

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
FEBRUARY 12TH, 2015 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Kevin Hanvey
 Mr. Tieg Martin
 Ms. Annerieke van Hoek
 Mr. Dan Parke
 Ms. Amy Tsang

REGRETS: Mr. Samir Eidnani
 Ms. Liane McKenna
 Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
 Mr. Greg Travers

STAFF: Mr. Frank Ducote
 Mr. Alfonso Tejada
 Ms. Lilian Arishenkoff (Item 4 a)
 Mr. Doug Allan (Item 4 b)
 Mr. Michael Hartford
 Ms. Azam Ansari

The meeting came to order at 6:05 pm.

1. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Michael Hartford advised the Panel that at the start of each year, the Panel elects a Chair and Vice Chair. Nominations were called for the position of Chair and Mr. Kevin Hanvey was nominated by a member of the Panel. A vote was called and Mr. Hanvey was unanimously elected to the position of Chair for the 2015 term.

Nominations were called for the position of Vice-Chair, and Ms. Liane McKenna was nominated by a member of the Panel. While Ms. McKenna was not in attendance at the meeting, Mr. Hartford noted that Ms. McKenna had advised she was willing to stand for nomination. A vote was called and Ms. McKenna was unanimously elected to the position of Vice Chair for the 2015 term.

2. MINUTES

The Panel reviewed the minutes of the meeting of December 11, 2014. A Panel member advised that one correction was necessary to the name of an individual and the correction was noted. A motion was passed to adopt the minutes as amended.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a. Notice regarding Voice Recording: Michael Hartford noted to the Panel that the meeting would be voice-recorded as a resource for District staff for taking minutes.

4. NEW BUSINESS

a. 2855, 2875, and 2931 Mountain Hwy.- Preliminary Application for rezoning for two residential buildings - 44 unit rental building and 88 unit condominium building

Lilian Arishenkoff, District Planner, introduced the design team and gave a brief overview of the site. Ms. Arishenkoff noted that the site is located in the heart of Lynn Valley, east of Lynn Valley Shopping Centre and to the north of the proposed Bosa re-development project. The site area is approximately 1.24 acres and is comprised of three lots. Ms. Arishenkoff noted that currently there are three 2 and 3 storey rental buildings on-site and a notable grade difference sloping from the north end to the south east end, with approximately 17 feet in grade change.

Ms. Arishenkoff noted that the development site is zoned "RL1: Low Rise Residential Zone" which allows for a maximum FSR of up to 0.45. The Lynn Valley Town Center Official Community Plan identifies this site as "RES 6: Medium Density Apartment" which allows for a maximum 2.5 FSR. Ms. Arishenkoff noted that the project is governed by the "Flexible Planning Framework" which allows for a maximum of 5 storeys. The project is also governed by the objectives of the Lynn Valley Town Centre Mobility Network with regard to road and walkway connections.

Ms. Arishenkoff noted that on the south side of the site there will be a new road, "High Street B" which will be built by the development to the south of the site. Ms. Arishenkoff also noted that in future "Library Lane" will be extended north along the west side of the site. The approximate building time frame for the new lane will be about 20 years. Further, it was noted that to the north there will be a future connection to Mountain Highway once the whole area has been developed.

Ms. Arishenkoff reviewed the design guidelines for Form and Character for Multi-Family Housing as well as the draft Lynn Valley Town Centre design guidelines. Key items noted included:

- 1- Building length or width for low or mid-rise buildings should not exceed 45 meters and partial above grade parking structures should not exceed a height of 1 meter.
- 2- Building roof lines should step down the slope in keeping with topography.
- 3- Ground level units should have their front doors on the street to support the unit identity and to add eyes on the street and frontages of the corners should have a strong massing form.
- 4- Building character should follow the Mountain Village theme
- 5- Street oriented ground level residential units are encouraged in all residential development forms including front doors, gardens, gates, and pathways oriented to the sidewalk
- 6- Setbacks for the residential units should be minimum 4 meters from the property line. Any garden wall, hedges or gates, should be 0.6m from the property line to provide an opportunity for grade transitions and landscaping.

The site requires rezoning and a Development Permit and a total of 132 units are proposed: 44 rental units in Building A and 88 condominium units in Building B. An FSR of 2.47 is proposed, with 188 underground parking stalls.

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

Mr. Bryce Rositch, project Architect, gave an overview of the proposal noting that the front door of Building B fronts Mountain Highway and the front door of Building A is located on High Street B. Mr. Rositch explained that Building B is an "L" shape and contains the market units, while Building A is rectangular in shape. Mr. Rositch reviewed detailed site photos and noted that there will be a gap between Buildings A and B because the buildings are on a slope. As a result, they will be built with different elevation and heights and the north and south sections of Building B will be one-half level off-set from each other. The entrance to the parkade is located off High Street B and in accordance with the design guidelines, has been incorporated into the building to reduce visibility and impact.

Mr. Rositch noted that street level units will all have terraces and front doors facing onto the street. One of the key design elements of the project is to focus on breaking up the 235 foot length of Building B. In order to achieve breaking up the length, the building has been divided in two by a recessed lobby with the recess extending to the upper levels.

Mr. Rositch mentioned that shadow studies have concluded that the current layout provides the best approach to sun exposures for the units. It was noted that the majority of units will be exposed to sunshine at some time during the day.

With respect to the architectural character of the project, Mr. Rositch noted that the design team worked to create an interesting identity for the project and the team has chosen flat roofs, bold accent materials, stone, cedar soffits, and strong vertical and horizontal elements to create a contemporary design. The design approach also provides an opportunity to create a strong corner of the building on Mountain Highway at High Street B.

Mr. Rositch noted that the grade differences between the west and east property line contribute to the design response proposed. The building is 5 storeys along 90% of the perimeter with a small 6 storey portion of the building only apparent for a small area of High Street B.

Mr. Rositch noted that at the public meeting for the project, comments from the public referenced the desire for a Mountain Village aesthetic, which is reflected in the current design.

Ms. Jennifer Stamp, the project Landscape Architect, reviewed the landscape plan. Ms. Stamp noted that the patios of Building A are roughly level with the grade of the new "Library Lane." It was also noted that the courtyard areas are split because of the grade change and that the main building entries are roughly 4 feet above grade. Patios on the north side of Building B are flush with the walkway to the north, and there is a retaining wall proposed along the north edge of the site beyond this walkway. It was noted that the courtyard is private and the patios are semi-private.

To decrease the mass of the retaining wall along Mountain Highway, Ms. Stamp noted that there will be a planter on the lower level of tiered wall and only a railing at the top of the second tier. At the north side of the site there is a pathway with the intention to help create eyes on the street.

The corner of Mountain Hwy. and High Street B will feature natural elements where there are benches and places to pause which will help to create a community atmosphere on the corner.

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:

Where is the location of the elevator machine rooms? Answer: In the parkade.

Where will the waste facilities be located? Answer: In the parkade.

Do all the units have balconies or patios? Answer: Yes

Are the garage exit stair enclosures covered or open? Answer: The enclosures have not been designed yet so this is not resolved.

A question was asked of District Staff whether High Street B will be a lane or a street? Answer: It is a two-way street – one lane in each direction.

Further clarifications were requested from the District Staff regarding the scale of the parking ramp to the street which appeared to be narrow, and the road design work for High Street B in the Bosa project. Mr. Hartford noted that the parking complies with the minimum requirements and that the initial engineering design indicated the need for separated bike lanes on this portion of High Street. This configuration has since been changed.

With respect to the building length, which is over 45 meters, a question was asked of District Staff: Does the main entry area have a sufficient gap or will there be further revisions required? Answer: The issue has been raised and some further exploration is required, but the District recognizes the site is difficult to develop efficiently.

Is it possible to remove the steps in the courtyard pathway? Answer: This was reviewed, but it was not found possible to address grades with ramps. All units are accessible from the interior, and the steps allow the common amenity patio to be at the same level as the indoor amenity room.

How are the retaining walls treated at the north edge? Answer: Walls exist in this location and surface detailing will be carefully handled.

What type of construction is proposed? Answer: Wood frame.

Is there any leeway regarding height? Answer: Not in number of storeys, perhaps in the number of feet.

Are there sufficient parking stalls? Answer: Yes – the parking proposed is consistent with the District's policies for parking in Town Centres.

How will the elevation of the west side of Building A be treated? Answer: This elevation is partially buried due to the grade so the patios of the first residential level will be above the basement storage area.

Can access to the bike room be clarified? Answer: Bike room is at the rear of Building A and access is through the main lobby.

Is the courtyard secured? Answer: The courtyard is gated but likely not locked.

Can you describe the design approach along the west property line? Answer: the design team recognizes that this is an odd area and the timing of Library Lane is uncertain. Plant material will be key to achieving a successful design solution.

The Chair asked Mr. Frank Ducote, District Urban Design Planner to make comments on the design of the project.

Mr. Ducote reviewed the key design guidelines that were included in Ms. Arishenkoff's presentation and added that the proposal should consider a mixture of stone and plant material in the public realm as well as a possible water feature. It was noted that the proposal appears to be moving in the correct direction with respect to building length but that additional exploration would be appropriate. Mr. Ducote raised some concerns about the sloping site and the challenges this creates for the site – the retaining walls proposed and sloped areas, as well as the relationship to Library Lane will need to be designed and finished to be aesthetically pleasing.

The Chair thanked Mr. Ducote for his comments and invited comments from Panel members.

In general, Panel members noted the application is a promising project. The density is well managed and the orientation of the buildings appears correctly approached. It was noted that the project site is challenging, and the edge conditions and overlook situations need to be buffered successfully. Further, the buildings need to fit well into the town center context.

It was noted that the character sketch is very appealing but the nature of construction may create the need for more flashings and up-stands than are shown in the project drawings, so a clearer approach to detailing will be beneficial.

The functionality of the stair accesses to the parkade in three corners of the site was noted as a concern which needs to be clarified, and the resolution of the design of these parkade stairs will be important.

A Panel member suggested there would be value in exploring options to provide accessibility to the courtyard by revising the walkway connections. It was suggested that creating a positive resolution to the garbage and recycling facility would benefited. Further, it was noted that the current design of Building B is as one long building and a greater differentiation in the two portions facing Mountain Highway would be more appealing.

It was suggested that generous patios and balconies would be beneficial to the design of the buildings.

The treatment at the north edge of the site was noted as being of particular concern because of the grade change, adjacent gas station, and the high retaining wall – this area would need to be handled carefully. The west edge treatment will also be key for the residents who will be looking toward Lynn Valley Centre. Clarification was requested as to whether the residents of these units will be looking out at landscaping or the gas station.

It was noted that access to Building A with the current lobby layout could be a potential source of conflict with the location of the benches, bike racks and a small lobby opening creating some congestion.

A Panel member noted that more work is needed to break up the Mountain Highway façade of the condominium building. It was suggested that pop-up roof areas on the west side of the building could be explored. It was also suggested that the "C" shaped elements on the façade might benefit from the use of a different material.

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

The applicant team thanked the Panel for their constructive comments and noted that the input is appreciated and will be taken into account.

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

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

THAT the ADP has reviewed the application, supports the general concept, and looks forward to a presentation at detailed stage that includes a review of the items raised by the Panel in its review of the project at the preliminary application stage.

MOTION CARRIED

**b. 3260 Edgemont Blvd, 3230 Connaught Cres & 1055-1073 Ridgewood Dr
- Detailed Application for rezoning and development permit for mixed-use
development of 60,000 square feet of commercial space and 89 condominium units**

Mr. Doug Allan, District Planner, introduced the applicant and gave a brief overview of the site. Mr. Allan reviewed the application and site context, noting that the development site is located at the north end of Edgemont Village between Connaught Crescent on the south, Ridgewood Drive on the north, Edgemont Boulevard to the West, and Ayr Avenue to the east. The proposed project consists of 2 commercial lots currently occupied by a grocery store and the Highlands Professional Centre, and 4 residential properties on Ridgewood Drive.

Mr. Allan noted that aside from the existing developed commercial properties to the south, the surrounding uses are a diverse range of housing types including townhouses, single family residential, Highlands United Church and a multi-family project to the west. The future Edgemont Senior Living project has been approved to the east and developed commercial lots (C1 and C3) to the south. Mr. Allan pointed out that the project was reviewed by the Panel at the Preliminary Application stage on May 8, 2014.

The site is designated as "Commercial Residential Mixed Use Level 1" which permits residential and commercial development with a maximum 1.75 FSR.

Mr. Allan noted that as per the Edgemont Village Design Guidelines, the project's objectives include:

- 1) To avoid blank facades
- 2) To have 'small shop' storefronts on a 5-10m pattern
- 3) To provide weather protection and wider sidewalks along the street frontages
- 4) To utilize architectural massing of the plazas to define corners
- 5) To utilize wood, stone and brick materials and establish a gateway at Edgemont Boulevard and Ridgewood Drive.

The Chair thanked Mr. Allan for his presentation and welcomed the applicant team to the meeting.

Mr. Mark Josephson of Grosvenor Edgemont Holdings Ltd. noted that at the presentation to the Panel in May, the project team received useful feedback that has been reflected in the current design of the project. It was noted that the main points taken into account are increasing livability, creating diversity of housing, providing useful outdoor gathering space, and including variation in building materials and massing.

Mr. Josephson invited Keith Hemphill, project Architect to speak to the design. Mr. Hemphill reviewed the context of the site and the surrounding uses. Mr. Hemphill noted that one of the constraints of the project is that there is a "back lane" for the site to allow for service areas.

Mr. Hemphill noted that providing a new grocery store on site is a major benefit to the community, but that this also creates some challenges with the need for ceiling heights and to respond to grades on the property. It was noted that the grocery store will be located in the south west corner of the project and will have an associated plaza. In order to minimize the impact of the large scale commercial structure and to comply with the design guidelines, the bulk of the commercial element will be buried in the sloping grade. Mr. Hemphill noted that the second large scale commercial unit will be a drug store at the west side of the project. The north-west corner will be designated for restaurant use, and that this is an opportunity to incorporate indoor and outdoor space with the corner of the plaza. It also creates an opportunity for public art in front of the restaurant.

Mr. Hemphill reviewed the multiple areas for loading, service, and vehicle access to the site. The principle service and delivery area is located on the Ayr Avenue side of the project, with a secondary, smaller loading area on the Ridgewood Drive frontage. The smaller, locally-oriented commercial units will provide an opportunity to adhere to the design guidelines for Unit Identity and Relationship to the Street.

The Ridgewood Drive frontage is residential, with single level residential units at grade level, and two storey townhouse units above them with access to and from the second level courtyard. The design team attempted to create residential character and scale adjacent to the residential units to the north and east.

Mr. Hemphill noted that the design team has introduced breaks in the massing of the upper floors to allow greater visual penetration to the site and to reduce the apparent size of the elements of the project. Mr. Hemphill noted another substantial change to the design involved the portion of frontage on the east end of Connaught Crescent: here, the facades of two residential floors are engaged with the commercial floors below which results in the building reading as 3 storeys in height. A partial 4th floor is substantially set back from the floor below to diminish it's presence on the street.

It was noted that varying types of stone with different textures as well as wood panels, have been used on the front of the building. Mr. Hemphill also pointed out that in front of the potential drug store there will be a transit stop with a comfortable waiting area.

Christopher Phillips, Landscape Architect, reviewed the input from the Preliminary application stage and noted that these comments included a recommendation to widen the sidewalks in order to provide pedestrian comfort and a re-alignment of the transit stop area. Mr. Phillips noted that in response to these comments, the design team has included a new bike path on Ridgewood Drive and a 30 foot wide sidewalk on Edgemont Boulevard for a safe and efficient transit stop area. It was noted that street paving and street tree selection has been discussed with District staff and these details will be resolved as the design evolves.

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:

Are garbage areas accessible within the building? Answer: Yes, with elevator access. Smaller bins are designed for the residential units and larger bins for the Ayr Avenue service bay area.

What is the maximum length of delivery vehicle that could be accommodated in the loading area for Ridgewood Drive? Answer: Mainly panel vans and smaller moving trucks.

How is the courtyard accessible without stairs? Answer: elevator access is available.

Is there a signage package for the project? Answer: A sign company has been retained and a detailed sign package is being resolved.

How much traffic would be using Ayr Avenue? Answer: The grocery store will manage deliveries for low traffic times of day and traffic volumes on the street are quite low.

Will there be commercial and residential parking, and are they separated? Answer: Yes, there are commercial and residential parking areas and they are separated.

Will the courtyard be secured? Answer: Gates will likely be provided, however the intention of the design is to prevent the appearance of a closure between the street and the courtyard.

How will private rooftop decks be formatted and used? Answer: Residents are encouraged to use planters to create privacy, but it is recognized that these will not be completely private areas. A walkway on the roof helps to create separation between the decks.

The Chair asked Mr. Alfonso Tejada, District Urban Design Planner, to comment on the design of the project.

Mr. Tejada noted that the gaps between the structures appear to be successful in breaking down the massing of the project. Mr. Tejada noted that the gateway location for the plaza at the north-west corner of the site has a somewhat industrial feel and does not in its current design project a welcoming aesthetic. It was suggested that the open spaces at the east and south corners of the site should have some better connection to the developments to the east and south, and in particular the Edgemont Senior's Living Project. Mr. Tejada recommended that the Ayr Avenue frontage be treated more softly, and noted that it is important to demonstrate how to create privacy and individuality for the units. Mr. Tejada concluded by

noting that the fourth floor element appears somewhat bulky when compared to the other residential elements and suggested that it would benefit from an improved roof design and edge treatment.

The Chair thanked Mr. Tejada for his comments and invited comments from Panel members.

Panel members thanked the applicant for the presentation and an appreciation was noted in particular for providing a useful model both in terms of scale and context, as well as the completeness of the drawings included in the information package.

In general Panel members felt that the project changes included successful responses to the Panel's previous comments.

Accessibility of the courtyard for the public was noted as something needing some clarification, particularly regarding use by disabled residents or visitors.

Streetscape edges, material choices, plantings, and efforts to include changes along Ridgewood Drive were commended, however a suggestion was made that efforts could be made to bring the landscape out to the public realm.

It was suggested that the design of the courtyard could be reexamined to include elements that would engage all ages, including children. As well, the elevations of the buildings facing the courtyard were noted as being far simpler and less interesting than the exterior elevations.

On Ridgewood Drive, it was suggested that attention be taken to ensure the loading area works efficiently in order to prevent conflict with bikes and pedestrians.

On Ayr Avenue, some concern was expressed regarding the wide vehicle access, and the need for a more successful resolution to provide a "break" between the loading area and parking access to ensure both a safe and attractive solution.

A Panel member commented that the north plaza seemed quite well resolved but could use further exploration to allow it to function as both a gateway and a gathering space.

Related to this, it was noted that the south-west plaza could use some additional attention to be successful.

It was suggested that Connaught Crescent elevation appeared to show too much variety in forms, materials, and textures and that this elevation could benefit from some simplification and calming.

It was noted that given the fact that the project is concrete construction, some of the details of the project such as roof overhangs and balcony columns seemed somewhat heavy. It was suggested that these elements could benefit from some refinement.

Some clarification was requested on access to the courtyard, particularly for disabled residents and visitors, as well as details on how this area will be secured.

The importance of a cohesive and complete signage package was noted as a means to ensure an attractive approach to signage for the commercial units.

The Chair thanked the Panel for their comments and asked if there were any comments in response from the Design Team.

The applicant team thanked the Panel for their constructive comments and noted that the input is appreciated and will be taken into account. Some comments were provided to confirm that the proposed courtyard is intended to be private space, and that gates will be provided, likely at the top of the staircase areas.

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

MOVED by Annerieke van Hoek and **SECONDED** by Amy Tsang.:

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 the design of the Ayr Avenue parking and service entrance to break up the wide vehicle access and ensure an attractive and safe design, particularly with respect to pedestrian comfort on the Ayr Avenue sidewalk.
- A review of the Ridgewood Avenue loading area to ensure it can work efficiently and not result in blockages of the sidewalk, bicycle lane, or roadway.
- A review of the Connaught Crescent elevation of the project to address the variety in forms, materials, and textures and allow for simplification and calming.
- A review of the courtyard (south) elevations of townhomes to ensure they are detailed to a consistent level with the exterior elevations.
- A review of the detailing in project elements such as roof overhangs and balcony columns to reflect the concrete construction of these elements and provide for greater refinement.
- A review of options for the north-west corner plaza to allow it to function both as a "gateway" element and as a successful gathering space.
- A review of options for the south-west corner plaza to ensure it can function successfully.
- A review of the potential for landscape elements to be brought further into the public realm rather than large expanses of wide concrete sidewalks.
- A review of opportunities for landscape elements in the courtyard that will engage all users, including children.
- Resolution of a complete signage package to ensure an attractive approach to signage for the commercial units

MOTION CARRIED

c. 1175 Lynn Valley Rd – Detailed Application for Development Permit for mixed-use development of six buildings with 360 dwelling units and 50,100 sq ft of commercial space.

Mr. Michael Hartford of the District Planning Department gave a brief overview of the application and site context. The site area is approximately 1.9 acres and it comprises the southern portion of the existing shopping centre property at 1175 Lynn Valley Road, the former Zellers store, an existing parkade structure facing Mountain Highway and the District's former public library site at 1280 E. 27th Street. The development site is zoned "CD-80: Comprehensive Development" which allows for a maximum FSR of 2.36. The site is designated in the OCP as part of the Lynn Valley Town Centre and will be governed by the Lynn Valley Town Centre Design Guidelines. These guidelines are currently draft, but will be adopted by the time the application is considered by Council.

Mr. Hartford noted the District's "Flexible Planning Framework" for Lynn Valley Town Centre was adopted by Council in the Fall of 2013. This framework was the result of extensive public input and sets height limits within the Lynn Valley Town Centre. A maximum height of up to 12 storeys is specific on some sites, including a portion of the subject property.

Mr. Hartford noted the application includes the development of six buildings as follows:

- two of 12 storeys (B and C)
- two of 7 storeys (A and E)
- one of 6 storeys (F)
- one of 4 storeys (D)

Included in the proposal are 360 residential units - reduced from 399 units in the rezoning application - with an overall Floor Space Ratio of approximately 2.36.

Mr. Hartford noted that 846 underground parking stalls are proposed, with 425 surface stalls to remain on the balance of the mall property. The project will be subject to achieving a green building target of "LEED Gold" or equivalent and making a commitment to the provision of public art. Further, it was noted that details of façade renovation and landscaping for the remainder of the mall will be the subject of a future Development Permit application which is anticipated in late 2016.

Mr. Hartford reviewed the applicable development permit guidelines, the draft Lynn Valley Town Centre design guidelines, and noted that the uses on the site are regulated by the site's CD-80 zoning and the Development Covenant registered at the rezoning stage.

Mr. Hartford introduced the project team and invited the project Architect, Ms. Karen Wiens-Suzuki to make her presentation.

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

Ms. Wiens-Suzuki of Chris Dikeakos Architects reviewed the benefits and the location of the project and the surrounding amenities of the site. It was noted that an internal connection between the former Zellers store area and the existing mall will be provided in future.

Ms. Wiens-Suzuki noted that the Panel's comments at the last review of the project were helpful to the team in fine-tuning the design of the project. It was noted that through the public consultation on Lynn Valley Town Centre, the overall theme for the project was that of a "mountain village" and there are some limitations as to how much change could be made to the character of the project.

Ms. Wiens-Suzuki reviewed the formats of the commercial podium, and each of the six proposed buildings, including the building entrance locations. The three vehicle accesses to underground parking areas were identified, as well as the loading area at the east side of the commercial podium.

Ms. Wiens-Suzuki reviewed the building finishes for the project, including different selections of stone finishes for the commercial podium and residential building elements, as well as colour differentiation between each of the proposed buildings.

Mr. Gerry Eckford of ETA Landscape Architects reviewed the landscape approach for the project, including the design, to provide a range of streetscape experiences, from the commercial "high street" experience at the west side of the project, to the calmer residential streetscape on "Library Lane" in the east portion of the project.

Street tree and boulevard plantings have been provided along all road frontages, and the paving materials and plant selections have been informed by a review of the draft Lynn Valley Town Centre public realm guidelines.

Mr. Eckford concluded by reviewing the design proposed for the podium rooftop and its mix of outdoor amenity "rooms" as well as an attractive roofscape which higher units will look down upon.

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:

Do the two tower buildings differ in terms of exterior design? Answer: differences are mostly in colour.

How close are the podium buildings to the north property line? Answer: Approximately 4.5 meters.

Is the plaza at the north-west corner part of a future phase? Answer: Yes, it is not part of this application but will be dealt with through the mall renovation.

What is the material for roofs? Answer: Standing seam metal.

How would gutters be dealt with? Answer: These details have not yet been resolved.

How would snow on the pitched roofs be dealt with? Answer: Snow catchers at eaves could be used, but this hasn't been resolved.

How does parkade exhaust work? Answer: The details are still being resolved, but some of the mechanical equipment will be located at the garage level with vents either at grade, or in the walls of the commercial podium.

Does the project include weather protection at the transit hub? Answer: These types of details are unresolved and need to be coordinated with Translink's requirements.

The Chair asked Mr. Frank Ducote, District Urban Design Planner, for his comments on the design of the project.

Mr. Ducote noted that he did not have a great deal of comments on the project, but suggested that a greater differentiation between the buildings, particularly the 12 storey building is beneficial to the project.

Mr. Ducote further noted that there is a need for a solar control strategy on the south and west elevations of the taller buildings.

The Chair thanked Mr. Ducote for his comments and invited comments from Panel members.

In general, Panel members felt the project seemed somewhat homogeneous, and expressed a desire to see real differences between buildings – not just colour and material changes. It was noted that variation in materials and colours were provided, but only minimal articulation was shown in the building planes. Further, it was suggested that there appeared to be little differentiation for floors between podium and penthouse levels and that these elements would benefit from more interest.

Building E in particular was noted as needing more attention. It was suggested that the east and west elevations should reflect the different influences (private and public), that the building should have a more meaningful "break" to help address the length of the building, and that more expression of the main entrance would be positive. Some concern was also expressed regarding the buffering of Building E, particularly the upper level units, from the adjacent gas station.

The Panel noted that weather protection for the proposed transit hub was a key item to be addressed, and must be carefully designed in order for this important element of the project to be successful.

A Panel member noted some concern with respect to maintenance of gutters and how snow control would be handled on metal roofs, as well as how timber elements in the higher portions of the buildings would be maintained.

It was noted that the project has served well to help understand the public's objectives for a "mountain village" character, but it was suggested that while the High Street B streetscape design appeared to include some elements of the character, further refinement is needed for the approach to be successful.

A Panel member commented that the rotation of the individual townhouse entries appeared to dilute the sense of entry to these units, and that the angled entry proposal should be reconsidered.

It was suggested that the revised podium landscape approach appeared somewhat angular and had lost some of its previous subtlety.

A Panel member noted that the tower buildings above the podium level have no windows on some elevations, and that opportunities for more windows, for both interest and livability, should be explored.

Some concern was expressed regarding the relationship of the new buildings to the north property line and how these buildings will relate to the existing mall.

Concerns were expressed regarding how solar protection would be provided and in particular for the westerly façade of the south-west building. It was noted that a solar protection strategy should be resolved for the project.

It was noted that given the complexity and context of the site, a larger-scale and more detailed model was essential in the review of the project, particularly to show relationships between existing and proposed components of the site development. It was also requested that the applicant provide a written summary of the responses to the Panel's comments to show how they had been considered.

The Chair thanked the Panel for their comments and asked if there were any comments in response from the Design Team.

Ms. Wiens-Suzuki responded to Panel's comments and noted that there are some challenges to differentiation of two towers as altering the tower floorplates significantly creates some economic challenges; however, the team is making efforts to satisfy community concerns for a safe and comfortable design. Further, with respect to creating a deeper break to proposed Building E, there will certainly be improvement on this issue. It was noted that timber elements on upper portions of building are specified in metal with a wood-like finishing, so weathering should not be an issue.

Ms. Wiens-Suzuki concluded by noting that the integration of the transit hub in the project is still under review and development, and that with respect to integration with the existing mall, these details will be resolved as part of a future development permit application.

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

MOVED by Tieg Martin and **SECONDED** by Annerieke van Hoek

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and **SUPPORTS** the general concept, but recommends revisions to the proposal and looks forward to a presentation that includes addressing the following items:

- Opportunities to include additional differentiation between buildings
- Options for alterations to form and materials of the rooflines for the taller buildings proposed
- A review of landscape geometries for individual grade level unit entries and at the podium roof level
- Attention to the design of proposed Building E to visually break-up massing, to resolve elevations in a manner to respond to the individual contexts, and to highlight main building entrance
- Resolution of the E. 27th Street transit to ensure a successful and useable transit facility
- Presentation to include reference to a larger-scale detailed model
- Presentation to include reference to the ways in which comments of the Panel have been addressed
- Resolution of a solar shading strategy for the project
- Options to address blank building facades above podium roof level

MOTION CARRIED

5. ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

6. NEXT MEETING

March 12th, 2015.

Chair 

Date 12/mar/15