

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY JUNE 28, 2023**

1. THE CHAIR CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 12:00 PM

Present: Devon Skinner (Chair)
David Berry
Pamela Madoff
Sean Partlow
Colin Harper
Ben Smith
Will King
Tamara Bonnemaïson
Peter Johannknecht
Matty Jardine

Absent:

Staff Present: Miko Betanzo - Senior Planner, Urban Design
Geordie Gordon – Planner
Patrick Carroll - Planner
Alena Hickman – Planning Secretary

2. AGENDA APPROVAL

Motion:

It was moved by Ben Smith, seconded by Pamela Madoff that the agenda for the June 28th, 2023 meeting be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

3. MINUTES

Motion:

It was moved by Colin Harper, seconded by Peter Johannknecht, that the minutes from the meeting held May 24, 2023 be approved.

Carried Unanimously

4. APPLICATIONS

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

4.2 Development Permit Application No. 000568 for 2850/2852 Douglas Street, 2706 Government Street, 670/680 Gorge Road East (Concurrent with Rezoning Application No. REZ00717)

The proposal is to demolish two existing commercial buildings, retain an existing 100-unit hotel and construct a new six-storey, 177-room hotel with a 370m² restaurant.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Scott Thomson - Northland
Paul Kwasnicky - Pacific Coast Architecture
Scott Harwood - Northland
Desmond Ngai - Northland
Tommy Ng - Northland
Kelly Wilkinson - GH Collaborative

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

- street wall to street width ratio
- opportunities to acknowledge a prominent location
- opportunities to improve the commercial street front
- parking and drive aisle impacts
- appropriateness of proposed building materials
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Tommy Ng provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Kelly Wilkinson provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Were there other options for the slopped parkade entry that don't require excavations.
 - We did go through a number of iterations. With the existing building in place there is an underground parkade in place that takes up a lot of space and so we were limited where we could place a parkade on site and get access. There may be some other options to look at. We are constrained and we wanted to maximize the parking.
- Is it possible to make use of the existing parkade entry and go off that?
 - It is very difficult given the arrangement with that building.
- Can you speak in more detail to the shrub plantings, species?

- It is not defined yet. Tree plantings have come off the approved list. We are open to changing species. Down in the southwest corner we have a passive space with some tree plantings and shade cover.
- Do you have a tenant for the commercial space restaurant?
 - We will decide upon the most appropriate restaurant for that corner as we own many. There will always be a strong restaurant on that corner to provide a high level of service to the hotel and public.
- Can you comment on the hardy panel siding and why you went with that?
 - This is Sandman signature product and is within our design standard. It is Non-combustible and works well for us. It is combined with an easy trim which gives us a refined product.
- Did you have a traffic consultant go through this or was it only with City engineering?
 - Both, the City staff and traffic consultants have gone through these plans.
- Is the intent to have walk-in traffic come in from that area?
 - Yes.
- Where do you expect the pedestrian traffic to come from?
 - I think it just provides the secondary access if people are walking down the street.
- Can you address the green space on Page 13?
 - Yes, that space is already existing.
- How do you intend for the other greenspace to be used?
 - It is passive green space with some shading.
- Are there any other signature Sandman hotels with differing design?
 - We have flexibility in some design. The general feel is fairly consistent wherever you go.
- Can you elaborate on how you achieved the pedestrian experience and realm you were speaking to in the presentation.
 - Part of that is bringing the activities to street level and allowing that visual connection. On the corner there will be interaction with the patio.
- What are the plantings in the landscape separation between Government Street and the hotel?
 - Pacific Sunset Maples are proposed in that zone.
- Have you explored moving the Gorge Road access further west to give the whole building more space away from the intersection.
 - I think there is opportunity to do exactly what you are speaking about. We may need to speak with engineering to move that access further to the west.
- Have you done studies on addressing that unique curved corner?
 - Yes, we have looked at many options. For many reasons this is where we have landed and think it was the best solution put forward.
- Near the patio where the parking cut happens in that slope, there is a cantilevered sideway over that. Could you expand out there for some more patio space.
 - We have not looked into that, but that is something we could explore moving forward.
- Have you considered locating the parking ramp under the building?
 - This would destroy the ground floor, there isn't enough from to get it under and still have a ground floor. So this can't be done.
- Did you look at a "V" shaped building which has frontages on all Streets?
 - This comes back to the brand standards. These buildings are efficient and one we do that we lose the efficiency.

- Why didn't you locate this along Government Street and Douglas Street vs Gorge Street?
 - We looked at that configuration, but it didn't create a remaining space on the site that was functional from the parking or public point of view. As well as the shadowing, so this was the optimal choice.

Panel members discussed:

- Was hoping for a more detailed landscape plan
- Opportunity lost on that curved corner
- Not the ideal corner for a low patio without any screening
- Amenity area seems like an after thought
- Having two rows of parking I think could be done without
- If the building was pulled to the west it would make it a much more friendly corner
- Concern with advertising and Sandman branding and overall look of the building
- Parking lot configuration isn't acceptable
- Lost opportunity for landscaping
- This building could be anywhere
- Brand driven proposal
- Concerned with placement
- Nothing sensitive about the pedestrian experience proposed.

Motion: Will King

Seconded: by Devon Skinner

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application Development Permit Application No. DP000568 for 2850/2852 Douglas Street, 2706 Government Street, 670/680 Gorge Road East does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined (and that the key areas that should be revised include:)

- Improvement in the areas related to a gateway building on a prominent corner and improvement to the treatment of the site and its landscape.
- Including but not limited to form and character, materiality, massing and urban design.

Carried Unanimously

4.3 Development Permit with Variance(s) Application No. 000230 for 1050 Yates Street

The proposal is for a mixed-use project comprising of two purpose built rental buildings over a common commercial ground floor and podium.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Mark Whitehead – Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
Don Chow – Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership

Nathan Jenkins – MCM (Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership)
Stephen Vincent – DKL Durante Kreuk Ltd
James Whelan – DKL Durante Kreuk Ltd
Byron Chard – CHARD – President
Mackenzie Biggar – CHARD – Vice President of Development
Anthony Quin – CHARD – Senior Development Manager
Trevor Heselton – CHARD – Associate Development Manager

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 impacts of height in relation to the design of Building-A (the 25-storey tower). Specifically looking at the alternating push/pull of the frame surrounding the balconies, the tower overhang above the podium, the repetitive horizontality of the proposed balconies and the infringements into the setback planes
- Design strategies and commentary to break up the perceived length of the proposed mid-rise on Cook Street (Building B)
- The south elevation of Building-B, above the podium with respect to its composition, interest, materials and articulation and the north elevation overhang above the podium
- The lobby entrance on Building B and its legibility within the overall design
- Infringements into the setback plane for Building-B.

Mark Whitehead provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and James Whelan provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- On the East face of Cook Street, you mentioned the colour and fenestration changes. Is that on the Juliette balconies only and does the colour actually change there?
 - In response to the urban design planners' comments, we would make it more evident.
- Are we intended to react to the proposal as presented if they are already mentioning changes?
 - As presented.
- Do you have tenants in mind already for the ground floor spaces along Cook Street and Yates Street? Can you speak to the interaction with the interfaces.
 - It is glazed with brick plasters at approximately a 25ft module which works with retail with the paving as described. We have been engaging with multiple restaurants and cafes as well as some prominent health care providers who are also looking for space.
- The rooftop landscaping is quite high, is there any type of guard?
 - Yes, there will be a guard and treatment to those levels.
- Have you explored three towers and what was the driving factor for two?
 - To create proximity between the three caused a reduction in density. The closer the towers get the less livable they get.
- Can you speak to how the buildings are terminated at the roof level.
 - being true to the concept of pushed and pulled masses with the crowning element being the mass that expresses the amenity itself, that for us is a

volumetric cornice, if you will, rather than a very refined cornice, which would be very necessary on a building like the Dalmatian building. Along with the urban designers comments which we felt were good ones, we can have a look at that as well, but it was our first intuition to stick with blocks rather than more traditional forms, and to use those blocks to imitate traditional forms.

- Have you explored other ways to make the entrances more prominent?
 - The 6-storey base diminishes in height as it goes under things and rises in height as it reaches corners and streets. Continuing across the break in the massing that's created by those the white volumes and the charcoal volumes and allowing that brick to rise up to encapsulate a canopy that in essence has a slight massing change.
- What is driving the decision of the running track on the roof?
 - Convenience really, it's a perk. To tailor to our target demographic. To add to the wellness package of the building for our residents.
- You mentioned in the tower that you shifted the vertical volume, did you consider doing the same thing with the bar massing?
 - We hadn't considered that. We can definitely take those comments into consideration.

Panel members discussed:

- Would like both buildings to be a bit more unique and independent from one another
- Push and pull of building is much more successful
- Content with proposal
- Verticality of fenestration on cook could be edited
- Stretch along cook Street could benefit from a break
- Concern with building on Cook Street
- Would like more substantive building
- Articulation is so important and should be further considered
- Love the tower portion and side of building
- Falls off and base needs to be more articulate
- Ground plane condition could use some thought
- Tower colour doesn't do the building any favours and looks heavy
- Inter-site crossways would have been nice to see in this proposal.

Motion: David Berry

Seconded: by Devon Skinner

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No.000230 for 1050 Yates Street be approved with the following changes:

- Applicant to consider the massing of the Bar building (B) to lighten the architecture given the length of the building along Cook Street and Yates Street.
- Further consideration of the materiality of cladding on building B.
- Panel supports the applicant's willingness to further explore items listed in the staff report below:

- The south elevation of Building-B, above the podium with respect to its composition, interest, materials and articulation and the north elevation overhang above the podium
- The lobby entrance on Building B and its legibility within the overall design
- Infringements into the setback plane for Building-B.

For: David Berry, Devon Skinner, Sean Partlow, Colin Harper, Ben Smith, Tamara Bonnemaision, Matty Jardine, Peter Johannknecht
Opposed: Pamela Madoff, Will King

Carried: 8-2

Matty Jardine left the meeting at 3:18pm

4.4 Heritage Alteration Permit with Variance(s) Application No. 00034 for 780 Blanshard Street

The proposal is for a tower addition to an existing heritage registered building. It includes seismic upgrading, heritage designation and rehabilitation of the existing building.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Jon Stovell – Reliance Properties
 Juan Pereira – Reliance Properties
 Jonathan Lim – Reliance Properties
 Steve McFarlane – OMB
 Bryan Lemos Beça - OMB
 Matthew Beall - OMB
 Shasha Wang - OMB
 Bryce Gauthier
 Rodrigo Rodrigues
 Merinda Conley

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 height of the building in relation to its context and any perceived impacts
- the fit of the addition with the heritage building
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Bryan Lemos Beça provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site, context and proposed landscape plan of the proposal.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Has new code and seismic upgrade been considered?
 - Yes, the design has factored in the new codes. It resulted in the tower being a bit chunkier than we had anticipated.
- Can you describe what you are doing to the heritage building to upgrade the envelope.

- We will leave the existing concrete exposed on the exterior and improve from the interior. We will add insulation to the interior and air barrier so we can improve tightness to the envelope.
- Are the original windows viable to keep?
 - This is something we are still assessing.
- The existing building has those brown blocks you can see in the renderings. Do you have the ability to emphasize that cornice treatment on the new building?
 - Those brown blocks are vents. We looked at many treatments and it was important to maintain the continuity of this building. We have a balancing act and want the heritage building to really stand out.
- Why not do T-shape rather than an L-shape for the configuration and keep the symmetry around the front entry.
 - The north and south aren't aligned with each other which is why we did that.

Panel members discussed:

- How to consider this as a rooftop addition to a heritage building when it's a building on top of a building
- Drawing package has been studied and carefully and thoughtfully done
- Density in the right location
- Tower is modern but isn't attention grabbing
- Wonderful proposal that lets the heritage building shine
- Excellent adaptive reuse
- Appreciation that the upcoming code update was given much thought

OPTIONS

The following are three potential options that the Panel may consider using or modifying in formulating a recommendation to Council:

Motion: Peter Johannknecht

Seconded: by Will King

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Heritage Alteration with Variances Permit Application No.00034 for 780 Blanshard Street be approved as presented.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn: Devon Skinner, Seconded by Pam Madoff

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of May 24, 2023 was adjourned at 4:03 pm.

Devon Skinner, Chair