

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON  
OCTOBER 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. James Paul (Chair)  
Ms. Annerieke van Hoek  
Mr. Greg Travers  
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell  
Mr. Kevin Hanvey (with the exception of item 1 a.)  
Mr. Robert Heikkila

REGRETS: Ms. Amy Tsang  
Mr. Tieg Martin  
Ms. Liane McKenna

STAFF: Mr. Erik Wilhelm  
Ms. Casey Peters  
Mr. Frank Ducote  
Mr. Michael Hartford  
Ms. Alex Anderson

The meeting came to order at 6:55 pm.

It was agreed to adjust the agenda to deal with "New Business" as the first item.

**1. NEW BUSINESS**

**a. 2151 Front St – Detailed Rezoning and Development Permit application for Grocery Store (File: 08.3060.20/014.14)**

Mr. Erik Wilhelm, District Planner, gave a brief overview of the site context for the detailed application. Phase One of this project to the west, is under construction and is comprised of an 80 unit mixed-use building and two standalone commercial buildings. To the east and south of the site are completed Light Industrial buildings; to the north-west are two older existing townhouse complexes. The District's Official Community Plan (OCP) designates the Phase Two as "Commercial." This application came before the ADP on June 12, 2014 and the Panel supported the general concept of the development at that time but requested reconsideration of some items and a further presentation.

Mr. Wilhelm introduced the applicant team, GWL Realty and Rositch Hemphill Architects.

The Chair thanked Mr. Wilhelm for his presentation, welcomed the applicant team to the meeting and outlined the procedure to be followed in reviewing the proposal.

Mr. Michael Reed, project design team member, outlined the changes made to the application since it was reviewed by the Panel in June, and highlighted the areas of focus identified by the Panel. These included a review of: the relationship of the buildings to Front Street, pedestrian connections, building massing, material choices, and the parking lot interface to Dollarton Highway.

Mr. Reed emphasized that this application is for the second phase of the Northwoods development, and that the design focuses on the grocery tenant, Stongs, which is seeking a shopping centre format. Mr. Reed also noted that this is a transition property to the adjacent town centre, and as a result is massed more heavily to the north, with parking to the south.

Mr. Keith Hemphill, the project architect, noted changes made to the overall project including changes to the pedestrian links, the addition of a plaza and the inclusion of seating pockets throughout the site. Mr. Hemphill reminded the Panel of the differences in grade throughout the site as a result of flood protection requirements. Mr. Hemphill also noted that the applicant team is working with the District Environment Department to ensure proper tree protection.

Mr. Hemphill reviewed the changes to the proposed grocery store building, noting the elevation changes and the revision from a vertical wall to an eave line with a sloped roof. It was noted that increased glazing has been provided throughout the building, as well as the addition of dormer forms to articulate the eave line. On the north elevation of the building, Mr. Hemphill pointed out the introduction of gable forms and wall articulation, additional landscaping, seating pockets and the introduction of window elements that allow for display. On the east elevation, Mr. Hemphill noted the pedestrian routes and the change in character they provide. Mr. Hemphill summarized by identifying the new pedestrian entrance at the west side of the building.

Mr. Hemphill reviewed the small CRU building at the south-west of the site, pointing out that the Panel had originally supported the building form as it was presented at the ADP in June, and that the applicant team had not made significant changes. He noted new access at the corner, a pedestrian-friendly pathway connection, and increased use of glazing.

Mr. Hemphill outlined the approach for the north east building and noted that the Panel had generally thought the façade to be successful. The applicant team carried this façade through the rest of the building, and added more glazing. He noted that the roof form at the east elevation of the building facing Riverside Drive had been changed to achieve a sloped, pitched roof with a gable at each end. As well, the applicant team created a new corner with a plaza and pedestrian weather protection.

David Stoyko, project landscape architect, commented on the improved pedestrian access and ease of movement throughout the site. He noted the focus on important spaces and the use of materials to maintain symmetry and richness, while focusing on the Front Street access. Mr. Stoyko pointed out the parking lot edge and noted that it is now more layered with a stepped and planted retaining wall, allowing for good visibility to the commercial aspect while creating a visual barrier to the parking from the street. He also noted the increased use of evergreens and larger sized plants to preserve the North Shore character.

The Chair thanked the design team for their presentation and asked if there were any questions of clarification from the Panel members.

Questions of clarification were asked of the design team on the following topics:

Clarification on the access to the site from Dollarton Hwy: Answer: There will be a level entry and new sidewalk through Dollarton that will connect to the existing trail.

Where will the large stack of boulders on the site be used? Answer: They will be used in the landscape plan, mainly on the south edge of the site along Dollarton Hwy, and potentially as part of the stormwater management plan.

Is public art part of the project, and if so, how? Answer: Yes, a commitment to public art was made at the rezoning stage. The applicant team is working through the process to identify the best location with the expectation that the south-west corner of the site may be a good focus.

On the north-west corner of the main building there is a new entrance created. Will this be a separate CRU and how will this work having two entrances? Answer: No, this will not be a separate CRU as it is a part of the grocery store.

The Chair thanked the applicant team and staff for their clarifications and asked for comments from the District Urban Design Planner, Mr. Frank Ducote.

Mr. Ducote complimented the design team on the positive changes. In particular, it was noted that the design team has achieved a stronger relationship to the development in Phase One. Mr. Ducote questioned the presence of handicap routes. He also commented on the need for Riverside Drive at Dollarton to be more pedestrian friendly rather than accommodating to large trucks and service vehicles, but noted that this comment was directed toward the District Engineering Department. Mr. Ducote commented on behalf of Alfonso Tejada, District Urban Design Planner, that there was an opportunity at the north elevation for a berm, rather than a high foundation wall. The applicant team responded that the landscape wall had been brought down, and the use of greenery increased so that none of the concrete will be exposed.

The Chair thanked Mr. Ducote for his comments and asked the Panel members for their comments on the project.

Panel members thanked the design team for their presentation and noted a general appreciation for the changes made since reviewing the preliminary application.

A Panel member noted in particular how far the design team had gone to minimize the "big box" appearance of the development.

A Panel member noted some concerns regarding the large glazed areas near the grocery store entrance, and hoped that the positive elements of this glazing would be not be diminished by store stock and advertising materials blocking this glazing.

The Chair thanked the applicant team and invited the Panel to compose a motion.

**MOVED** by Robert Heikkila and **SECONDED** by Greg Travers:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the revised proposal, commends the applicant for the quality of the proposal, and recommend **APPROVAL** of the project as presented.

**CARRIED**

**b. 1203-1207 Harold Rd – Detailed Rezoning and Development Permit Application for 8 townhouse units (File: 08.3060.20/030.14)**

Mr. Kevin Hanvey joined the Panel at 7:40 pm.

Ms. Casey Peters of the District Planning Department gave a brief overview of the application and site context. The site is located at Harold and Baird Roads, on the edge of the Lynn Valley Town Centre. It is designated in the Official Community Plan as Residential Level 4 – transitional multi-family with a maximum FSR of 1.2. Surrounding developments include existing single family homes to the north, existing multi-family Residential Level 3 with a 0.8 FSR to the west, designated Residential Level 4 properties to the east and Residential Level 5 properties with a maximum 1.75 FSR to the south.

This project forms a transition from lower densities to the Lynn Valley Town Centre, and as a part of the project plan, there is a required dedicated portion of land to the east. The long term plan for this area is to create a new pathway that connects to an existing trail network to the north, as well as to future development to the south.

Ms. Peters noted that this development is in the development permit areas for Form and Character, as well as Energy and Water Conservation and Green House Gas Emission Reduction.

Clarification was requested on whether public art is part of the project. Ms. Peters noted that a Community Amenity Contribution is a part of the application, and that public art could be one of the potential amenities. Ms. Peters also noted that a decision has not been made as to whether this public art would be located on site or elsewhere in Lynn Valley.

Ms. Peters introduced the design team, Duane Siegrist, project architect, Mike Brody, project applicant and Bill Harrison, landscape architect.

The Chair thanked Ms. Peters for her presentation, welcomed the applicant team to the meeting and outlined the procedure to be followed in reviewing the proposal.

Mr. Siegrist reviewed the highlights of the application, beginning with the site planning. Mr. Siegrist noted the park connection and future green walkway connection that are intended to reinforce pedestrian movement through the site and to the Town Centre. He also noted that the built form in the surrounding area is predominantly of the same size, and that the proposed development will reflect this scale.

Mr. Siegrist spoke to the urban form of the project, noting that the built form in the area over the past few years focuses on street access to the front door and parking located in the interior of the site. It was noted that the setbacks proposed are typical in the area. Mr. Siegrist commented on the building mass and noted that the design team felt strongly about the need to provide a soft edge to the building with a vertical transition from the sidewalk. He indicated that the intent is to provide gated access to the interior parking, so as to create the sense of an internal courtyard.

Mr. Siegrist reviewed the building elements, highlighting the sliding screen features to help create a sense of privacy and comfort, as well as sun-shading on the balconies. Mr. Siegrist noted that the materials used are durable, west coast materials, that the building form provides weather protection with deep overhangs, that the colours and materials generally include a

solid stone base to ground the form, and lighter, more muted colour choices above. The rooftop decks are an element reflecting the design team's' livability statement, and are intended to provide residents with quality outdoor spaces. Mr. Siegrist noted that the plans for the building include elevator rough-ins that can provide access to bedrooms and underground parking and help to assist with aging in place.

Mr. Bill Harrison, project landscape architect, outlined the use of a limited but attractive selection of landscape materials. He noted the emphasis on connecting the units to the street front, including the use of stoops or porches for most of the units. Mr. Harrison noted the European feel of the drive and courtyard interior and pointed out the simple planting palette proposed so as not to take away from the building's design elements. Mr. Harrison noted that there are rain gardens proposed on Harold Road, as well as the use of permeable paving as a part of the stormwater strategy. Mr. Harrison also noted that the access gate will be well lit and secure.

Mr. Siegrist summarized the design team's objectives and pointed out that the proposal meets zoning requirements with the exception of height due to the taller building elements that allow stair access to the roof decks.

The Chair thanked the design team for their presentation and asked if there were any questions of clarification from the Panel members.

Questions of clarification were asked of the design team on the following topics:

Will some of the units be able to have step-free access off the street? Answer: Stairs cannot be eliminated for any of the units, but the intent is to reduce the number of stairs.

Will elevators provide access to roof decks? Answer: Solutions to mobility challenges have been focused on vehicle and bedroom access, not the roof decks. Allowing for this might create more bulk, as well as reduced floor space.

Could the "coach house" style units have doors to the lane, rather than to Harold Road? Answer: The intent was to create a street connection to Harold Road.

Has Swiss Pearl panelling been used on townhouse projects in the past? Answer: Yes, but the approach in this building will employ a rail system rather than exposed fasteners.

How many units are roughed-in for elevators? Answer: 4 of the 8 proposed units.

How do the screens on the west elevation slide? Answer: The screens will be made of treated cedar. They are built on rails with a spring system to allow for movement.

Will the building be wood frame? Answer: Yes.

How will the thin balcony edge detail be achieved? Answer: The balconies will have a vinyl membrane running to the edge, likely with a cap flashing.

Are both the pedestrian and vehicle gates secured? Answer: Yes.

Will there be lighting on the easterly walkway? Answer: Yes, soffit lighting.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for their clarifications and asked for comments from the District Urban Design Planner, Mr. Frank Ducote.

Mr. Ducote noted that the proposal included a number of innovative features. Mr. Ducote wondered if the laneway façade of the “coach house” building could be treated differently so as to benefit the lane. With regard to the roofscape, it was suggested that the many stair towers seem to add bulk to the building and could perhaps be minimized to some extent. While there is an appreciation for a natural pallet, the choices were noted as being quite muted and there could be an opportunity for additional colour, perhaps on the doors. As well, the edges of the building could be treated in a somewhat more delicate manner and this would add to the West Coast feel of the building.

The Chair thanked Mr. Ducote for his comments and asked the Panel members for their comments on the proposal.

A Panel member commented that this appears to be a well-conceived design that accommodates the density on the site quite well.

It was noted that while the project is an attractive design, the quality of the detailing will make it successful as a finished project. It was noted that the applicant may wish to consider an alternate material for the proposed sliding screens to ensure they are functional and durable.

It was suggested that access to garages could be challenging and should be reviewed.

Some Panel members felt that the height of the stair towers seemed to be an attractive counterpoint to the horizontality of the project overall, and that there was generally no objection to the increased height. With regard to the stair towers in particular, one Panel member noted that horizontal bands of glazing on the stair towers might keep the parapet from appearing relentless.

Some Panel members suggested that the east elevation appeared poorly resolved and would benefit from more interest and variety.

One Panel member noted some disappointment with the conversion of the project to a townhouse form and the fact that this will reduce accessibility in the project. It was noted that access from the street with fewer steps would be a positive outcome. It was suggested that there was some lack of clarity on formatting for future elevator installations, and that while this is a very positive idea, there might be other ways to achieve them which would provide improved access to the interior spaces.

The Chair thanked the Panel for their comments and invited the applicant team to respond to the comments made by the Panel.

Mr. Siegrist thanked the Panel for their comments.

The Chair thanked the applicant team and invited the Panel to compose a motion.

**MOVED** by Kevin Hanvey and **SECONDED** by Robert Heikkila:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and recommends **APPROVAL** of the project **SUBJECT** to addressing the following items to the satisfaction of staff:

- Further study of the eastern elevation and auto court to promote greater variety and interest, including colour
- Further consideration of fenestration of stair towers on the western façade
- Further review of stair access from the street for the four westerly units
- Review of the practicality of the gate to the auto court
- Further review of detail of balcony projections to ensure thinness and reflection of building images as presented
- Review of provisions for future elevator format for westerly four units to provide access from the street and garage
- Review of parking opportunities for handicap parking on site

**MOTION CARRIED****c) Seylynn Village – Phase Two, Buildings A and D (08.3060.20/052.12)**

Mr. Michael Hartford of the District Planning Department introduced the design team and gave a brief overview of the application and site context. Mr. Hartford noted that these are two separate development permit applications being processed simultaneously. Mr. Hartford provided background information for Panel members who were not present at the beginning of the project and outlined that Council recently adopted an Implementation Plan for the Lower Lynn Town Centre. Surrounding land uses include Highway 1 to the east and north, lands for future residential development to the south, and existing Seylynn Park to the west. A new bypass road is currently under construction at the north edge of the site.

Buildings A and D constitute the subject development and comprise Phase 2 of the larger project. Design Guidelines specific to Seylynn Village were adopted at the time of rezoning in order to shape the development and to help respond to site specific issues such as:

- Addressing the internal roadway and how best to approach it
- The handling of pedestrian opportunities throughout the site
- A unique identity for the site
- How to deal with open space on the site so that it works for residents and the community

Mr. Hartford noted that the site falls into Development Permit Areas for Form and Character, Creek Hazard (flooding) and Energy, Water and Greenhouse Gases. The target for all buildings is LEED Silver.

Mr. Hartford outlined the District input for Building D, the 6 storey building, and that topics which the District had reviewed with the applicant included the interior organization of the recreation facility, the relationship of the building to the new East Keith Road, a review of the main plaza area in order to make it a successful space, and the need to define travel paths for users of the site.

For Building A, the 28 storey tower, it was noted that the District reviewed items such as the format of the residential lobby area and its relationship to the second plaza, the relationship between the driveway and the residential lobby, the townhouses on the west of the site and their relationship to Mountain Highway, building massing of the north podium arm, and a review of the tower proportions.

The Chair thanked Mr. Hartford for his presentation, and asked the Panel if they had any questions of clarification before introducing the design team.

A question was asked regarding whether the two projects should be dealt with in one motion? Answer: Mr. Hartford noted that the outcome would likely depend on the Panel's review, but that either one or two motions would be possible as there are two applications under consideration.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team to the meeting and outlined the procedure to be followed in reviewing the proposal.

Mr. Mark Ehman, project architect outlined the goals of the design in regards to layout and connectivity and connection of the site to adjacent properties, specifically Seylynn Park, the pedestrian connection along Keith Road, and Phibbs Exchange to the south. He identified the project as a family of towers that share certain elements, but still express individuality. Mr. Ehman pointed out that the development centers around a central green space with the buildings wrapping around it with the towers sitting on top of a series of podiums that define the streetwall and internal space. Mr. Ehman noted that the towers are 28, 32 and 24 storeys, with Building D a lower 6-storey building.

Mr. Al Johnson, project architect, spoke to the specifics of each building, beginning with a review of Building D. The theme for the building was noted as being inspired by natural surroundings and the industry of the area, and the functionality of the building includes two main components: rental residential and recreation.

Mr. Johnson noted that access to the main plaza is off the internal road, as well as entry into retail space and a childcare facility. Underground parking will be directly underneath the north portion of Building D. The ground floor plan includes three access points off the main community plaza: the recreational area to the north, main access to the residential lobby, and three residential units that open onto the plaza. A range of unit sizes are provided and glazing in the building corners provides natural light and day lighted corridors when possible.

Mr. Johnson noted that, while colour is important in the project in order to break down scale, translucency is also important. The material palette includes staggered cementitious panels, steel shingles in a copper colour, laminated balcony glass in two shades of blue, and a corrugated metal component. The pool building demonstrates an outdoor terrace component, copper shingle roof, and a warm wood-lined space. The childcare at the base of the building will incorporate primary colours, as well as a protected outdoor play area. It was noted that the more public parts of the building are closer to the street edge, with the residential spaces set back in the site.

Mr. Johnson spoke to the building design for Building A, noting a series of arrival points for the commercial, residential common entry, and residential townhouse entries. Mr. Johnson noted that the townhouse elevations on Mountain Highway have been pulled back and that more depth and greenery have been added in front of these units. The theme for this building includes simple, linear forms with a strong relationship between indoor and outdoor spaces. The use of cementitious panels is staggered but repetitive and offers visual interest and thinness to the tower. Mr. Johnson noted the use of a series of horizontal aluminum sun shading along the side of the building, creating a vertical landmark element. The inspiration for pattern and colour are drawn from moss green and forest areas of the park.



Level two of the building will include bicycle and residential storage in the north portion of the podium, with a ramped exit to allow for bicycle access. Level three includes a children's play area. Units have corner glazing in living rooms, offering views toward the park and open spaces on site.

Mr. Gerry Eckford, the project's Landscape Architect, provided comments for the Panel on the proposed landscape. Mr. Eckford noted the patterning on the paving throughout the site, the use of abstracted wall shapes, and the "folded" heavy timber element as ways of connecting to nature. On the internal road frontage, it was noted that the design includes water features along the main roadway, street tree plantings, and the folded wood platform that creates a social and interactive space. Mr. Eckford pointed out the vegetated berm along the Keith Road extension.

Mr. Eckford noted that the public art component for the project is proceeding, and that the artist has been engaged and is currently in the process of developing a theme for the piece. The directive for the public art piece is to be unique and engaging, as well as notably different from patterns already in play.

For Building D, Mr. Eckford pointed out the fractured rock separation at the pool terrace level, as well as buffer planting that serves to separate the amenity lobby from the building lobby. He noted that the intention for the childcare play area is to include a tall glazed wall for auditory separation but with a pattern to engage children.

Mr. Eckford then reviewed the views of the surrounding area using diagrams and photographs provided by the design team. It was noted that all the roofs below the tower are landscaped.

The Chair thanked the design team for their presentation and asked if there were any questions of clarification from the Panel members.

Questions of clarification were asked of the design team on the following topics:

Plaza venting for Building D? Answer: The vent provides air intake only, and is flush to the surface of the plaza.

Response to orientation and the solar gain for Building A? Answer: The design team has included sun shade, slab extensions and horizontal shading. As well, all of the residential units in the building are air conditioned. In response to the challenge of noise pollution, the windows are all triple glazed. There are also operable windows in every unit.

Was consideration given to the articulation of Building A between floors 5 and 25, or is there a rationale to having the similarity in this middle portion of the building? Answer: Yes, this choice was intentional. The area surrounding the towers will be low to mid-rise and the intention was to encourage the lower pedestrian street well, and to keep the massing simple and repetitive in the middle of the tower to accentuate thinness.

How does access to bicycle storage in Building A work and how will security issues be resolved, particularly at night? Answer: Gate will be "fob" controlled at the bottom of the ramp in order to create a safe entrance and exit. The design team is aware that lighting choices will be critical in this area, however the location is adjacent to the cycling route, and as such the access point makes sense.

Landscaping for Building D seems unresolved – what is the rationale? Answer: There is an increased amount of activity coming and going in this area, and the intention is to provide more open space to allow for activity and events to take place.

Will the playground in Building A be accessible? Answer: Yes.

Are the townhomes on the west side of Building A accessible? Answer: From the outside they are not, and the elevation is due to water table issues. Inside they are, with a lift for access in the interior corridor.

Is there a unisex bathroom in the common recreation facility? Answer: No, not currently.

Is over-height parking available for visitors and residents? Answer: Yes, there is in one of the levels of parking.

What noise mitigation strategies does the project include? Answer: All of the residential units will have triple glazing and air conditioning, and as well, an acoustics analysis will be applied.

Are the solid wall elements mass concrete or are they framed insulated assemblies? Answer: Framed insulated assemblies.

Was the option of more wall and less window explored as the tower seems to show floor to ceiling glazing? Answer: Yes, this was considered, however marketability is an issue. The goal is to strike a balance between glazing and solid form, and the buildings have approximately 40% glazing.

What are the details of the energy strategy? Answer: It is a continuation of the strategy used in the first tower - the current project includes a geo-exchange system and high efficiency systems. Load-sharing is being explored with the recreation facility.

Will the balconies be accessible? Answer: The level three units are accessible. The other units will have a threshold, but ramps will be provided to assist with accessibility.

What is the material for the “folded” wood element in the plaza? Answer: Heavy fir timber.

Is the Level 5 green roof accessible? Answer: Only the patio areas are accessible, not the entire roof area.

At completion, will each phase have its own parking? Answer: Yes, they will all be separate.

What are the details of the multi-modal path and pedestrian experience along E. Keith Rd? Answer: There will be two bermed areas and pathways up into the centre of the site. The berms will merge into a screen, likely glass, to separate childcare and other private areas. The recreation facility comprises a perforation through the natural landscape.

What are the details of the proposed rooftop child’s play area for Building A? Answer: The applicant team is proposing a creative play space, rather than a play structure approach. The undulated surface allows for creative play, and the material will be resilient and safe.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for their clarifications and asked for comments from the District Urban Design Planner, Mr. Frank Ducote.

Mr. Ducote noted that the material boards show a different approach to colour expression between the two buildings, and wondered if there is some opportunity to see colour expression as shown on Building D, expressed on Building A. Otherwise, no concerns were expressed.

The Chair thanked Mr. Ducote for his comments and asked the Panel members for their comments on the proposal.

As a general comment, Panel members thanked the project team for a carefully prepared presentation and complimented the level of attention to the design of the buildings.

Comments were made on the lack of a clear solar strategy for the residential units, noting that the applicant should not be relying on air conditioning as a solution to the lack of shading provided by the building form. It was acknowledged that some portions of the buildings are set back and articulated, but a large number of units will still have a great deal of sun exposure and solar gain.

A member commented that the bicycle storage room appears to be a vulnerable aspect of the project from a security perspective, as there is little natural surveillance in the area. It was noted that the landscaping contributes to the surveillance problem, and that some efforts should be made to address this concern. It was also recommended that the applicant team look at ways to discourage skateboarding along the sharp concrete edges of the walls of the Keith Road elevation of the podium.

Related to this, it was suggested that the north wall of the podium on Building A seemed somewhat formidable, and could possibly benefit from some openings at the lowest level to allow for a more comfortable pedestrian environment. The relationship between the urban edge of the swimming pool and the road and pathway to the north was also suggested as being tight, and might be improved with more landscaping.

It was noted that the different building entries in Building D need to be resolved, and that the recreational facility entry is not working well with its current design. Further, the way in which the rental and recreational elements of Buildings D interface appears uneasy, including a lack of clarity with the curved portion of the building and how it separates the residential from the recreation space.

While it was suggested that the landscape design looked interesting and well-developed, it was suggested that the lawn space at the south edge of the plaza needs to be reconsidered in order to make better use of space, and it was noted that the air intake vent in Building D plaza needs to be relocated.

It was questioned whether a more direct connection to Seylynn Park could be explored as part of either this phase or later in the project.

The Chair thanked the Panel for their comments and invited the applicant team to respond.

The applicant team noted that the District has stipulated there be no pedestrian connection at the internal roadway location, but that Fern St. will be well-lit and provide a safe connection to the park. The applicant team thanked the Panel for their comments.

The Chair thanked the applicant team and invited the Panel to compose a motion.

**MOVED** by Annerieke van Hoek and **SECONDED** by Kevin Hanvey:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and recommends **APPROVAL** of the project **SUBJECT** to addressing the following items to the satisfaction of staff:

- Review of walkway access to the bicycle storage facility in "Building A" with regard to CPTED (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design) principles
- Review of a passive solar strategy for the buildings with particular attention to shading for the south elevation of "Building A"
- Further study of the format of the private recreation facility front entrance to improve functionality of the entrance area
- Further study of the architectural treatment of the private recreation facility in terms of its relationship to the rental component of the building, with particular attention to the north-east corner of the recreation facility element
- Review of the location of air intake in "Building D" plaza with consideration of relocation
- Review of landscape materials in the "Central Commons" plaza, and in particular replacement of lawn with hardscape, all with the intent to improve cohesiveness
- Provision of a unisex change/washroom area in private recreation facility
- Review of fenestration opportunities for north face of podium element of "Building A" abutting E. Keith Road Extension

**MOTION CARRIED**

## 2. MINUTES

An error was noted in the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting for Sept. 11, 2014 as circulated – it was noted that the record of members attending the meeting required corrections. Michael Hartford advised that the corrections would be made prior to posting of the minutes.

A motion was made and seconded to adopt the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting for Sept. 11, 2014, as amended.

## 3. OTHER BUSINESS

It was noted that Mr. James Paul will be leaving the Panel and the position of Chair at the conclusion of this term. AIBC will provide a nomination for a replacement Architect for appointment to the Panel.

There was some discussion around the provision of models for ADP presentations, and it was decided that this item should be listed as an agenda item for a future meeting.

**4. ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was moved, seconded, and carried to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

**5. NEXT MEETING**

November 13, 2014

Chair James R. Pace

13 November 2014  
Date