A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

1. **Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel of March 16, 2005**

   It was regularly moved and seconded

   THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held on March 16, 2005 be adopted.

   Unanimously Carried

2. **Business Arising**

   None
3. **Staff Update**

**(a) Events**

**14th & 15th Streets & St. Andrew’s Avenue**

Council has reviewed two proposed development concepts for this proposal and the developer is proceeding with public consultation on traffic and parking issues, as well as neighbourhood reaction to zoning issues in the area.

Public input sessions are being hosted by the developer at Room #118 – 123 West 15th Street, and are scheduled for:

- Tuesday, April 26 at 6:30 p.m. Traffic & Parking Workshop
- Thursday, April 28 at 7 p.m. Traffic & Parking Open House and Workshop
- Thursday, May 26 at 6:30 p.m. Revised Development Plan - Open House & Presentation
- Tuesday, May 31 at 7 p.m. Revised Development Plan - Open House/Community Meeting

The Assistant City Planner will be attending these workshops on behalf of the City.

M. Rahbar entered the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

**(b) Pier Opening**

The Official Opening of Phase 1 of the Pier development will be held on Saturday, April 23. The ceremonial handing over of the waterfront walkway to the City will be held at 1:00 p.m. The City will be programming the waterfront area. Efforts to promote this site for the National Maritime Museum are underway.

**(c) Cellar Exclusions**

Council has now passed a bylaw to exclude gross floor area within cellars in two-family dwellings.

**(d) Density Bonusing Policy**

This went to a Policy Committee of Council this week and it was agreed that any density exceeding 10% in bonusing, transfers, exclusions, would require a broader public consultation as part of the rezoning process.

S. Friars entered the meeting at 5:50 p.m.
D. Lee entered the meeting at 5:55 p.m.

4. **Key Insurance Services – Signage**

The Development Planner reviewed the placement of the proposed sign to be located on private property. The tenant wishes to use an existing pole but the height does not comply with the Sign Bylaw and the applicant has been asked to make a presentation to ADP for comment.
L. Archibald and D. Asachek – Key Insurance Services were introduced and advised that the applicant is attempting to fit the new sign onto an existing structure used by a previous tenant. Mr. Asachek reviewed the drawings and design details of the proposed rotating sign. The sign will be perforated aluminum with individual channel letters and double tube neon.

**Questions from the Panel were:**

- Height of the sign
- Horizontal distance of the building to the sign
- Flashing light from rotating sign
- Sign construction
- Height of sign compared with height of previous signage

The Development Planner advised that under the Sign Bylaw signs are permitted to be 25’ above ground; this sign is 47.5 feet above ground level.

**Comments**

- Sign needs to be lower and less imposing;
- Relationship of sign to the window should be considered and should relate to the spandrel on the building;
- Sign will be distracting from inside the building;
- Should obtain written agreement from tenants to permit a rotating sign;
- If base drops to15’ sign would centre on second spandrel panel;
- Not in contravention of the bylaw if height measured from plaza level not more than 25’ (proposing 28’6”);
- Applicant should be responsible for ensuring that sign meets height requirements from the plaza;
- Sign should not rotate.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the development permit application for Key Insurance Services at 132 West Esplanade and recommends approval subject to the top of the sign being within 25 feet of the plaza deck and that the sign not rotate.**

**Unanimously Carried**

5. **346 East 5th Street – Rezoning**

The Development Planner advised that the existing home is on the supplemental list of the Heritage Inventory. The owner could demolish the house and build a duplex but prefers to stay in this location and wishes to move into the proposed infill and sell the existing heritage house. In response to APC comments, the revised plans reflect increased height in crawl space.

M.T. Hansen - Architect, D. Easton – Landscape Architect and L. Pinfield – owner/developer entered the meeting. The Architect reviewed the location of the
site and context of the area and noted the status of the existing house on the Supplemental Heritage Inventory. The owner has been advised by the City that if he is willing to protect the house through a Heritage Designation Bylaw, the City may support an in-fill development.

The proposed infill is designed to respect the existing house and the Architect reviewed the design details as set out in the information package distributed to the Panel and noted the revised height increase in the basement storage space. Exterior finishing materials and colours were displayed and explained. The change will not impact the massing of the building. CPTED issues will be addressed by use of security lighting through the site and at the lane.

The Landscape Architect reviewed the site and noted a few large shrubs which will be relocated from the rear to the front yard. Access to the units will be from the street and from the rear garage/parking areas. Interlocking pavers will be used on patio areas and ornamental and native shade tolerant plantings will create privacy for the residents.

Questions:

- Elevation of existing sundeck relative to main floor
- Layout of existing house
- Location of garbage and recycling areas
- Colours to be used on infill
- Views from rear unit and view corridor past the existing house

Comments:

- Handsome scheme and supportable with minor issues on garbage/recycling;
- Site plan and landscape well resolved;
- Concern with roofline – design would benefit from greater regularity;
- Concern with how to drain upper roof;
- Need for weather protection for balcony off the main bedroom – extension of roof may be safer;
- Need for relaxation at the lane setback;
- Concern with planter against bedroom on the lane;
- Concern with elevation at the lane for the garage – building could be raised to address this;
- Need lighting placement plan;
- Large concrete area at the side needs to be addressed;
- Stormwater management needs to be addressed to incorporate permeable surfaces, street tree, rain barrels.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 346 East 5th Street (Matthew T. Hansen, Architect) and recommends approval and further supports this type of infill development to encourage retention of heritage buildings. The Panel commends the applicant on a thorough presentation.

Advisory Design Panel
April 20, 2005
It was moved and seconded

THAT the motion be amended to recommend that the roof of the infill be simplified, subject to approval by the Development Planner.

It was moved and seconded

THAT the motion be amended to exclude the commendation for the presentation since the following details were not addressed:

- Design of the heritage house;
- Rear elevation;
- Coloured presentation material.

This was accepted as a Friendly amendment

The secondary amendment was Carried

The primary amendment was Defeated

The main motion as amended was adopted with the final wording being:

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 346 East 5th Street (Matthew T. Hansen, Architect) and recommends approval and further supports this type of infill development to encourage retention of heritage buildings.

Carried

M. Rahbar left the meeting at 7:36 p.m.

D. Rose declared a conflict of interest because of his professional involvement in the presentation for 1553 Mahon Avenue and left the meeting at 7:37 p.m.

D. Rose returned to the meeting with the delegation at 7:39 p.m.

6. **1553 Mahon Avenue – Rezoning**

The Development Planner gave an overview of the site and zoning.

C. Moorhead – Architect, D. Rose Landscape Architect and the Developer were introduced. The Architect reviewed the site context and gave an overview of the proposed development which will have three units – one 2-bedroom unit and two larger 3-bedroom units. The rear units have private patio areas to the south. Windows and access to the rear units have been designed to maintain privacy for residents of the adjoining site. Interior layouts of the three units were explained and design detail of the roof decks on the larger units was explained. Exterior finishes and colours were displayed.
D. Rose, Landscape Architect reviewed the access and screening at patio areas. An existing Japanese Maple and Cypress tree at the south of the site will be retained and other planting detail through the site and entries from the street were explained. Street trees are being addressed in discussions with staff. Parking areas will have permeable paving.

**Questions:**

- Garage access from front unit
- Lantern feature at roof and garage to introduce light into the buildings
- Intersecting roofs – drainage a concern
- Roofs A & B slope intended to introduce light into the middle unit
- How to address drainage at roof connections
- Location of garbage / recycling
- Window finishes
- Is it realistic to do circular windows in vinyl?
- Do circular windows open

It was noted that the same shingles are used on all roofs but the application on the front unit is slightly different.

D. Rose left the meeting at 8:02 p.m.

**Comments:**

- Interesting scheme with only concern that connection at roof is weak;
- Refreshing to see ‘modern’ architecture rather than copying craftsman style – good addition to the neighbourhood;
- Project is skilfully handled – building design, landscape, lighting and interior design;
- Challenge is in execution and achieving finest detail in finish;
- Like the contemporary character of project – hope it can be executed as shown;
- Sustainability statement refers to use of fibre cement siding in place of wood. Believe this is controversial - cement energy intense and wood is a renewable resource.

**Applicant’s Comment:**

Like to make statement in buildings and always have concern about where water is going. Will make commitment to fulfil what has been displayed.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 1553 Mahon Avenue (Charles Moorhead Architect) and recommends approval. The Panel commends the applicant for a thorough presentation.**

**Unanimously Carried**
D. Rose returned to the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

7. **969 Marine Drive – Building Permit**

R. Meiklejohn – Architect, and T. Babalos – Owner were introduced and the Architect gave an overview of the proposed changes to an existing development. It is proposed to change the existing frontage to a storefront presentation to incorporate two retail units with separate canopies over the glazed areas. This change would improve the streetscape on Marine Drive. Exterior colour and finishes were detailed. Future signage will be designed to meet the needs of the tenants.

The location of the site was explained and details of the parking design were reviewed. The owner advised that a tenant is in place for one retail space and bollards or concrete planters between the parking area and the storefront are being considered to respond to security concerns.

**Questions**

- Two auto bays to remain
- Colour of building exterior as shown
- Landscape considerations
- Style and materials of canopies
- Consideration of pavers at parking to create pedestrian type use

**Comments**

- Encourage consideration of pavers;
- Minimal intervention and improves appearance of building;
- Change of use good;
- Positive change for Marine Drive.

**Applicant response:**

May reconsider number of parking stalls.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Building Permit Application for 969 Marine Drive (Millenia Architecture Corp) and supports the project with the recommendation that the applicant consider using pavers in the parking area to address permeability.**

Unanimously Carried

8. **999 Marine Drive – Outdoor Dining Enclosure**

A proposal received today from the applicant was distributed to the Panel. In reviewing the material, it was determined that the scope of work to be undertaken was not clearly set out in the package.
The Development Planner was requested to have the applicant provide details on:

- Elevations
- Sections
- Site Plan
- Complete design detail

The applicant should also determine Code implications on the proposed changes, determine occupancy and if the project is covered by The Architects Act before coming back with a further presentation.

**Action:** Development Planner

9. **Design Awards - 2004**

Mr. Vesely made a presentation on projects being considered for design awards. A presentation on the projects on the shortlist will be considered at the meeting in May.

**Action:** R. Vesely  
Committee Clerk

10. **Other Business**

None

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 19, 2005 at 5:30 p.m.

Chair