

**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