

MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON NOVEMBER 13th, 2014 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER

ATTENDING: Mr. James Paul (Chair)
Ms. Annerieke van Hoek
Mr. Greg Travers
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
Mr. Kevin Harvey
Mr. Robert Heikkila
Mr. Tieg Martin
Ms. Liane McKenna
Ms. Amy Tsang

STAFF: Mr. Erik Wilhelm
Ms. Natasha Letchford
Mr. Frank Ducote
Mr. Michael Hartford
Ms. Alex Anderson

The meeting came to order at 6:05 pm.

1. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

The Panel reviewed the minutes of the meeting of October 9, 2014.

Mr. Bob Heikkila noted that his name was misspelled. A Panel member raised a point of clarification on Page 10 of the minutes, regarding a question relating to concrete wall assembly. The Panel member suggested a clarification of the question and answer to read: "Are the solid wall elements mass concrete or are they framed insulated assemblies? Answer: Framed insulated assembly."

Staff advised that the spelling correction and adjustment for clarification would be made prior to the adopted minutes being published.

It was moved and seconded and carried to adopt the minutes as amended.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

a. **Panel Membership Update:** Mr. Michael Hartford noted that the Advisory Design Panel has received nominations for:

1. Re-appointment of Mr. Greg Travers as the representative on accessibility issues
2. Appointment of a replacement Architect: Mr. Dan Parke
3. Appointment of a replacement Professional Engineer: Mr. Samir Eidnani

Mr. Hartford expressed appreciation to Mr. Travers for agreeing to serve another term. He further noted that the nominations received have been reviewed by the District's Advisory

Oversight Committee and recommendations for appointment to the Design Panel are to be considered by Council at the meeting of December 8th 2014.

- b. **Design Awards Tour:** Mr. Hartford noted that, regretfully, as there are no completed projects ready for inspection by the Panel, there will be no Design Awards Tour for 2014.
- c. **Discussion Regarding Need for Models:** Mr. Frank Ducote asked that while the Panel are reviewing the three development applications at this meeting, that they pay particular attention to the potential for a model to assist in the review. Further Mr. Ducote suggested that the Panel consider what type of models would be useful in helping to explain the projects.

3. NEW BUSINESS

- a. **3730 – 3736 Edgemont Boulevard – Detailed Rezoning and Development Permit to create seven townhouse units**

Ms. Natasha Letchford, District Planner, gave a brief overview of the site and context for the detailed application. Ms. Letchford noted that the development is on 0.48 hectares of land and is currently zoned as RM1 - Multi-Family residential. The Official Community Plan designates the site as attached residential and allows for a maximum of 0.8 FSR. This proposal is asking for 0.75 FSR, and as such is below the maximum permitted. The development is in the Development Permit Areas for Energy, Water and Greenhouse Gases, as well as Form and Character. Ms. Letchford noted that to the north of the site is a 60 unit townhouse complex, a smaller townhouse complex to the south, Shalal Gardens to the east, and primarily single family homes to the west.

Ms. Letchford introduced the applicant team, Stefen Elmitt, Steven McFarlane, Al Saunders, Bill Harrison and Nicholas Stevenson.

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

Mr. Stefen Elmitt, project team member, gave an overview of the surrounding area, highlighting a few properties in particular that were influential in the development's design. Mr. Elmitt noted that the Hollingsworth-designed Shalal Gardens and the West Coast Modernist movement were particularly inspirational for their proposed project. Mr. Elmitt showed the Panel street view photographs to present an overview of the trees on site. He pointed out trees to be retained and those to be removed.

Mr. McFarlane, the Architect, reviewed the building layout for the Panel, noting the proposal is for 7 units overall. The FSR is just below 0.75 with 40% lot coverage and two parking spaces per unit. The design allows for two additional above ground guest parking spaces. Mr. McFarlane noted that there is a mixture of housing type and size, ranging from 2300 to 3200 square feet, including the parking area. He noted that the applicant team has carefully considered shadow studies and adjusted the site layout to maximize sunlight.

Mr. McFarlane drew attention to the parkade aspect of the proposal, as the design team believes it is a feature that differentiates this development within the market place. Each suite has a private garage, one that is large enough to accommodate additional storage. The parkade has a high level finish, meant to encourage neighbour interaction.

Mr. McFarlane noted access to the upper level from the parkade through an internal stair, while level access to individual units from the outdoors is through the courtyard. Each unit is three bedrooms. The northern units have roof decks accessed by stairs, and while the southern units do not have a roof deck they do have a green roof and additional deck space. The overall height of the project is comparable to "The Manor" complex to the north. The entryway to the building is signaled by an arrival point sitting between two of the units, and indicated by a common mail area.

Mr. McFarlane spoke to the sustainability highlights of the proposal, which include passive design strategies, mitigating the heat island effect through planted roofs, and construction using durable building materials.

Mr. Bill Harrison, the project Landscape Architect expressed his excitement for the project and noted that the landscape design is intended to support the expression of the architecture. Mr. Harrison noted the paving design in the guest parking area which includes a random pattern of lights meant to bring light to the area and to highlight the design. The main entry is marked by two water features, one on either side of the walkway. Mr. Harrison noted that the planting on the street side will be maples and ginkgo, leading to the entryway which will feature timber and black bamboo. There is the potential for a gate at the entry but this has not been resolved.

Mr. Harrison spoke to the amenity space in the internal courtyard and noted that the applicant team is exploring the use of frosted light squares as well as granite squares; a raised area of poured concrete for seating; and, stairs to the underground 'lane'. The underground parkade is characterized by individualized unit entrances to articulate the distinct units.

Mr. Harrison reviewed the roof deck proposal and noted that planting would be to the homeowner's discretion. He reviewed an area set aside for three resident garden plots and noted that the remainder of the planting scheme would be low-maintenance and provide colour and texture to the project. Any lawn areas will be synthetic. There will be a public art component, and the design team is exploring options to incorporate an art piece into the project's bicycle storage.

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:

Can some clarity be provided on the format and landscaping of the north-west corner of the site? Answer: The north-west unit has a more compact outdoor space. There is a park-like setting adjacent to the smaller yard, which will help to create a sense of openness.

What planting is proposed for the green roof? Answer: Sedum planting in trays which require minimal maintenance.

What is the edge condition for the roof? Answer: There will be a parapet. The roof is only visible from the upper floors of nearby units.

A question was asked regarding the height and inclination of the solar panels. Answer: These have yet to be finalized, but will not be more than a 40-45 degree inclination, and will be facing south. The array will be lower and wider than what is shown in the drawings.

What is proposed for the windows? Answer: Consistent window treatments will be a part of the project, and will likely be blinds.

A question was asked regarding the heating of the units. Answer: The heating will be in-floor hydronic heating, and will likely be on-demand, tank-less hot water.

Will the building be wood frame? Answer: Yes, over a concrete parking garage structure.

Could some clarity be provided on wheelchair access? Answer: Access will be a sloped path along the side of the driveway, but the design team needs to consider providing a more effective means for those with mobility challenges to announce their arrival.

What type of brick is proposed? Answer: Yes, unglazed white concrete brick is proposed.

How will the parapet be treated? Answer: It will be flashed with careful detailing.

If Corten steel is used in large panels, and how will these be installed? Answer: They will be mechanically fastened with countersunk fasteners in a matching colour.

Is there a potential for chemical conflict between the steel cladding and pressure treated strapping? Answer: This is something to consider, and a buffer material may be required.

A request was made for clarification of the landscape treatment at the east side of the property. Answer: This is a relatively tight space which will likely include fencing rather than hedging in the south end of this corridor.

Is the underground garage proposed to be gated? Answer: Yes.

Could clarification be provided on the approach to the east and west elevations? Answer: The west elevation has an element of privacy provided by the introduction of a screen at the end of the courtyard. The east elevation is a simple expressions of the overall massing strategy. The foreground is slender and low in volume to bring the scale down with respect to the neighbours.

How will daylighting be provided in to the garage area? Answer: There will be a modest amount of daylighting that will reach the underground areas with a few small windows at the west end of the underground area. Lighting through the courtyard is being explored.

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 noted that this is an exciting project, that the three C's are well represented; Crisp, Contemporary and Contextual. Mr. Ducote commented that the finishes are interesting and that the light above dark steel creates a floating quality to the building. Mr. Ducote noted two issues from the District Urban Designer, Alfonso Tejada. Firstly, the west elevation landscaping and access seems uncomfortable and needs more expression. Secondly, that the shallowness of the rear yard at the north-west corner could be further explored. Mr. Ducote commented that the daylighting to the garage could be interesting to further explore as well.

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

In general, Panel members noted that this is an exciting design that appears to include very high quality material choices, and a successful response to the site and the context. While the inclusion of a CPTED component in the presentation was noted as being particularly appreciated, it was noted that the presentation could have benefitted from more visual references to the context and surrounding buildings.

It was suggested that the concrete brick elements looked somewhat heavy and could present maintenance issues in the future. It was also noted that the design of the project has an exoticism that seems to prevent it from fitting in with the North Vancouver context and this could be assisted with some additional use of wood cladding to help create a stronger fit.

It was suggested that some means to further daylight the basement area could be positive.

A Panel member commented on the use of poplar and bamboo in the landscape plan, and noted that these can be difficult species to manage in terms of lifespan and maintenance. It was suggested that different options be explored, or that care be taken with the management of these species.

A Panel member suggested some difficulty with the idea of urban agricultural plots on the upper level, and the impracticality of access by stairs for plant materials and equipment. It was suggested this area might be put to a different use.

It was suggested that the north side planting plan seems to include a variety of non-native plants, and a more natural edge was encouraged for this area to compliment the surroundings. It was also noted that there are many small lawn areas that may be a maintenance issue.

It was suggested that improved accessibility and retrofitting one or two units for elevators might broaden the market and a Panel member noted that conversion of the access on the south-east to a ramp would assist with universal access.

It was noted that solar hot water solar readiness would need to be taken into consideration.

The Chair thanked the Panel and asked if the applicant team had any comments in response.

The applicant team thanked the Panel for the constructive comments.

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

MOVED by Tieg Martin and **SECONDED** by Annerieke van Hoeke:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the revised proposal, commends the applicant for the quality of the proposal, and recommends APPROVAL of the project SUBJECT to addressing the following items to the satisfaction of staff:

- Design revision to provide comfortable and practical accessibility to the courtyard in the project
- Further exploration of options to provide additional natural light to the underground garage area

CARRIED

b. 1200 – 1226 Marine Drive – Detailed Application for two- storey commercial building with a childcare facility on the second floor.

Mr. Erik Wilhelm of the District Planning Department gave a brief overview of the application and site context. The proposal is for a two-storey commercial building with an accessible rooftop and at-grade parking, located at the corner of Pemberton and Marine Drive. Mr. Wilhelm noted that Pemberton Plaza and the proposed Amadon Plaza are under the same ownership, and that this application is a continuation of ongoing site improvements as a part of a previous development permit for the larger plaza site.

The site area is approximately 2,608 m² (28,072 sq. ft.), and the proposed density is in compliance with the OCP requirements of the existing C9 zone. Mr. Wilhelm noted that this proposal requires a laneway purchase at the western portion of the site, and that Council has already endorsed the sale of this lane.

Mr. Wilhelm introduced the design team, and noted that Ms. Cheryl Fu (a registered architect) will be presenting to the Panel on behalf of the project.

Ms. Fu introduced Bill Harrison, Landscape Architect, Edgar Leon and Paul Skewes, designers, and Mr. Michael Apostolides - Senior Associate of B and H Architects, the firm of record on the project.

Ms. Fu reviewed the site context and adjacent properties by showing photographs of the existing views from the street. Ms. Fu reviewed the design proposal and noted that the project includes ground floor retail and a second floor childcare use. It was noted that this will be only the second childcare of its kind in North Vancouver. Ms. Fu highlighted the massing along the street to create a strong street presence and to help create a sense of arrival on the corner.

Ms. Fu spoke to the importance of street connections on the site, and the desire to create plazas to strengthen the pedestrian connections. Ms. Fu noted that weather protection is provided for pedestrian connections through and adjacent to the site to enhance the pedestrian realm. Marine Drive and the parking lot area of the site are both being treated as frontages, and vehicular access will be from the District lane to the north, as well as through the adjacent shopping centre parking lot. The proposal carries through the strong design theme of the renovations to the adjacent plaza, and the corner in particular is anchored with this contemporary design.

Ms. Fu reviewed the material palette, which includes brick and wood, as well as wood-like products and an aluminum screen which will be used to delineate the children's play area. There will be a green screen on the south side of the building, which will be carried through to brick column elements.

The project target is to achieve a minimum of LEED silver and will include electric vehicle charging stations, drought-resistant landscaping, bike racks, and parking stalls in permeable pavers to enhance the storm water management plan. Signage guidelines for the project will follow those set out for the Marine Drive area, and will all be LED letters.

Ms. Fu noted that the building design addresses the District's Marine Drive Design Guidelines, and will serve as a strong landmark to anchor the Marine Drive and Pemberton corner.

Mr. Kevin Hanvey, through the Chair, noted that there was a need for a registered architect to be present representing the firm, and requested that this individual be identified and recorded

in the official minutes. In response, it was noted that Mr. Michael Apostolides of B + H Architects, the firm of record, was in attendance to represent the architectural design firm.

Mr. Bill Harrison, project Landscape Architect, gave a review of the landscaping and tree retention plan for the proposal. Mr. Harrison noted that the existing trees located at the plaza off Marine Drive lend great scale to the streetscape and are proposed to be retained by pulling the building back from this area. Mr. Harrison commented that benches normally shown for the sidewalk edge on Marine Drive have been moved further into the site to provide more pleasant seating opportunities and that the street edge locations will be occupied by bike racks for ease of access to the street.

Mr. Harrison noted that the hardscape on street frontages is defined by the District's streetscape guidelines but commented on the screens located on the building, and noted that while the details need to be explored in some further detail, the intent is to use these screens to help break down the façade of the building. Efficient and comfortable pedestrian connections are proposed between the adjacent commercial sites, and to the public sidewalks on two sides of the property.

It was noted that the roof plan is shown as something of a placeholder at the moment as the childcare provider has yet to be finalized. Mr. Harrison noted that the roof will provide a green, open space and plenty of opportunity for children of the childcare to engage in outdoor play. Rainwater leaders from this area will be directed to a storage facility as part of the storm water management proposal for the project.

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:

The childcare seems large, how will the applicant be approaching stroller storage? Answer: The intention is not to provide storage on the ground level, but the elevator is quite large and will access the childcare level of the building so strollers could be stored within the childcare space.

Brise soleil are shown at the west end of the south elevation but not on the east end – why are they different? Answer: There was a desire to highlight the skewed angle of this portion of the building.

How many children would the childcare accommodate? Answer: Approximately 100.

What are staff parking requirements for the childcare centre? Answer: Vancouver Coast Health requirements are to provide drop-off spots only, and staff would share parking with the parking lot for Pemberton Plaza.

Have traffic patterns been reviewed? Answer: Yes, Bunt & Associates have reviewed and the load for traffic from the childcare and commercial uses is expected to take place at different times of day.

What material are the proposed “façade fins”? Answer: A combination of steel frame and cement panels.

Does Vancouver Coastal Health have any concerns regarding noise from Marine Drive for the rooftop children's area? Answer: Not that they have expressed, but the applicant is proposing an eight foot screen wall to help mitigate noise.

Will the childcare have operable windows? Answer: No, the space is air-conditioned.

Is the patio area at the west end of the site connected to a restaurant location? Answer: It could be, but at the moment there is no certainty on a restaurant tenant for the adjacent space.

Do the proposed bathroom facilities offer universal accessibility? Answer: Yes.

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

Mr. Ducote commented that he felt this was a fresh design for Marine Drive and the surrounding area. He suggested that an open but roofed area as a part of the rooftop design would be a positive addition. He wondered whether the breezeway would need to be secured or if it would remain open 24 hours. Mr. Ducote commented that the skewed effect being used is interesting but that he would like to see it carried through to the roofline. It was noted that the parallel parking area may be a challenge from a functional point of view, due to the adjacent landscaping. Mr. Ducote expressed an appreciation for the difference in the east and west halves of the south elevation, but that there could be an opportunity for improved solar control on the east half as well.

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

In general, the Panel noted that the project would be an improvement to this important corner on Marine Drive, and would help extend the Marine Drive streetscape improvements that have been taking place over the last several years. There was general support for the idea of a childcare facility and it was noted that in other areas of the Lower Mainland, there have been examples of very successful childcare operations with rooftop play areas.

A Panel member commented that while the form of the building seemed very positive the proposed partial sun-shading for the south façade seemed problematic, and should instead extend across the full length of this façade.

It was suggested that the location of the exit staircase on the prominent commercial frontage seemed like an odd choice and a blank space instead on the smaller east portion of the façade would be less prominent location.

It was suggested that the project design would benefit from some editing in order to calm and simplify the planes and finishes.

Panel members commented that the proposed rooftop outdoor area looked like a wonderful asset, but it was questioned whether consideration had been given to providing shade, as well as a sheltered area for all-weather outdoor space. It was further noted that the area could benefit from some soft planting as a positive addition to the landscape design.

It was also suggested that the peripheral steel screen on the roof could contribute to the roof area feeling somewhat "prison-like" without the ability to see the sky, and that some opportunities to view the outside world from the rooftop would be beneficial. Related to this, it

was suggested that the openings in the screen could pose safety concerns for children and the details of the screen design should be reviewed carefully.

A Panel member commented that given the mix of uses proposed, parking provided should be sufficient.

It was suggested that the prominent corner of the façade seemed somewhat muted and that the colour of the roof screen element seemed to draw unnecessary attention – it was suggested that the use of wood soffits might help to offset this attention.

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

Ms. Fu thanked the Panel for their comments and responded to the concerns raised. Regarding the screens, Ms. Fu commented that the colour could be adjusted and selection will be reviewed prior to making a final decision. It was further noted that the screen design will need to be reviewed by Vancouver Coastal Health for safety and functionality as part of the childcare licencing. Regarding the addition of wood soffits, the applicant team would like to make this addition, but the fire code restricts their use. Ms. Fu responded to the issue of the horizontal screens proposed for the south façade, and noted that these were intended as decorative elements to add interest to the façade, rather than specifically as solar shading devices.

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

MOVED by Robert Heikkila 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:

- A review of options for providing weather protection and soft landscape elements in the roof deck area.
- Review of relocation or re-design of stair elements on south elevation.
- A thorough review of opportunities for simplification of all elevations, with particular attention to the south elevation.
- Consideration of solar control on the south elevation, either through demonstrated performance through project modelling or through passive solar control devices applied in a consistent manner over the south façade.
- Consideration of providing operable windows in the second floor area.
- Reconsideration of material selection for rooftop screening with respect to materiality, colour, and transparency

MOTION CARRIED

c) 115 & 123 W Queens – Detailed Rezoning and Development Permit application for 18 townhouse units (08.3060.20-027.14)

Mr. Erik Wilhelm of the District Planning Department introduced the design team and gave a brief overview of the application and site context. Mr. Wilhelm noted that the site is located on the south side of West Queens Road in the Queensdale Village Centre. The development site and properties to the west are designated as “Residential Level 5: Low Density Apartment” which allows for a maximum FSR of up to 1.75. Mr. Wilhelm noted that the larger property to the west is market rental housing for seniors and the property to the east is occupied by the Queens Cross Pub.

Mr. Wilhelm noted that the site area is approximately 4,430 sq. m (15,400 sq. ft.). The proposed density of the project is in compliance with the density allowed by the OCP, and the site would require rezoning. The proposal includes purchase of a portion of the lane at the rear of the site. The OCP guidelines for ground-oriented housing, as well as multi-family residential development are applicable to this application.

As background, Mr. Wilhelm noted that this application was seen by the Panel at the preliminary application stage on November 14, 2013. The previous application was for 20 units and proposed a flat roof design. Given the prevalence of ‘pop-up’ roof buildings in recent District of North Vancouver projects, and a desire to reflect the more traditional architecture in the area, the applicant was encouraged to provide a pitched roof design.

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. Taizo Yamamoto, project Architect, reviewed the site context and layout. It was noted that the site slopes down from east to west, and from north to south. Mr. Yamamoto reviewed photos of the context to indicate the surroundings and site features.

Mr. Yamamoto noted a previous Panel concern regarding the size of the internal courtyard, and in response the applicant team has increased the courtyard width by three feet to allow greater separation between the buildings. The design team has also removed the exterior stairwells from the courtyard and created grade level entries for the upper units. The unit count has been decreased from 20 units to 18 and the roof form has been changed with the effect of creating a less repetitive streetscape. Street-fronting units have level access where patio areas meet the W. Queens Road sidewalk.

Mr. Yamamoto noted that the proposed building steps with the grade, and the design of the building, including finishes, such wooden accents, elements of stone and “Hardi” panel are intended to relate to the surrounding land uses. Large windows are proposed at the upper levels to contrast the more solid base. Mr. Yamamoto concluded by reviewing the shadow studies for the project.

Ms. Marlene Messer of PMG, the project Landscape Architect, spoke to the landscape plan and outlined the trees and vegetation chosen for the design. Ms. Messer pointed out the use of small planters and small trees as an appropriate scale for the interior courtyard, and noted that the plants have been selected for year-round colour and interest. Street trees proposed are a continuation of the trees to the west, to provide continuity.

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:

Does the courtyard provide level access to the units? Answer: Some of the units will have stairs, but it is the design team's intention to minimize stairs as much as possible.

How is the canopy glazing affixed to the canopy structure, and has the structure been seismically designed? Answer: The canopy glass will be inserted in steel channels, and it has been seismically reviewed.

What material is used for the soffits? Answer: It will be a hardi material.

Are the ceilings of the top floor vaulted and has there been provision made for venting the peaked roof areas? Answer: Yes, ridge and soffit vents.

How does the parking layout work? Answer: Some of the parking spaces are tandem and would be assigned in pairs.

What day of the year are the shadow studies performed for? Answer: September 21st.

How has the shadow study influenced the design? Answer: The study shows minimal impact on neighbours and across the street so has not influenced the design a great deal.

Are the unit entrances all from the courtyard? Answer: All but the ground floor units that are accessed directly from W. Queens Road.

How will the accessible parking space work? Answer: Intent is that this space would be available for the resident of one of the single-level units. A stair glide would be necessary to allow access to the unit.

Is it practical to consider use of a stair glide given the location of a closet at the top of the stairs? Answer: This could be problematic, and may require some re-design.

Given that most of the units are multi-level, how could accessibility be achieved in the units? Answer: There is the potential to frame in a shaft for a future elevator installation.

Does the waste disposal area open onto the sloped ramp and how will access to this area work? Answer: Yes, currently the area opens to the slope, but options are being explored to allow this area to function more efficiently.

How will unit entries be identified for First Responders? Answer: Each will be addressed, and there will be strobe lights at unit entries in the case of emergency.

What is the unidentified area in the basement parking area? Answer: Electrical and mechanical space.

Is the gate to the courtyard from W. Queens Road intended to be secured? Answer: Yes, and will be operated with a fob.

How will the Hardi-panel siding be fastened. Answer: Surface fasteners with colour matched trims.

The large windows would seem to imply a commercial glazing system – is this correct?

Answer: no, the intent is to use vinyl-framed, residential windows.

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

Mr. Ducote spoke on behalf of Mr. Alfonso Tejada, District Urban Designer, and delivered Mr. Tejada's comments for the Panel. Mr. Ducote commented that the project seems to be a good fit in terms of scale and built form relative to nearby uses, and maintains a residential character that is integrated with the slope of the site. As no material board was provided, clarification is needed on the finishes proposed. It was noted that the proposed glazed entrance canopies along W. Queens Road may be difficult to maintain, and not an appropriate treatment for the character of this street – a more traditional solid design might be more appropriate. Finally, it was noted that a streetscape elevation showing the projects to east and west, would help in demonstrating the relationship of the proposed building to the existing buildings.

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

It was suggested that while the handling of the density on site as well as the stepping of the building appears to be positive, there is a lack of clarity in terms of the project details and the relationship of the project to its site and to surrounding development. It was noted that project review would benefit significantly from the use of a physical model.

There was a request for more detail as to how the elements of the building will interface with each other, as the renderings do not appear to show these elements clearly, including texture of finishes, and window material choices. It was noted that the proposed dormers work as elements to create a rhythm for the design, but the elements between the dormers seem to interrupt this rhythm.

It was suggested that the proposed complex rooflines would require very careful detailing, including appropriate gutters and rainwater leaders. It was recommended that simplification of the roof design could help eliminate some of these challenging details.

A comment was made with regard to the appearance of quality of the project – the cultured stone cladding on the W. Queens Road elevation does not continue to the courtyard elevations or the south elevation which are primarily Hardi-plank. It was suggested that these material choices could compromise the overall aesthetic quality of the building, and it was suggested that use of natural stone (rather than cultured) even if only in a small amount would assist in adding a sense of quality to the project.

A Panel member felt it was difficult to judge the project from a practical point of view in terms of how residents and visitors would access the courtyard and the individual unit entries, and a comment was made that unit identification is a serious safety issue that needs to be resolved for efficient access by First Responders.

Some concern was expressed regarding the unit entries in the courtyard, and it was suggested that these unit entries do not appear to be as successful as those fronting W. Queens Road, particularly with regard to a lack of privacy. In general, it was felt that individual unit entries appear poorly identified, and need to be resolved, particularly with regard to the use of a

consistent canopy feature and door style. It was recommended that the proposed glass roof entry features be revised.

A Panel member noted some concerns with the practicality of the parkade, and suggested that the tandem parking spaces may be awkward to use. Access to the bicycle storage room was also noted as problematic.

It was noted as unfortunate that none of the units lend themselves to being accessible, in terms of either internal layout or the access from the courtyard.

It was noted that the OCP Design Guidelines recommend that balcony areas be at least partly inset into the building mass, and that the proposed cantilevered balconies do not appear to be the most successful approach.

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

Mr. Yamamoto thanked the Panel members for their comments and valuable input.

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

MOVED by Kevin Hanvey and **SECONDED** by Tieg Martin:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and **SUPPORTS** the general concept but recommends revisions to the proposal and a further presentation to address the following:

- Provision of a physical model to show contextual information including relationships to adjacent properties.
- Further consideration of exterior material palette to include a review of greater variation in materials and colours, and resolution of exterior detailing.
- A review of opportunities for improved access to the courtyard units through the elimination of stairs.
- Consideration of treatment of unit entries for courtyard-accessed units to improve separation, privacy, and unit identity.
- An accurate representation of window system for W. Queens Road elevation.
- Re-visiting design of balcony elements for response to OCP Design Guideline provisions regarding inset balconies.
- Confirmation of Zoning Bylaw compliance and practical usability of parking garage layout, including bike parking and trash/recycling facilities.
- A clear demonstration of the proposed designs for fencing, planters and wall elements around all four sides of the project.
- A review of options for more clearly-identified courtyard access from the street, including visitor access to the project.

MOTION CARRIED

d) Workshop Item – Review of the need for models and 3-D Representations in development applications

Some discussion took place on the relative merits of models and 3-D representations, particularly with regard to the three applications that had been considered earlier in the meeting.

Panel members questioned what requirements are for other North Shore municipalities and staff advised that this information could be attained and reported to the Panel.

Given time constraints, it was agreed to table this item for consideration at the next meeting of the Panel.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None


5. ADJOURNMENT

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


The meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

6. NEXT MEETING

December 11th, 2014



Chair



Date