

It was moved by Brad Forth, seconded by Peter Johannknecht, that the Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00177 for 450 Dallas Road be approved as presented.

**Carried Unanimously**

*The panel communicates to staff for consideration for relocation of the parking access from Lewis Street to Menzies Street recognizing the narrow two-way dead-end condition of Lewis street.*

## **5.2 Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00158 for 1042 Richardson Street**

The proposal is for a new development consisting of a six-storey residential rental building with underground parking.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Christine Lintott	Christine Lintott Architects Inc.
Bart Johnson	Breia Holdings Ltd.
Chris Windjack	LADR Landscape Architects Inc
Bev Windjack	LADR Landscape Architects Inc

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

- height and massing
- privacy and lighting
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Christine Lintott and Bart Johnson provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal. Chris Windjack provided a detailed outline of the landscaping.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Are there a number of perimeter trees being removed?
  - Yes correct, 12 trees being removed.
- Have you explored trying to maintain the trees along the driveway entrance to the underground parking?
  - We could look at trying to save some but there will be root impact because of the slop down of the driveway. Because the ramp is dropped down in that location that the root systems won't be able to be safely retained.
- Is there any data to show that bike parking on every floor is a workable concept?
  - We are doing several projects where there is no vehicle parking at all, it's one of the reasons we have created the flow we have. Younger people and families are choosing bikes as their main source of transportation. We have tested the dimensions and they seem to work. All the corridors in the building are being treated as though it's an outdoor space.
- Does accessibility extend beyond only the oversized elevator?

- Yes, it does. Oversized doorways and accessible entrances. The bedrooms are generous sizes as well.
- Would the planters outside the screens be easily maintained?
  - They would be accessible from the interior courtyards. It would be a swing on the screen. We are not expecting residents to maintain those while on ladders.
- Can you comment on the institutional look of the stair tower?
  - It does have that feel because of the materials we are using. We are hoping the openness and visibility into the stairwell will have residents using the staircase as much as possible. From the street you will be able to see residents moving through the building.
- How will the lighting in the stairwell function, will it only be lit if someone is in the stairwell?
  - We will have to think carefully about that. It must be visible to patrons entering the building. Given surface treatments and how they are indirectly lighted, I think we can get those lighting levels achieved without having to see the lamping.
- Have you considered a different pattern for the windows in the stairwell?
  - We are open to opinions. We were keeping it as a simple element, it is more dramatic as opposed to the articulation of the building.
- Have you considered any other locations for the stairwell?
  - We did look at several placements for the stairs. Having to have two exits separated by code limits us in what we can do with the elements.
- Have you considered any different materials or colour pallets for the building?
  - I think while it is a residential street it is a transitional street as well. This area is going to see a lot of change in the coming years. We are being bold with suggesting something like this proposal. We played with textures and materials and landed on a high-quality cementitious material.
- Can you confirm the width of the drive isle to the parkade?
  - Yes, its 3.7m.
- That seems narrow, is that typical for a two-way drive isle?
  - It is only a one-way, and we are allowed that if we are less than 10 vehicles.
- Has a light signal system been considered for the driveway?
  - It is something we can look at. The bulk of the driveway is outside so visibility is high.
- Why does the grade need to drop at 15%?
  - To comply with the highway access bylaw. So, we are maxed out to get down to be underground.

Panel members discussed:

- Concerns with accessibility

- Concern with setback and future neighbours
- Exterior corridors are interesting
- Concern with the location of stairwell
- Intrigued with the functional moves internally
- Architectural expression is missing
- Variances are not supportable
- Site too small for what the developer is trying to achieve
- Architectural aspects and materials seem cold
- Building height is excessive
- Stair tower is stark would appreciate if it was softened
- Appreciation for exterior breezeways
- Appreciation for the bikes in the hallways
- Concern with material choices

## **OPTIONS**

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

### **Option One**

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00158 for 1042/1044 Richardson Street be approved as presented.

### **Option Two**

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00158 for 1042/1044 Richardson Street be approved with the following changes:

- as listed by the ADP.

### **Option Three**

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00158 for 1042/1044 Richardson 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:)

- Variances are not supportable. For example, the proposal has only 1/3 of the site area required in this zone.
- The architectural expression, particularly the stair tower has a more institutional than a residential expression as outlined in the guidelines.
- Open space requirement is 50% and the project proposed 28.7%
- Maximum site coverage required is 40% and the project proposed 60.02%
- Re-examination of the materiality particularly regarding the exterior cladding

### **Motion:**

It was moved by Pamela Madoff, seconded by Devon Skinner, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit with Variances Application No.

00158 for 1042/1044 Richardson 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:)

- Variances are not supportable. For example, the proposal has only 1/3 of the site area required in this zone.
- The architectural expression, particularly the stair tower has a more institutional than a residential expression as outlined in the guidelines.
- Open space requirement is 50% and the project proposed 28.7%
- Maximum site coverage required is 40% and the project proposed 60.02%
- Re-examination of the materiality particularly regarding the exterior cladding

**Carried Unanimously**

*Ruth Dollinger and Brad Forth have recused themselves from Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00180 for 429 Hillside Avenue*

### **5.3 Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00180 for 429 Hillside Avenue**

The proposal is for a new two-storey industrial building consisting of warehouse uses. The variance is related to parking.

Applicant meeting attendees:

Alan Lowe  
Tania Costillo-Pelayo

Alan Lowe Architect inc  
Alan Lowe Architect inc

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

- design of the front elevation and street relationship
- selection and application of exterior finishes
- fence and gate design
- any other aspects of the proposal on which the ADP chooses to comment.

Alan Lowe provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

The Panel asked the following questions of clarification:

- Is there going to be any use down the west side elevation between properties?
  - That is the neighbour's property. They use it as an exit and is not for our use.
- What kind of vehicles will be coming into that loading bay?
  - It will depend on what eventually goes into the building. There are loading docks on the other side as well.
- In your letter to Mayor and Council, you said there were no variances, was that a mistake?
  - Yes, that is an older letter. When we first submitted there weren't any.