

**MINUTES OF THE  
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY APRIL 24, 2019**

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

**Present:** Sorin Birliga, Jason Niles, Marilyn Palmer, Jessi-Anne Reeves, Karen Sander, Stefan Schulson

**Absent for a  
Portion of the Meeting:** Roger Tinney

**Absent:** Pamela Madoff, Carl-Jan Rupp

**Staff Present:** Andrea Hudson – Acting Director, Sustainable Planning & Community Development Department  
Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design  
Joaquin Karakas – Senior Urban Designer  
Jim Handy – Senior Planner, Development Agreements  
Leanne Taylor – Senior Planner  
Alec Johnson – Senior Planner  
Katie Lauriston – Secretary

**2. MINUTES**

**Minutes from the Meeting held April 10, 2019**

**Motion:**

It was moved by Roger Tinney, seconded by Sorin Birliga, that the minutes from the meeting held April 10, 2019 be adopted.

**Carried Unanimously**

**3. NEW BUSINESS**

- Andrea Hudson and Joaquin Karakas provided an overview of upcoming municipal-led projects with a design component, to follow up from the Panel's December 19, 2018 motion. Items discussed include:
  - neighbourhood planning for the Fairfield Neighbourhood and draft Cook Street design guidelines, as well as upcoming neighbourhood plans for North Park, Fernwood, North and South Jubilee and Rockland
  - Council's request for a city-wide housing strategy
  - public realm projects including Ship Point, Centennial Square and the implementation of the bicycle network master plan
- The Panel asked:
  - how individuals could be involved in the engagement process for the bicycle network. Joaquin Karakas noted the upcoming public engagement opportunities for the Vancouver Street project

- whether core policy documents take their cues from Council policies. Joaquin Karakas explained that Ship Point was part of Council's latest strategic plan, and Centennial Square was a focused action plan from the Downtown Public Realm Plan adopted in 2017.

#### 4. APPLICATIONS

##### 4.1 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00074 for 1301 Hillside Avenue

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit with Variance Application to construct a six-storey mixed-use building with live-work units and long-term bicycle parking on the ground floor fronting Hillside Avenue and vehicle parking at-grade at the rear.

Applicant meeting attendees:

|               |                               |
|---------------|-------------------------------|
| MICHAEL BACON | STUART HOWARD ARCHITECTS INC. |
| ADAM COOPER   | ABSTRACT DEVELOPMENTS         |
| SCOTT MURDOCH | NVISION PROPERTIES            |
|               | MURDOCH DE GREEF INC.         |

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

- the proposal's massing and density
- the provision of green and open space
- the building's street relationship.

Michael Bacon provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Scott Murdoch provided details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- has there been any reaction from the community in terms of the proposed increase in density?
  - overall the reaction to this version of the project has been mixed, but the community seems happier with the current overall design
  - there has been a positive reaction to seeing the height reduced
  - there is some confusion in the community over the parking requirements and how affordable units affect these requirements
  - there is no reaction to the proposed FSR per se, rather, the proposal is understood in terms of the overall unit count and parking provisions
- in what Large Urban Village is the site located?
  - Jim Handy noted that the Official Community Plan (OCP) identifies the site within the Urban Place Designation, which contemplates densities up to 2:1 Floor Space Ratio (FSR). Affordable housing is not excluded from the FSR calculation, and so the application would require an OCP amendment to allow the proposed FSR. In terms of density, the application is a better fit within the Large Urban Village designation; therefore, the question is whether the Urban Place Designation is amended or whether the site would be assigned the Large Urban Village designation.

- given that the deciduous trees in the plaza will be bare in the winter months, were further features considered, such as trellises or a green strip, to further define the plaza edge?
  - this can be considered
- what is proposed for the large white windowsill on the southern portion of the building long Burnside Road East?
  - the metal sill will be raised and sloped, with a gutter and concealed rainwater leader
  - the design defines this edge and builds on the building form
  - an earlier iteration envisioned a planter at this location, but the viability of plants was problematic
  - fritted or patterned glass is being considered to reduce the sunlight into the stairwell
- what is proposed for the roof next to the fifth floor units along Burnside Road East?
  - a roof is proposed at this location, which will provide a better transition to the single-family dwellings across the street
- how are the materials assembled; what is proposed for the joints?
  - the joints are shown in some plans, but are not included in the renderings because the joints come out far darker in renderings than they will be in reality
  - the joints and fasteners will be painted the same colour as the panels, so that from a distance the reveals blend in and there are only hairline joints
- what material is proposed for the white panels?
  - a metal hardie panel system will be used, which will be a similar product to a longboard.

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the thought process provided
- appreciation for the inclusion of a rain garden
- the proposal as elegantly executed, and a good combination of simplicity with expression
- appreciation for the process and level of community engagement
- understanding for the cost efficiency of hardie panel.

#### **Motion:**

It was moved by Sorin Birliga, seconded by Stefan Schulson, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000542 for 3020 Douglas Street and 584 Burnside Road East be approved as presented.

**Carried Unanimously**

*Roger Tinney left the meeting at 2:20pm.*

#### **4.3 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00106 for 1700 Blanshard Street**

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to construct a twenty-three storey, mixed use building containing 235 market rental residential units with ground-floor commercial.

Applicant meeting attendees:

GERDA GELDENHUYS  
DAVE ENGLISH

MUSSON CATTELL MACKEY PARTNERSHIP  
TOWNLINE

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

- the massing and interface with nearby properties
- the entryway and ground level relationship to the street
- the façade articulation and materials.

Gerda Geldenhuys provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- how will the Hudson Bay blanket landscaping feature be maintained?
  - the multicoloured sedums only need weeding and fertilizing once or twice per year and will be irrigated
  - this system has been successful on other projects that the applicants have completed
- how will residents get food to the rooftop harvest table?
  - there is a kitchen on the roof and food can be brought up to this location
  - the harvest table is intended as an indoor-outdoor space with a party table
- what features make the residential portion more homey?
  - the entrance courtyard creates interest with a walkway and sense of discovery
  - there is a very welcoming main entrance to both components with a lot of brick and warm materials
- the rooftop feature where the frame extends beyond the roofline draws attention to that area; is that rooftop area accessible?
  - there is a double-height amenity space at the top level with large windows
  - the area below the rooftop feature is not accessible, but there is outdoor rooftop amenity space
  - the open frame feature continues the mass while visually fading into the sky and allowing glimpses of the sky through the frame
- is there anything else on the roof with the rooftop feature?
  - there is a partially obscured mechanical room on this roof
  - the adjacent rooftop is for the amenity space
- was it considered to align the volume of the tower facing Blanshard Street on an angle, in line with the street?
  - this was not considered; the proposed design uses the angle to Blanshard Street to reduce the impact of the building height at the street level
- where does the pedestrian link lead?
  - the link provides a circuitous route to wander through the site, from Blanshard Street to the interior laneway
- where is the waste management located for the commercial and residential units?
  - these services are incorporated into the rear of the southeast tower, accessed through the internal laneway

- what variances are proposed?
  - the upper corner of the podium facing Herald Street encroaches just over 2m into the setback, and the upper portion of the building facing Blanshard Street also encroaches by just under 8m
  - the height of the open frame feature also extends beyond the height.

Panel members discussed:

- the full wraparound balconies as being excessive for the building, especially considering its height
- the proposal as being of a different typology than what is found in the rest of Victoria
- whether keeping the building square to Herald Street is beneficial, or whether it should be shifted to align with Blanshard Street
- desire for further design features that would counteract the additional massing caused by the setback variance
- the lack of a distinct middle of the building
- concern for the proposed height variance along Blanshard Street, with the building's significant massing and strong skeletal structure
- the building's significant presence and massing to the street
- the building as having the details of a smaller building (i.e. many projecting balconies)
- opportunity to simplify the building expression and make its elevations more sleek
- appreciation for the effort made in creating a sense of slenderness
- no concern with the overall height at this location; however, the Jack Davis plaza will be shadowed
- opportunity to further explore the Blanshard Street façade so that the top is less prominent and the tower is still well-articulated to the bottom, and so that all the components better articulate to each other
- appreciation for the design of the plaza, the corner of Fisgard and Blanshard Streets, and the material choices
- the materials as giving a rugged, formal appearance that is more commercial than residential
- concern that the rooftop mechanical room may be visible from Hudson Place I
- desire for further rationale for the extended frame building top feature, whether there is precedent elsewhere in Victoria, and what it is meant to draw attention to
- whether the concrete frame feature is necessary or should be removed.

#### **Motion:**

It was moved by Jason Niles, seconded by Sorin Birliga, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00106 for 1700 Blanshard Street be approved with the following changes subject to:

- addressing the articulation and expression of the Blanshard Street façade
- reconsideration of the building top
- simplification and refinement of the building body, with particular attention to the volumetric expression towards the Blanshard Street elevation
- ensuring the overall aesthetic consistency of the building.

**Carried Unanimously**