

4.2 Development Permit with Variances No. 00051 for 937 View Street

The City is considering a Development Permit with Variances Application to construct an 18 storey, mixed use building containing approximately 267 residential units.

Applicant meeting attendees:

CHARLES KIERULF	DHKA
CHRIS NELSON	OWNER
SCOTT MURDOCH	MDG LANDSCAPE

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

- built form and massing
- building separation distances
- relationship to the street
- architectural expression
- through-block walkway
- any other aspects the ADP chooses to comment.

Charles Kierulf provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal. Scott Murdoch provided the panel with a detailed presentation of the landscaping plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- The podium seems very harsh as it relates to the pedestrian realm, what was the design concept from the architect's perspective with regards to that?
 - Our focus for the podium and units was to maximize the livability of the units. What is presented to the street is uniform and a clearly defined structural framework of housing units. You see that its several units overlooking the street and that was the intent.
- Has any other consideration been discussed to add canopies to create or minimize the harshness of the podium relative to the streetscape?
 - Yes, canopies have been mentioned along with overhangs, but more in relation to the main entrance. Our ground floor units already have weather protection so running a full canopy wouldn't make sense. I would like to have a slightly higher main floor; it aligns with the commercial type ground floor. We are not showing that because we want to keep our options open. But I think it would help differentiate the ground floor from the rest of that podium.
- Can you say what that floor to floor height would be?
 - Currently I think our floor to floor is 3.2m which gives us the most options. That may or may not change. We are working with steel and are trying to maximize the efficiency of that. We need that floor to floor height to make that work.

- Has there been any further development to the pedestrian through access on the side to make it look more pedestrian orientated?
 - We have not refined it as of yet. It is a patterned paver type of space which we think sets it apart but, we can look into different things to better define it as a pedestrian walkway. We are thinking about a mix of permeable pavement and colours. We don't want it to look like a road.
- There isn't much of a unit mix within this building. Has there been more discussion about this or is this something the City is specifically looking for?
 - It hasn't been the focus of the discussion. This project has zeroed in on the predominantly studio mix and anticipating a certain demographic that will be interested in this smaller type of unit and trying to address that need.
- Being that this building is mostly studio apartments and it really doesn't have parking, why wouldn't you deal with that through road space as a landscaped area.
 - Because unfortunately it is a road. It is a statutory right of way over this property from the adjacent property. So, we must keep that driveway open.

Panel members discussed:

- Appreciation for the materiality
- Desire for more visible amenity space, fitness area,
- Concern that the driveway is being sold as an amenity space and pedestrian walkway
- No issue with the height of the building
- Concern with the heaviness of the podium

Motion:

It was moved by Pamela Madoff, seconded by Marilyn Palmer, that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00051 for 937 View Street does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined (and that the key areas that should be revised include:)

- A shorter podium, in compliance with the guidelines, should be considered to respond to the narrow proportion of View Street and to create a more human scale. The podium should be clearly defined by a significant building setback.
- The DCAP guidelines for street walls requiring a 3m setback for buildings up to 30m and a 6m side yard setback for portions of buildings above 30m should be followed in order to address issues of privacy, create space between buildings and reduce impacts on adjacent buildings.
- The building presents a very austere facade at the ground level. The DCAP guidelines encourage an articulated facade at the base level with multiple entrances, extensive glazing, pedestrian-scale lighting and canopies and awnings to provide weather protection for pedestrians.

- DCAP guidelines stress the importance of a strong architectural expression of 'base, body and top' specific to taller buildings. The proposal does not respond to this guideline and this has resulted in a uniform, monolithic appearance.
- The monolithic appearance of the building is further accentuated by a lack of variety in fenestration, materials, colour, texture and architectural expression.
- The proposal does not provide the high-quality architecture, building materials, landscape and urban design response that it specified in DPA 7B
- Design development to enhance/refine pedestrian experience.

Carried 6:2

For: Pamela Madoff, Marilyn Palmer, Devon Skinner, Brad Forth, Matty Jardine

Opposed: Joseph Kardum, Sean Partlow

5. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of February 24, 2021 was adjourned at 2:45 pm.

Marilyn Palmer, Chairs