

2. Generally supportive of removing step back requirement. The balconies meet the intent.
3. Generally supportive of the overall building massing, form, and character. The central arcade is successful, creates a nice atmosphere and makes the building unique.
4. Consider roofline as it relates to the neighbouring single-family homes.
5. Suggest the design proceed with the roof line that works best with thermal gains/losses.
6. Suggest the design incorporates more windows in the stairwells to break up the massing.

Materials, colour, detail, and landscape (hard and soft):

1. Generally supportive of material and colours. They work well with proposed planting.
2. Suggest mechanical vent be screened with planting.
3. Concern that the green wall structure wouldn't be successful. Consider alternative options to buffer the space.
4. Suggest increasing plant sizes and trees.

**That** the Advisory Design Panel **does** support the proposal of RZ001181 if the applicant addresses the ADP comments noted above. The Advisory Design Panel **does not** request to see the proposal again.

CARRIED

#### 4.3 **File No. DP001961 – 1000 Alpha Lake Road** **1<sup>st</sup> Review**

J. Opsal invited RMOW Planner, T. Napier to introduce the application. T. Napier explained the project as follows:

The applicant recently received development permit (DP) approval for mixed use commercial/retail/warehouse and employee housing at the subject lands. Due to a recent revision to the original subdivision plan, Lot 2 increased, allowing for additional gross floor area. Therefore, the applicant seeks to amend the issued development plans to increase the amount of employee housing on the site and respond to changes in the market that no longer support the proposed development of a building for the specific use as a brewery.

Staff requests ADP provide comments and recommendations with respect to the site layout, site circulation, landscaping, as well as the proposed changes to the building design, massing, colours and materials.

J. Opsal invited the applicant team, B. Murdoch, to present the proposal and scope of work. The applicant team advised on the following:

This application proposes revisioning the approved multi-use development at 1000 Alpha Lake Road. Specifically, it proposes the following changes: building C changes from a brewery to a mixed-use building that is the same as Building A, with warehouse and retail on ground floor, and three stories of employee housing above; buildings A and B have minor changes to the exterior materials, lighting, etc., that mostly reflect the window placements as a result of interior layout changes; and the site plan is changed to

offer additional parking due to the increase in employee housing units, and removes the outdoor patio area that was associated with the brewery. In total, the proposal results in 72 employee housing units, an increase of 24 units over the currently approved DP.

The landscape plan relies on the retention of more substantial trees and keeping the tree preservation area intact. Some revegetation may be required and will be conducted with the input of environmental consultants and infill planting with native plant species, in line with FireSmart guidelines.

This development differs from what is typical of the Function Junction neighbourhood as it is designed as a walkable community, and the proposed improvements enhance this walkability.

The panel members asked several clarification questions about parking locations and requirements, outdoor patios and communal spaces, differences in building designs, commercial spaces, etc. which were answered by the applicant team. The panel members provided the following comments on site planning, circulation, and accessibility; building massing, form, and character; and materials, colour, detail and landscape – hard and soft.

Site planning, circulation, and accessibility:

1. Support the additional employee housing dwelling units.
2. Consider realigning the crosswalk at the north-west corner of building B.
3. Consider more outdoor space and seating. Consider patios for the commercial spaces.
4. Consider reducing parking to create more communal spaces. The parking to communal space ratio seems harsh.
5. Consider the relationship of surface parking to open space. Consider less surface parking, less asphalt and more green space.
6. Commercial activities and retail are generally more successful when they are sited across from one another, not single loaded like building A in the proposed design. Consider relocating the buildings across from each other.

Building massing, form, and character:

1. Generally supportive of building massing and form.
2. Consider greater materiality or modulation to differentiate between the residential and the commercial uses.

Materials, colour, detail, and landscape (hard and soft):

1. Generally supportive of material and colours. Consider greater colours to add fun into the project.
2. Use planting to soften the hardscapes. The streetscape experience isn't there, the pedestrian experience can be increased.
3. Increase planting.
4. Consider improvements to public open space. The small park does not appear to be an inviting, useable space as currently proposed.

**That** the Advisory Design Panel **does** support the proposal of DP001961 if the applicant addresses the ADP comments noted above. The Advisory Design Panel **does not** request to see the proposal again.