

**MINUTES  
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL**

Meeting held Wednesday July 12, 2017

**Design Panel Members**

**Present:**

Councillor Bill Dingwall  
Eitaro Hirota  
Matthew Harburt  
Emily Kearns  
Maureen Robertson

**Regrets:**

Greg Turnbull  
Patricia Johnston  
Bernie Smandych

**Staff:**

Lisa Grant, Manager of Community Development  
Dana Parr, Planner II  
Kathy Wilkins, Minute Taker

**Delegations:**

David Wong – WHG Design – Jolly Coachman

Thomas Tsang – Thomas Tsang Architect  
Henry – Consultant to Thomas Tsang

**Chair:**

Emily Kearns

Thomas Tsang

The meeting started at 2:05 pm

Quorum was not met for this meeting. It was decided that the Jolly Coachman would present and any changes that might come out of the meeting could be sent out to the entire group via email to get feedback and if all members agree, it will move forward to Council for consideration.

The townhouse application is at ADP guidance and feedback before it moves forward to the neighbourhood consultation meeting. As the project moves along this project will be back to the advisory design panel

**1. Minutes of Meeting held February 12, 2017**

Minutes cannot be approved at this meeting as quorum was not met. Bring forward to next meeting.

**2. Discussion**

Dana advised the Panel that Doron Fishman is no longer a member of the ADP.

Quorum discussion took place. Suggestion of the potential for a member to call in for the meeting, number of members necessary to achieve quorum, possibly add current non-voting members, as voting members. Staff will look at some strategies to deal with this situation.

### 3. Development Permit Application – 19072 Advent Road – 9 Unit Townhouse Complex

Staff presented background on the project: This application is in the early stages of the rezoning process for a nine unit townhouse development. Consistent with the Official Community Plan as medium density development. Has had one neighbourhood consultation meeting and will require a second one. There has been no application for a development permit submitted at this time.

Thomas Tsang Overview: Nine units with most being three bedrooms. Garages will be serviced off access road and the two units on interior of the project are single garages. City requires two more parking spaces to meet minimum parking requirements.

Concerns being addressed: Tree retention. An arborist report was presented to the group and gave an idea on how root systems can be saved.

#### Councillor Dingwall:

- Is there any driveway parking (in front of garages)? *Only a few units have driveway parking;*
- Narrow entrance is a concern;
- 4 to 6 feet between the units, but feels there should be windows, for security;
- Middle units are very "thin" and not esthetically pleasing;
- Backyards are very small and there is no front yard use;

#### Eitaro Hirota:

- What is the reason for the path/walkway? *Was additional research in the event the other lot may be developed; the potential for development on the adjacent property was done at the request of Staff. The current path shown would only lead to the fence at this time;*
- There is really no need for a path at this time. Maybe grass or gravel or pavers;
- Take building 1 & 2 and flip 1 to have the same orientation as 2, this would give the appearance of staggering; This may solve the problem of the tree on Advent Road and also give more light in to some of the units;
- Even flipping just building two would look nicer.

#### Matthew Harburt:

- Feels like tree on Advent is a major issue. Who is making the determination of whether the tree stays or goes. It will ultimately be Council's decision. Needs 9.4 ft to save the tree. In order for the panel to give a recommendation of keeping or not keeping the tree, the panel would need an alternative site plan that preserves the tree as what is currently shown would not preserve the tree. Even if the roots are not severed during construction, the tree will probably not survive as it will be unable to receive water or nutrients. Effect on the trees off the property development are important as well.
- Yard sizes on building three particularly unit 7, growing lawn in that back yard will not happen so need to come up with an alternative for unit 7;
- Would want to see examples of materials, permeable paving materials, etc.
-

**Maureen Robertson:**

- What is the tree plan? Wants to see tree location of current trees;
- Do we know if the fence lines trees and the ones to the west, will be an issue for dripline?
- Would like to see a sun/shade report;
- Do we know how close the house to the east and west are to the property? Would like the setbacks provided for each property;
- 20 ft wide access road, where does the 20 feet have to come from.
- When digging foundations, the neighbours fences can be affected, what will the condition of those fences when the development is complete?

**Emily Kearns:**

- Concerned about livability in the rear yard sizes, in particular units 6 & 7;
- Concerned about trees and feels they should remain. If the trees are to be removed, consider flipping building 1 & 2 so their fronts are on Advent Road. The road would come in between the two buildings;
- The pathway should be removed between the two buildings;
- Recycling and garbage container, move behind visitor parking;
- Rooflines, look at making two small gables into one bigger gable.

**Panel Recommendations:**

- Trees – will ask arborist to look into trees along the lot line;
- Requirement of a sun/shade report;
- Wants to know potential damage and condition of neighbouring fence after development complete;
- Developer will provide survey drawing showing the evolution of the west face and survey of all windows in existing houses;
- Look at the possibility of eliminating a unit.

**4. Development Permit Application – 19167 Ford Road – Jolly Coachman Patio Renovation**

Project overview: This project is presented to the Advisory Design Panel for the second time (February of 2017 was the first time). A development variance permit for parking was approved by Council on April 4, 2017. A presentation that included detailed drawings and a descriptions that included the following:

- Retaining walls – will be finished concrete and tempered glass;
- Planters – there will be series of planters surrounding the patio;
- Lighting;
- Furniture and fabrics;
- Roof system; Will have a local engineer stamp the roof plans;
- Vegetation & landscaping;
- Heating system

**Matthew Harburt:**

- Feels all prior concerns have been addressed;
- Pleased to see the louvered system rather than glass;
- Likes the planters and built in irrigation system;
- Glazing – maybe raise the glazing height for better security;
- Agrees with landscape planting selection;
- Flooring – porcelain on concrete, is there enough drainage; architect will check to make sure the drainage is adequate

**Eitaro Hirota:**

- Confirm type of glass – tempered glass will shatter, consider the use laminated glass as this will be a safer choice;
- Sliding door will need a breakaway panel;
- At building permit stage – exits signs, panic hardware, pull stations will need to be reviewed, will have to look at the load for this exit;
- Verify the height of the guard

**Emily Kearns:**

- Wheelchair access to washrooms - through the patio doors and automatic doors will be installed.

**Maureen Robertson:**

- Likes the idea of the sliding glass doors;
- Maybe put in new door, inside the front entrance;
- To the west, there is an existing area of patio with gates, why is that area not used as patio?  
*Too narrow and would make patrons feel secluded from the rest of the patio;*
- From a CPTED perspective, feels all hedges should be removed or kept very low. Would make the area more esthetically pleasing.
- Landscape needs tidying up.

**Patricia Johnston:**

- Would like to see a bike rack – *there will be one installed*
- Have a table that is not attached to the patio area for people stopping in that may have a dog with them;

**Councillor Dingwall:**

- Feels this new patio would be good for the pub

5. **Motion**

Among the items that were discussed with regards to this application were:

- accessibility from patio to the washrooms inside the building (accessible washroom is available nearby);
- increasing the height of the glass panels;
- requirements for safely exiting the area;
- safety concerns regarding the existing hedges. To the last point, part of the hedge is proposed to remain along the 191B building frontage. The panel suggested that the application consider removing the hedge and updating the landscaping.

Members of the panel that were present recommended that:

- a) The application move forward to Council for consideration of Development Permit issuance as presented; and
- b) The voting members of the ADP who were not present for the meeting be sent a copy of the meeting minutes, be solicited for any further input or recommendations and indicate whether they support the first recommendation of the panel members who were present at the meeting on July 12<sup>th</sup>.

5. **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.