

**MINUTES**  
**ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING**  
Saanich Municipal Hall, Committee Room No. 2  
October 5, 2016 at 3:00 pm

Present: Ron Drane, Chair; Eric Barker; Art Beck; Pat Danforth; Illarion Gallant  
Staff: Andrea Pickard, Planner; Tania Douglas, Senior Committee Clerk  
Regrets: Sorin Birliga; John Gauld; Cory Lee

---

**MOVED by A. Beck and seconded by P. Danforth: “That the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting held on September 7, 2016 be adopted as circulated.”**

**CARRIED**

**CASE #2015/010**

**Application by Mark Anthony, Number Ten Architectural Group, to rezone from the RA-1 (Apartment Zone) to site specific zone to allow a total of 164 affordable dwelling units at 1550 Arrow Road. A Development Permit application to construct a new 3-storey, 84 unit apartment is requested. The existing 80 unit apartment building will remain.**

**Legal: Lot A, Section 56, Victoria District, Plan 23817, Except Part in Plan 2701**

**Planning File(s): DPR00614 / REZ00559**  
**Planner: Andrea Pickard**

Mark Anthony and Sian Porter, Number Ten Architectural Group; Renee Lussier, LADR Architects; and Peter Daniel, Anglican Diocese, attended to present design plans and answer questions from the Panel.

Ms. Pickard briefly outlined the proposal and noted:

- The ADP considered this application in September last year. There had been lots of public opposition and in response, changes were made and a new application is before the Panel.
- The original application was to rezone from the RA-1 (Apartment) zone to the RA-3 (Apartment) zone to allow a higher density on the property, and for a Development Permit for a new 3-storey apartment. The existing building was to remain for some years before it would be removed and redeveloped in the future.
- The application has been revised for a site specific Comprehensive Development Zone to allow the proposed 3-storey to be constructed in one “Development Area” and for the existing building to remain in a separate “Development Area”.
- The proposed 3-storey building and site layout has been revised in response to public input and due to the extent of changes a second referral to the ADP was recommended.

The applicant highlighted the proposal and demonstrated the changes with visual aids and noted that after interaction with the neighbourhood the following changes have been made:

- The building is shifted from the north to the south and they have reduced it by 16 units.
- North setback changed from 12m to 17.8m and west setback changed from 8.1m to 13m. The east setback is unchanged.

- Revised parking is changed from 88 to 82 residential stalls; visitor parking is increased from 7 to 17 stalls, or from a total of 95 to 99. Ten foot downcast lamps will light the parking lot, which was reduced from 14 foot.
- An expanded rain garden has been moved from the west to the northeast corner of the property, where a previous turn-around was planned. This gives a larger buffer to the neighbours in that area. Landscaping has been modified to alleviate the concerns of the adjacent neighbours.
- The original building used more modern materials and the revised application shows a more traditional residential look in the roofing, materials and lines. Juliette balconies and bay windows were added on the north and east for visual variety. Full balconies on the south and west elevations overlooking the central courtyard remain.
- The proposed west end has a stepped massing with a two storey step down portion and there are no windows related to living units facing the west for the adjacent neighbours' privacy. There are no west facing balconies. Corner units on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor are angled at 45 degrees in the northeast corner to address overlook concerns.
- The interior ceiling heights have been reduced to alleviate height concerns. Finished building height is changed from 9.5m to 8.6m
- The garbage/recycle pickup area has shifted to the front entrance so the truck does not have to drive as far into the property as previously proposed.
- Where the rain garden was originally proposed, some of the raised garden beds would be located.

### **Comments from the Panel**

The Landscape Architect stated:

- He has been to the site and likes the mixed neighbourhood context as it makes it warmer, homelike and intimate.
- It would be nice to have vegetation planted instead of a deer-fence for the garden plots; black chainlink with vegetation planted through is recommended.
- The walkways through the vegetable gardens are good. The rain gardens are isolated; it would be good to have walkways throughout this area and around the facility.

The representative for persons with disabilities stated:

- The common gardens are low and it can be difficult for seniors to bend; suggested raised garden plots.
- Asked if the laundry area is sufficient.
- The units may not be accessible enough; suggested that washroom access may be better served with a pocket or barn door style.

The Saanich resident representative stated:

- He noticed that there are now more studios than in the previous proposal.
- Suggested that a public restroom be provided on each floor.
- It is important to have a family space for visiting considering the small size of the units.

The Architect stated:

- It is too bad that the applicant had to endure so many unfair changes, they have gone over and beyond their duty to satisfy the public.
- Integrating a path within the rain gardens is very important, even though the neighbours do not agree. It is a beautiful garden.
- He does not like the deer-fence but he does like the garden plots.
- Architecturally, the front of the building is understated. The treatment on the elevations and facades work well, but it is just not strong enough. Would prefer something more generous, stronger or bigger.

The Chair stated:

- There is one blank wall near the entrance that could use some relief. Suggested similar stucco treatment to that which is proposed on the other corner of the building.

Responses from the applicants:

- There are no pathways planned in the rain gardens because neighbours asked for a buffer. So the pathway is between the building and the rain garden. The proposed deer-fence is black mesh with wood posts and not as shown in the model.
- They could wheel up to the vegetable plots or have seats.
- The laundry area is a common area; the third floor has the exercise room and the lobby has a large lounge. These spaces are considered to be social spaces.
- Pocket doors can interfere with electrical/wiring, however a barn door may be an option.
- The number of studios did not increase, the number of one bedroom units decreased.
- The Society has focused on the outside of the building more than the interior. They would like to reintroduce a family eating/common space, even if they have to lose one or two units to do so.

\*\* I. Gallant left the meeting at 3:40 pm, prior to leaving he granted the Chair his proxy vote of approval for the application \*\*

#### **MOTION:**

**MOVED by E. Barker and Seconded by P. Danforth: "That it be recommended that the design to construct a new 3-storey, 84 unit apartment building at 1550 Arrow Road be approved as presented and that the comments from the Panel, as recorded in the minutes, be considered."**

**CARRIED**

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm.

#### **NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting date is November 2, 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**CHAIR**

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Committee Secretary**