buildings, but were not drawn in the plans
- why does the fence along Hollywood park not follow the property line?
 - the concept was for the fence to follow the roofline, but this will likely change so that the fence follows the property line.

Panel members discussed:

- concern for height, although Fairfield Road is noisy and the proposal may be in alignment with the proposed area guidelines
- the view of the proposal from the park
- questioning the appropriateness of precedents such as New York, UK and California in Fairfield
- the urban feel and architectural strength of the building
- the proposal being a challenge to support for this site
- the proposal's lack of fit within the neighbourhood and the OCP, being too dense and urban for the context
- the potential for a small urban village designation and changes to the local area plan
- the OCP outlines issues relating to height, but other issues include the proposal's form and character
- the precedent-setting nature of the proposal
- the proposal being an urban solution in a residential area
- an appreciation for the materiality and the rooftop following the site's topography
- appreciation for the complexity of the site
- recognition of the proposal's architectural merit

- the proposal representing an opportunity to improve the area's character through good architecture that is responsive to the site
- the importance of the proposal's relationship to the park
- the proposal offering a different interpretation of residential
- concern for adequate breathing room between the proposed buildings, particularly the southern corner of Block 3 and the space between Block 3 and Block 2
- lack of soft landscaping in the central courtyard
- insufficient density of planting space
- concern for proposed Leyland cypress as an invasive species and its impact on neighbours
- the planters being too small to for growing large trees
- shading concerns for the site
- safety concerns for the height of the wall into the parkade
- the desire to see the parkade entrance softened
- desire for more amenity space for residents
- recognition of the interior plaza as an interesting and contemporary idea
- accessibility concerns
- concern for the appropriateness of the materials in a rainy climate
- the importance of the prominence of the front entries
- opportunity to improve the pedestrian experience
- the monolithic massing of the proposal from Fairfield, looking north
- the opportunity to step down or otherwise refine massing towards the east, especially on Block 3.

Motion:

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Jesse Garlick, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit No. 000519 for 1712 & 1720 Fairfield Road be approved with consideration of the Panel's discussion as captured in the meeting minutes.

Carried

For: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Sorin Birliga; Justin Gammon; Jason Niles; Carl-Jan Rupp; Stefan Schulson
Against: Elizabeth Balderston; Deborah LeFrank

Stephan Schulson recused himself from Rezoning Application No. 00611 and Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 00225 at 3:35pm.

2.4 Rezoning Application No. 00611 and Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 00225 for 1306-1324 Broad Street / 615-625 Johnson Street / a portion of 622 and 630 Yates Street

The City is considering a Rezoning and Heritage Alteration Permit Application to construct a mixed-use building for ground floor commercial and student rental units and to allow the renovation and addition to the existing Duck's Block heritage building.