

PRESENT: P. Rust, Chairperson
K. Hammersley, Vice Chairperson
K. Park (arrived 4:15pm)
N. Waissbluth

ABSENT: F. Gharaei
P. Byer

NON-VOTING MEMBERS: S. Greysen, BIA Representative

GUESTS: A. Kulla, Arborist / Landscape Designer
P. Dhaliwal, Architect
J. Saluja, Agent
K. Saluja, Agent

S. Craig, Architect
J. Edmonds, Architect
D. Tyacke, Landscape Architect
R. Gurm, Agent

One member of the public attended.

STAFF: C. Isaak, Manager of Planning

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 4:15 pm.

It was noted that prior to quorum being achieved at 4:15 pm, the panel members had introduced themselves, the Manager of Planning provided an overview of the procedures and options for the panel to make a resolution regarding an application, and the applicants for item 4.1 had provided a presentation of their project to the members of the panel present.

The applicant's discussion of the proposal, prior to the meeting being called to order, included the following commentary from the architect (S. Craig) and the landscape architect (D. Tyacke)

- This site is in a five minute walking distance of key civic amenities including Peace Arch Hospital, Earl Marriott Secondary School, Kent Street Activity Centre, and local parks. It is also within a ten minute walk of shopping and services available in the Town Centre on Johnston Road. Proximity to these areas makes the site appropriate for new housing.
- The overall project contains a wide range of housing types and sizes with different designs to meet different family needs, including townhouses with front doors at the street level and flats above, accommodating a population of approximately 200 residents. Over 30% of the units on the apartment site are in a building that will be operated by a non-profit at below market rents.

- The central courtyard, including a play area and BBQ patio, provides a common area for all residents to connect, and amenity spaces within buildings provide further opportunities for social interaction.
- The building is designed to be constructed of mass timber (CLT), manufactured off site and assembled on site in a faster process than traditional wood-frame construction, which is intended to minimize construction activity in the neighbourhood as well as utilizing a local and environmentally sustainable material.
- The overall form of the building does not include extended balconies or fins that create heat loss, rather a streamlined form is proposed, using masonry cladding. Other material elements in the simple palette include wood soffits and charcoal metal flashing.
- The pathway through the site beside the central courtyard is an accessible path despite an overall change in grade and a flat lawn for the play area.

The panel's discussion of the proposal included questions with the applicant and the following comments:

- The loading bay on Maple Street may not be conducive for serving the number of residents in the development.
- The appearance of the building is appreciated but in a marine environment the openings that do not have protection from the rain containing salt from the ocean may be improved with a small overhang.
- An apparent error on the drawings indicating no windows in bedrooms on two levels of the townhouse plans was brought to the attention of the Architects.

2. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

It was **MOVED** and **SECONDED**

THAT the Advisory Design Panel adopts the April 23, 2019 agenda as circulated.

CARRIED

3. **ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

It was **MOVED** and **SECONDED**

THAT the Advisory Design Panel adopts the minutes from the November 20, 2018 meeting as circulated.

CARRIED

4. **SUBMISSION TO THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL**

Comments received from the Chief Fire Official.

No comments.

Comments received from the Engineering and Municipal Operations Department.

No comments.

Comments received from RCMP-CPTED.

No comments.

4.1 – Agent, Urban Arts Architecture – 15654 North Bluff Road et al. (S. Craig and D. Tyake)

As noted above, the applicant had provided a presentation of their development proposal prior to meeting quorum being achieved, using a digital presentation and poster boards. Upon the arrival of K. Park, the meeting was called to order and after item 4.1 on the agenda was reached, the following comments were provided further to the discussion provided before the meeting:

- The landscape architect stated that he was pleased with the overall design and distribution of landscaping, however there were some technical issues that have to be solved. These were identified as:
 - o The tree protection zone sizes shown are not consistent and it would be helpful to have the arborist report to review with the landscape plans.
 - o The underground parkade walls extend under portions of the tree protection area, and some of the hardscaping shown in the tree protection area is not appropriate.
 - o The planting shown beside the townhouses against the Maple Street property line on sheet L8.2 will not be practical due to the steep slope of the soil, and should be reconsidered.
 - o There is a new tree planting shown on L2.0 and L3.0 planted in the protection zone of tree marked OS5, which should not be in the protection zone.
 - o The planting buffer on sheet L7.0 appears to be less than one metre in width and should be widened to provide a better buffer with viable soil volumes for plantings.

It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Advisory Design Panel recommends that the application for the development proposal at 15654 North Bluff Road proceed to Council.

CARRIED

4.2 – Owner – 15894 Roper Avenue (P. Dhaliwal, A. Kulla, and J. Saluja)

The applicant provided the following overview of the updates to their development proposal (two single-family homes with a secondary suite each) since the previous ADP review on November 20, 2018, using poster boards:

- Responding to previous concern that the eventual building heights may project beyond what has been proposed in the plans in order to accommodate features to meet BC Building Code requirements that were not accounted for in the drawings, the applicant confirmed they have designed the building to be within the maximum height as measured from average natural grade.
- Responding to previous concern that the ‘mirroring’ of interior room layout of the two houses and aligned window placement may result in a loss of privacy between the two homes, the applicant illustrated how the windows have been staggered where they previously aligned directly, and also converted to clerestory (above eye level) in one of the units where they are still aligned.
- Responding to previous concern regarding the accessibility and light access for both secondary suites, the applicant noted that the basement wells in the back of the homes have been widened.
- Responding to previous concern regarding the entrances of the homes being visually ‘secondary’ to the overheight garages, the applicant noted they have lowered the garage height of the homes.
- Responding to previous concern regarding the proposal soil volumes for plantings and excavation and landscaping within the tree protection zones on the property, the landscape designed noted they have addressed the soil depths and simplified the proposed plantings, including converting the rear yards to regular lawn from turf.

The Advisory Design Panel then discussed the application, including the following comments:

- The Panel commended the applicant for their changes, while requiring further clarification on the mirroring of the homes and noting that despite the off-centered location of the windows that it will be possible to view into the other home when looking through the windows at an angle.
- The Panel also noted that the driveway for one of the units appears to have a City street light in the boulevard which may be an obstacle for the driveway access.
- The Panel requested that on the shared property line between the two units that dense planting be provided on either side of the driveway to prevent the entire front area from being hardscaped.
- It was suggested that the applicant may need to consider providing continuous pavers on the sideyard walkway to the secondary suite for firefighter and resident access.

It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Advisory Design Panel recommends that the application for the development proposal at 15894 Roper Avenue proceed to Council subject to the applicant giving further consideration to the following revisions:

1. Consider the revising the driveway configuration to account for the impact of the existing City street light in the boulevard, or the potential requirement to relocate the street light;
and
2. Consider adding dense planting between the units adjacent to the driveways.

CARRIED

5. CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting concluded at 4:50 pm.

Karen Hammersley
Chairperson, Advisory Design Panel

Greg Newman
ADP, Committee Secretary