

5. APPLICATIONS

5.1 Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 00032 for 579-589 Johnson Street

The proposal is for the construction of a new five-storey strata residential building on two adjoining properties.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Gerald Hartwig	Hartwig Industries
Stephanie Hartwig	Hartwig Industries
Tom Moore	Studio 531 Architects

John O'Reilly provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application. Gerald Hartwig provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site, context of the proposal and the landscaping plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- There is reference made to a wood simulation façade but then I thought I saw it was aluminum sheets. Which is it?
 - We started transitioning our thinking from the wood to the aluminum. The cornice detail and everything along Johnson is painted metal. We think it's appropriate on the street that we would go with the wood simulation, although we haven't fully made that decision. When we get to the courtyard it would be a powder coated metal.
- Are the measurements given from structure to structure or do they include finishes? What do you expect the floor to ceiling finished to be in those units?
 - We have a mass timber flooring system. The building is designed so that we have at the front of the building on the ground floor 4.5 meter which is predicated by the cast iron columns and then as you get into the building it goes down to a 4-meter floor to floor which gives us 12ft clearance in the commercial units. The residential units about will be 8ft floor to ceiling.
- Is there more to the playful openings than just the placement of them?
 - The openings are there to provide access from each on of the balconies to the street.
- Is there anything specifically significant about the waving of the Johnson Street facade?
 - We had a flat façade, then we looked at the cornice and how it would work and instead of articulating that as a horizontal projection we started looking at it as vertical, so it felt like a good fit.
- Can you clarify the discrepancies between the renderings and model that were shown?

- The renderings are correct, and we have now made a new model which we can show you.
- How is the glulam's durability going to be affected by the weather?
 - We think we can find ways with materials to keep it durable. It will take more maintenance.
- What is the material of the gate to the courtyard?
 - It's a wooden gate.
- How is the easement to the east on the neighbouring property being secured?
 - It's not on the neighbouring property. There is a shared easement between the corner property and were able to utilize that for exiting the courtyard.
- What is happening with the loading to the back CRU's in the courtyard and how will people get goods back there?
 - The alleyway that we are maintaining is good for vehicles. But we will do mostly hand carting. We do have garbage and recycling and servicing of the retail spaces.
- What is the ground surface material in the courtyard and laneway?
 - It's a permeable square paver.
- What is the material on the rear of the rear building?
 - It's a cementitious panel.
- Are the slats forming a guard, would it be about 6 inches?
 - Correct they do provide a guard and the openings would be no larger than 6 inches.
- Can you explain how you got the cornice detail?
 - The base of the building is high quality. When we get into the middle of the building, we have these vertical openings that access the recessed decks. We then have a subtle break, it really does separate the middle piece of the building from the top and then the top of the building, which is the cornice element in our concept basically has no openings. In fact, the way it kind of disappears into the sky and the curve we think really helps to define it as a separate element. It's an interpretation.
- Can you please confirm what the openings had been previously at the street level and what is currently being proposed?
 - When the Shotbolt building was a two-storey building, the access to the residence off Johnson Street was through the two center cast iron columns that you currently see. There was glass in the plane of the columns. The alcove in the recess in the original building was from the columns to the east and the west by the edge of the building and that was the alcove. We've taken a slightly different view and we've moved the glass all down. But as I said, the division of the Glass and the location of the glass is all the same.

Panel members discussed:

- Concern that the parapet and detail is lost
- Appreciate that the horizontal elements along Johnson Differ
- Vertical elements are strong and do not fit in the context
- Roofline is indistinct and not responding to the guideline
- Street rhythm fits well from a massing and proportions aspect
- Concern with the side gate and flow
- Appreciation for a small streetscape setback
- Appreciation for the way the glazing is setback with small tables in the public realm
- Missed opportunity for the building to step back
- Desire for the existing columns to be incorporated better into the glazing
- Appreciation for the applicant's rationale of the setback
- No issue with the height
- Desire to see distinct base, middle and top
- Desire for more of a vertical articulation
- Concern that this application does not conform with the guidelines
- Columns could be removed if they are not going to get incorporated fully
- Concern with the lack of cap or cornice
- Building needs to carry through to the back
- Don't want to create a faux heritage building
- Livability with windows at a proper size should be reconsidered
- Concern with items on larger balconies
- Like the site planning
- Appreciate the roof garden
- Concerns with materiality

Motion:

It was moved by Pamela Madoff, seconded by Marilyn Palmer, that Heritage Alteration Permit Application No. 00248 and Development Permit Application No. 000608 for 579-589 Johnson Street does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and policies and should be declined (and that the key areas that should be revised include:)

- guideline 5.1 building mass scale and siting. Roofline along Johnson Street should be more distinct through further consideration of the building having a base middle and top.
- guideline 5.22 reconsideration of the integration of existing columns and more distinct entries to the CRUs
- guideline 5.3.7 Further resolution of the openings of the façade to better meet the rhythm of the street in a more structured application
- guideline 5.3.10 consider other forms of outdoor access along Johnson Street, other than cantilevered balconies
- guideline 5.5 reconsideration of the appropriateness of the screen element. Ensuring high quality materials for the project including the rear part of the building accessed from the laneway
- guideline 5.6 consider improvements to the north elevation accessing natural light

Carried 6 -3

For: Pam Madoff, Marilyn Palmer, Ruth Dollinger, Brad Forth, Peter Johannknecht,
Joseph Kardum

Opposed: Devon Skinner, Ben Smith, Matty Jardine