

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY NOVEMBER 28, 2018**

1. THE CHAIR CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 12:05 PM

Present: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Elizabeth Balderston; Sorin Birliga; Jason Niles; Stefan Schulson

Absent for a Portion of the Meeting: Justin Gammon; Paul Hammond; Carl-Jan Rupp; Deborah LeFrank

Staff Present: Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Leanne Taylor – Senior Planner
Jim Handy – Senior Planner, Development Agreements
Alec Johnston – Senior Planner
Katie Lauriston – Secretary

2. MINUTES

Minutes from the Meeting held October 24, 2018

Motion:

It was moved by Paul Hammond, seconded by Carl-Jan Rupp, that the Minutes of the Meeting of Advisory Design Panel held October 24, 2018 be adopted as presented.

Carried Unanimously

3. APPLICATIONS

3.1 Development Permit Application No. 000521 for 919 and 923 Caledonia Avenue

The City is considering a Rezoning, Heritage Designation and Development Permit Application to restore and heritage-designate the existing single-family dwelling, as well as construct a new two-storey building and four-storey multi-family residential building consisting of approximately 19 rental dwelling units.

Applicant meeting attendees:

PETER HARDCASTLE

HILLEL ARCHITECTURE INC.

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

- infill development
- massing of the low-rise multi-family residential building
- balconies on the east elevation.

Mr. Hardcastle provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

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

- what feedback has there been from immediate neighbours?
 - there has been a positive response from the neighbours across the street
 - an earlier version of the plans was presented to the adjacent neighbours, and the proposal now has much better sightlines, which will benefit neighbours
 - as this is an urban setting, the site could have been developed to a higher density; instead, the proposal is a thoughtful and respectful contribution to the neighbourhood
- do the neighbours have any concern regarding the size and potential overlook?
 - the neighbours aren't directly supportive in this regard
- what is proposed for the existing trees on the east property line?
 - the construction of the foundation will compromise the existing hedge, but it will be replaced
 - there is no walkway on that side; it is a fully landscaped edge
- are the existing trees on the subject property or on the adjacent property?
 - they are on the adjacent property, and will be protected as much as possible
- what about the trees beside the adjacent heritage house?
 - this is the hedge that will be replaced
- is there any landscaping proposed at the railing located at the entrance of the parkade?
 - the railing design will be contemporary in nature, with the same obscure glass as is used for the balconies
 - at the edge of the property, an opaque wooden fence provides separation towards the adjacent parking lot
- is the opaque glass only at the top of the parkade entrance?
 - the glass railing forms an L-shape along the parkade entrance, and the wooden fence faces the neighbours
- how will the recessed planters be watered during the winter?
 - the planters are recessed about 400mm into the building, and the irrigation will run through the building so it will not need to be winterized
- what is the rationale behind the location of the sidewalk?
 - the sidewalk curves to accommodate the Statutory Right-of-Way, and eventually will run straight at a greater distance from the street
- what is the rationale behind the boxy roofline on the new home's front porch?
 - each of the surrounding buildings is subtly different in detail
 - the new building is intended to come across as new, while referencing the context and surrounding heritage homes
 - the roof's simple gable makes it distinct and purposely contemporary
- what is the distance between the new 2-storey building and the existing 2-storey building?
 - approximately 3.2-3.6m and 3.6-3.8m at the rear, towards the multi-family building
- what is the separation distance between the multi-family building and the existing adjacent buildings to the south and to the east? Was there consideration for liveability and privacy?
 - there is a 3m setback at the rear and glazing on the multi-family dwelling to mitigate privacy concerns

- there is approximately 8m between the neighbouring dwellings and the multi-family dwelling at the courtyard
 - there is a similar distance of approximately 5-6m towards the neighbouring heritage building
- does the apartment exit comply with fire code, given the minimal pathway width?
 - fire distances and materials have been examined, and the materials are non-combustible
 - a building code compliant sprinklering system has been developed to protect the heritage house's bay window
- was increasing the performance of the glazing considered, given the potential for privacy and noise issues near the walkways?
 - there will not be a change in glazing on the existing building, and the new building has no glazing on one side and a good separation distance and height from the walkway.

Panel members discussed:

- the importance of retaining the trees along the east property line and the large deciduous tree on the adjacent property at the south
- opportunity to alter the underground parking structure to ensure the retention of existing trees
- there being significant benefits to the proposal as presented, and reluctance to require architectural alterations to ensure the retention of the existing trees
- the need for a tree retention plan
- the need to ensure sufficient soil depth for the proposed trees and all other planting
- appreciation for the sensitivity shown to the surrounding context, and for the care and attention to moving and supporting the existing house
- the proposal as an example of sensitive infill
- the community's desire for projects that are not built to the maximum allowable floor space ratio
- desire for further measures to mitigate the harshness of the street
- opportunity to review the peak roof on the multi-family dwelling, as a flat roof would better provide a contemporary addition, contribute to the building's massing and be more sensitive to the context
- appreciation for the materials selection.

Motion:

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Deborah LeFrank, that Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000521 for 919 and 923 Caledonia Avenue be approved with the following changes:

- that measures be taken to ensure that the existing trees to the south are protected as much as possible
- that adequate soil depth is ensured for the new planting as shown.

Carried

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

Opposed: Paul Hammond and Jason Niles