

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY JUNE 26, 2019**

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

Present: Elizabeth Balderston, Sorin Birliga, Brad Forth,
Pamela Madoff, Jason Niles, Karen Sander, Stefan
Schulson

Absent: Marilyn Palmer; Jessi-Anne Reeves; Carl-Jan Rupp;
Roger Tinney

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

2. MINUTES

Minutes from the Meeting held May 22, 2019

Motion:

It was moved by Jason Niles, seconded by Karen Sander, that the minutes from the meeting held May 22, 2019 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

3. APPLICATIONS

**3.1 Development Permit Application No. 000544 for 2 Paul Kane Place and
Development Permit Application No. 000545 for 1 Cooperage Place**

The City is considering applications to amend previously approved Development Permits in order to add mechanical equipment and screening to both roofs, add a gas meter and screening to 2 Paul Kane Place and change several doors from glass to solid.

Applicant meeting attendees:

PETER DE HOOG

DE HOOG & KIERULF ARCHITECTS

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

- rooftop mechanical
- gas meter
- solid doors.

Peter de Hoog provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- where are the sightlines located, which were mentioned in the staff report and the letter to Mayor and Council?
 - the sight lines extend down from Lime Bay Park or from further up the hill, looking towards the water
 - the rooftop mechanical screening would not be visible from the Westsong Walkway
- what is the height of the spandrel glass around the gas meter?
 - it will be the mandated height as per Fortis BC, who also require that it be enclosed
- is there a public walkway between the two planters?
 - Rob Bateman noted that there is a Statutory Right-of-Way on the properties that creates U-shaped public walkways
- it appears that the equipment extends beyond the screens, and the screens interfere with the curved roofline. What options have been explored to minimize the visual impact of the screening and equipment?
 - the screening could be reduced slightly, but this would run the risk of not entirely screening the mechanical equipment
 - the applicants are prepared to consider reducing the size of the screening
- was it considered to relocate the mechanical equipment?
 - the equipment is pretty much locked into its current location, as there is limited flat-roofed area on the building
 - the equipment is sized to ensure that it is as small and low to the roof as possible, with minimal duct runs
- is it possible to enclose the mechanical equipment entirely with sound-dampening materials to minimize noise impacts?
 - this is theoretically possible and wouldn't greatly affect the design, but the equipment requires ventilation with open movers; this would defeat any sound-dampening benefits
- why is the equipment so much larger than the approved screening? Was the building initially designed for a use other than a restaurant?
 - it was not initially identified as a restaurant
 - this is essentially a TI issue; it was missed along the way
- are there only solid doors to street?
 - yes
- was there no plan for gas service at any earlier point in the project?
 - gas service was initially planned from Paul Kane Place, but the applicants didn't think it would be much of an issue
 - the gas servicing became problematic because of the location of the walkway and view corridor
- was the placement of the gas servicing part of the original approval?
 - not likely; servicing was identified on building permit drawings only
- what is the proposed height of the rooftop screen?
 - it is currently proposed at about 1200mm
- given that the existing screens already compromise some views, is there a higher depth of screen that would provide better enclosure from farther vantage points?
 - *the applicant showed before and after views of the proposed screening*

- there is minimal impact with greater screening
- was there an original landscape plan with the initially-approved development permit?
 - no, only planters were proposed
- was a landscaping treatment considered to obscure the gas meter, rather than spandrel glass?
 - this was considered, as shrubs are not an issue for the view corridor.

The Panel discussed:

- the screens making a significant improvement; preference for rooftop boxes rather than views of the equipment
- the possibility of designing the rooftop screening to better reflect the building design, e.g. cantilevering the screening or reducing square edges
- whether the rooftop screening is sufficiently tall
- the rooftop screening as a major oversight in the building's earlier design; the previously-proposed rotunda as far too small
- the need for a more elegant solution for mechanical screening; any proposal at this stage would be a band-aid solution and would take away from the initial sleek, light design
- concern for setting a poor precedent for future development
- support for the proposed, necessary changes to fix the roofline
- the sight lines are also compromised by the yachts
- the challenge of improving screening around the gas meter
- the gas meter screening as being in keeping with the existing building, but opportunity for improvement with landscaping
- no issue with the proposed door design
- questioning why no landscape was required with the original proposal
- opportunity to create a less harsh transition along the Statutory Right-of-Way and a more inviting public plaza
- soft landscaping within the public plaza would improve the area overall
- opportunity for the applicants to explore entering into an agreement with the City to improve the walkway.

Motion:

It was moved by Pamela Madoff, seconded by Elizabeth Balderston, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000544 for 2 Paul Kane Place and Development Permit Application No. 000545 for 1 Cooperage Place be approved as presented, recognizing that the screens detract from the curving form, symmetrical design and clear architectural composition of the buildings. Further, it is the opinion of the Panel that although the screening had to be accommodated after the fact, the approval of these applications sets a dangerous precedent for future development.

Carried (6:1)

For: Elizabeth Balderston, Sorin Birliga, Brad Forth, Pamela Madoff, Jason Niles, Karen Sander

Opposed: Stefan Schulson

The Panel discussed:

- the need for landscaping, even if only container plantings.

Motion:

It was moved by Jason Niles, seconded by Brad Forth, that the Panel recommend to Council that the owner of 2 Paul Kane Place and 1 Cooperage Place explore opportunities to improve the interface between the public and private realms.

Carried Unanimously