

**MINUTES OF THE  
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 25, 2017 AT 12:30 PM**

**1. THE CHAIR CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 12:40 PM**

**Present:** Sorin Birliga; Patty Graham; Jesse Garlick; Jason Niles; Carl-Jan Rupp; Justin Gammon; Paul Hammond

**Absent:** Elizabeth Balderston; Deborah LeFrank

**Absent for a Portion of the meeting:** Paul Hammond

**Staff Present:** Charlotte Wain – Senior Planner, Urban Design  
Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design  
Katie Lauriston – Secretary, Advisory Design Panel

**2. MINUTES**

**Minutes from the Meeting held August 30, 2017**

**Action:**

It was moved by Sorin Birliga, seconded by Patty Graham, that the Minutes of the Meeting of Advisory Design Panel held August 30, 2017 be adopted as presented.

**Carried Unanimously**

**3. APPLICATIONS**

**3.1 Rezoning Application No. 00593 and Development Permit No. 000502 for 930 Fort Street**

The City is considering a rezoning application to allow for a 12 storey, mixed use building with commercial on the ground floor and residential above.

Applicant Meeting attendees:

DANIEL ROBBINS  
FRASER MCCOLL  
CHRIS BOYD  
DAVID MCGRATH  
DANIKA PROVEN

SAKURA DEVELOPMENTS  
SAKURA DEVELOPMENTS  
SAKURA DEVELOPMENTS  
SAKURA DEVELOPMENTS  
CALID SERVICES LTD.

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

- Lack of a through-block walkway
- Design of the podium
- Height and retail bays at street level
- Uniformity of the tower design, in particular in the north (rear) and side elevations
- The building setbacks and separation distances
- The functionality of the residential amenity deck
- Any opportunities for refinement of the materials and finishes
- The need for landscaping enhancement.

David McGrath provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and Danika Proven provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

Questions of clarification were asked by the Panel on the following:

- the rationale for the 12-storey height?
  - to maximize Floor Space Ratio (FSR) while raising the podium
  - the Downtown Core Area Plan (DCAP) limits the height in this location
- the rationale for using brick only in the one location?
  - a response to staff concerns for the initially proposed green wall. Brick brings solid materials to the palette, and adds a simple accent to the façade
- any functional issues in increasing the height of the podium?
  - increased podium height would reduce the building height due to FSR limitations
  - increased podium height would also take away significant functional areas of the tower
- how does the northeast bicycle storage connect to the street, given the difference in elevation?
  - there are two areas for bicycle parking; the commuter parking is level with the street elevation and the residential parking at the northeast has a set of stairs with a runnel connecting to the street
- has the applicant considered shifting the proposed tower to the west to reduce or eliminate the setback relaxation?
  - this was considered, but the downstairs parking dictates the tower location. To allow for two driving aisles on either side, the drive aisle in the east would be affected by moving the tower over
- could the stairs in the central core be moved to the other side of the elevators?
  - the core has to go all the way down through the tower, and the overall size would remain the same. Moving the stair poses the same challenges as moving the whole tower
- could the core and parkade be moved further west?
  - geotechnical conditions on the site require soil improvements on east and west property line prior to any work. The parkade is set back from the property line to accommodate this issue
  - trying to avoid any more stress to the adjacent Lund's building
- a two-storey podium makes sense, but the street elevation seems lower than two storeys. Is it possible to raise the podium a bit more to give greater height in the patio space?

- the applicants have looked at pushing the podium higher, but have been restricted by the core
  - the landscaping and front wall have been designed to raise and soften the front edge
- how does the proposed façade relate to the podium across the street?
  - no direct comparison has been made, but the façade is sensitive to existing adjacent buildings
  - the applicants would prefer to design something more modern to highlight heritage buildings in the area rather than trying to match the corridor's heritage aspects
- can the impression of a higher podium be given by moving the screen upwards?
  - this is a possibility, and increasing the landscaping on the second floor could change the entrance area significantly and create two distinct level changes
- is there an intended tenant for the recessed retail space?
  - a café with seating could easily suit the space, but other retailers could have installations on the exterior, and the seating in the area can create a public space and activate the retail bay
- the location of the glazing wall, and whether a less deep overhang was considered?
  - commercial space is approximately 15ft from the property line, and with the front panel raised there will be more daylight in the recessed area
  - perforated metal panels help to let light in
  - pushing the retail bay towards the property line it reduces the seating area
- the colour of the perforated metal screen?
  - different options being considered, with lighter material
  - considering the possibility of varying the transparency
- is the roof deck amenity space being further developed?
  - yes, the applicants are considering adding a rooftop amenity space on the twelfth floor
- for staff: what is the heritage intent from the Official Community Plan (OCP)?
  - this is a heritage conservation area under the OCP; the heritage objectives are to conserve the heritage value, special character, features and characteristics of the area and to achieve a more cohesive design and enhanced appearance through high quality architecture, landscape and urban design responsive to its historic context through sensitive and innovative interventions

Panel members discussed:

- the area's suitability for commercial space
- concern about deeply recessed commercial bay and overhang size
- the eastern retail space responds well to the adjacent building, but podium could be pulled back
- further articulation of the retail bays is not necessary, but further refinement is desired for the corner with recessed commercial bay
- desire for refinement of the screen design
- concern about the screen material and how it will age over time
- the possibility of bringing more tower materials into the screen instead of it being a distinct element
- the potential for a landscaping structure such as a trellis to add another horizontal line

- further detail on the corner by retail bay could be achieved in part with landscaping details
- ground floor landscaping
- no immediate concern about the lack of a through-block walkway
- support for increased tower height
- further articulation of the tower design is not necessary
- desire for additional, narrow bedroom windows to allow north-south views
- apprehension about the reduced setback with possible future developments, especially considering the bedroom locations
- support for increasing the amenity space, and a desire for increased public space
- asymmetry of podium on ground floor.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Paul Hammond, seconded by Justin Gammon, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Rezoning Application No. 00593 and Development Permit Application No. 000502 for 930 Fort Street be approved with the following recommendations:

- Improve the ground floor public realm, specifically outside the retail space, to address natural light, landscaping, access and CPTED concerns
- Reconsider the materials of the metal architectural screen along the Fort Street façade to improve durability and appropriateness to the context and increase the perceived height of the podium through materials and landscaping, with consideration to the setback and height of immediately adjacent buildings
- Support for the applicant's intent to increase the rooftop amenity space
- Support the idea of an additional storey through a slender tower and increased setbacks
- Explore adding bedroom windows to allow north-south views
- Refine the drawings to ensure the horizontal eyebrows are accurately noted.

**Carried Unanimously**

*2:00 p.m. – Paul Hammond recused himself from Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00034.*

**3.2 Development Permit with Variances No. 00045 for 777 Herald Street**

The City is considering a Development Permit with Variance Application to construct a 26 storey, mixed use building.

Applicant Meeting attendees:

JUSTIN FILUK  
LAUREN ANTIFEAU  
JOHN O'DONNELL  
FOAD RAFII  
BRANA STANIMIROV

TOWNLINE GROUP OF COMPANIES  
TOWNLINE GROUP OF COMPANIES  
TOWNLINE GROUP OF COMPANIES  
RAFII ARCHITECTS  
RAFII ARCHITECTS

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

- Massing and step back ratio
- Pedestrian experience of the ground floor design
- Distinctions in base, body and top
- Design with regards to height variance.

Justin Filuk provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, Foad Rafii provided details on the architectural design, and Peter Kreuk provided details on the landscape design.

Questions of clarification were asked by the Panel on the following:

- what is the finish on the top portion of the building?
  - a copper-coloured powder coat paint
- what is on the wall at the top of the building?
  - vertical fins concealing the machine room and a cooling unit
- who can use the outdoor patio space?
  - this is a private space for strata use
- will the passage through be closed off?
  - yes, if it became a CPTED issue
  - the southern portion is public and can still be walked through
- could you speak to the liveliness of the main floor, with the deck and water feature?
  - the intention is to create an outdoor space to brighten the public market and differentiate the experience along the carriageway
  - the design creates depth with the water feature and lighting while the public art wall will help with wayfinding
- where is the property line between the public space and the carriageway?
  - the carriageway is jointly owned, with a statutory right-of-way favouring the City
  - while the carriageway will be maintained by all the buildings, the sidewalk and seating area will be maintained by Hudson Place 1
- was the design of the top element considered as a beacon?
  - ways of lighting up the top element at night are being explored
- can you see through the fins at the top of the building?
  - these are vertical blades with 12" separation, so you can see between them at some angles

Panel members discussed:

- the proposal presents an elegant solution to the desired density and base/body/top guidelines
- layers of interest are added by the top copper fins
- satisfactory ground level elements
- setback and massing, especially at the corner of Herald Street and the carriageway
- the introduction of the horizontal screen and the material change (white cornice) at level 7 give the appearance of varying the setback, but could be more cohesive

- the dark colour of materials on northwest corner sets it apart from the other buildings as a substantial edifice
- the public space is recessed, but there is considerable depth allowing light
- apprehension regarding lack of public space
- public benefit of walkway, amenity space and carriageway
- the possibility of extending public space from the front deck through landscaping changes
- carriageway as public space, with chairs and garden area as secondary connection
- good access to bicycle parking.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Sorin Birliga, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00045 for 777 Herald Street be approved as presented.

**Carried Unanimously**

**4. ADJOURNMENT**

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of October 25, 2017 adjourned at 3:00 pm.

---

Jesse Garlick, Chair