

4.1 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00239 for 854-880 Pandora Avenue

The proposal is for 68-metre, 14-storey mixed-use residential rental apartment building with two levels of parking underground and outdoor amenity spaces on the roof of the third level and the rooftop.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Devin Spence - Townline
Korbin Dasilva -Townline
Leigh Stickle - Townline
Stefan Slot - Townline
Peter Odegaard - Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership Architects
Mark Grimsrud - Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership Architects
Justin Taylor - Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects

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

- relationship with heritage designated church properties
- tower material colour
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Peter Odegaard provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Justin Taylor provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Why haven't you maxed out the height component on the building?
 - The proposal does max out the maximum density at. Because cost effectiveness was important and we wanted to strike a balance with the context in respect to overall height, we can't go over the 4.5 FSR.
- Are the balconies spandrel glass and painted white?
 - The balcony itself would be face mounted, so the glass of the balcony railing would fly by the face of the slab and painted. We haven't decided on that detail yet but there may be a film over the glass to cover the flat edge.
- Is there a specific intent for those commercial spaces?
 - We would like for it to be something active. The reality is, it may be a neighbourhood retail store with an outside display. We would like to create a community feel.
- The neighbouring building to the west on Pandora has a rhythm of commercial spaces, which tend not to fare well in Victoria. Is there's anything you are taking on for the nature of commercial spaces to ensure spaces aren't sitting vacant?
 - Yes, having walked the neighbourhood and the street and I understand the challenges. We have spoken with neighbourhoods and community groups. We are optimistic and we think what we are proposing something with eyes on the street that will bring in successful businesses.

- Can you talk a bit about your explorations in attempting to meet the radii requirements from the landmark heritage buildings, because there is an intrusion with the proposal you have.
 - It was quite straight forward. It was an exercise in balancing that, with the intent and guidelines in DCAP with respect to tower separation and preventing orphaning adjacent buildings. If the tower was to be located to the west the adjacent site would essentially be orphaned.
- Did you explore stepping or shaping the tower differently to meeting the radii requirements?
 - We didn't explore that option at great length. We do step and articulate the top of the tower. Providing that amount of stepping would be difficult to achieve in this rental project.
- What kinds of soil depth are we looking at for trees and on the roof?
 - Generally, the trees have a minimum of 6 cubic meters if not more.
- What is your rationale for deviating from the Downtown design guidelines?
 - The intent was to provide some differentiation and focus the eye and attention on the podium and the rich materials and articulation on the first 3 stories as they are going to relate to most of the people that interact with them on a day-to-day basis. Focusing on the materials and drawing the eye to the lower portion. I think the intent was rooted in the building having a certain respect or deferential nature to the taller structures around it to the heritage history.

Panel members discussed:

- Issue with proportion
- Podium works well in scale
- Struggle with what we want it to be and what we may end up with
- This project will put a lot of people into
- Townhouses have beautiful detail and relevance
- The tower is prominent and dark – would like more definition
- Top floor could be improved in some ways
- Need to be vigilant with the radii
- Colouration with building and tower seem to have a disconnect
- Support for the inner neighbourhood connection
- Landscape is rich and supportable
- Tower in the current location allows amenity space to have a less traffic
- Would like to see design to better reflect the heritage character of the surrounding buildings.
- Would like to explore different ways to change podium

Motion: Devon Skinner

Seconded by: Pamela Madoff

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00239 for 854-880 Pandora Avenue be approved with the following changes:

- Applicant to provide staff and council with studies showing what the same density would look like in a more slender but higher tower to allow the tower to encroach less into the view radius of the heritage buildings.
- Further consideration to the tower placement on the podium to indicate to staff and council that the proposed location is the most optimal one to balance the competing objectives in the planning documents.
- Applicant to further consider the nature of the colours and materials in order to create a greater sense of cohesion to the podium.
- The applicant to demonstrate to staff how the commercial spaces are intended to be used, particularly with how the building touches the ground.
- Applicant to further explore additional opportunities for details that reference the heritage buildings in the context.

Carried Unanimously