

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

**Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel  
Held at City Hall, 141 West 14th Street, North Vancouver, B.C.  
In Conference Room A on Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

---

**MINUTES**

---

- Present:** W. Chong  
K. Bracewell, RCMP  
K. Yushmanova  
B. Phillips  
J-P. Mahé  
M. Messer
- Staff:** D. Johnson, Development Planner  
R. Fish, Committee Clerk  
M. Epp, Director of Planning  
S. Galloway, Manager of Planning  
W. Tse, Planner 1  
A. Yu, Planning Technician 2  
S. Smith, Planner 2  
B. Hurley, Planner 1
- Guests:** 645 St. Davids (Development Permit Application)  
James Stobie, Synthesis Design Inc.  
Kevin Li, Synthesis Design Inc.  
Matt Hansen, Matthew T. Hansen Architect  
David James, Insite Design Landscape Architecture  
Curtis Krahn, Principal of Synthesis Design Inc.  
Gregg and Diane Hallaway, Owners  
Mark Hallaway, Owner
- Absent:** B. Jones  
B. Harrison
- 

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

**1. Panel Orientation and Welcome to New Members**

D. Johnson took the chair and welcomed the new members to the Panel. The members introduced themselves.

D. Johnson gave members a presentation on the advisory body process and introduction to the mandate of the Advisory Design Panel.

## **2. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for the Period of February 2018 to January 2019**

It was agreed to elect the Chair and Vice Chair by show of hands.

D. Johnson asked for nominations for the position of Chair; Jean-Pierre Mahé was nominated and accepted the nomination. There being no further nominations, J-P. Mahé was elected Chair.

D. Johnson asked for nominations for the position of Vice Chair; Bill Harrison volunteered. There being no further nominations, Bill Harrison was elected Vice Chair by acclamation.

J-P. Mahé took the Chair at 5:45 p.m.

## **3. Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018 be adopted.

**Carried Unanimously**

## **4. Business Arising**

The Panel was reminded that the 2018 Volunteer Appreciation Reception will be taking place on April 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018 at 6:30PM; members were invited to attend.

## **5. Staff Update**

None.

## **6. Zoning Bylaw Livability Review**

W. Tse and A. Yu gave a presentation on the Zoning Bylaw Livability Review:

- The initiative is part of the Housing Action Plan which was endorsed by Council in October 2016.
- Introduce amendments to zoning bylaw and current review procedures, improve livability of the City's ground oriented housing forms.
- Ensuring more diverse and appropriate housing options.
- Properties would be in areas designated levels 1-2, which occupy a substantial proportion of the City.
- In the early stages of getting public feedback.
- Going to Council in March to seek further action on how to proceed.
- In May or June it will go back to Council with the proposed amendments and a Public Hearing.

## Proposed Amendments

### Minimum Lot Size

- Smaller minimum lot size is warranted based on the number of people who live in the households.
- Proposed 4,400ft<sup>2</sup> requirement for RS-1 with a minimum of 3,600ft<sup>2</sup> for RS-2
- Fulfill original Housing Action Plan for attainable home ownership.
  - How do you see that process working, how will the lots get from bigger to smaller? Would you buy two lots together and divide? **A:** Yes, if they bought 2 and subdivided they may be able to 3 lots. We don't want to go too small but we recognize some of the larger lots may be too large based on the occupancy numbers we have.

### Height Envelope

- Suggesting to permit a taller height envelope to enable basement level suites be raised from the ground as much as possible.
- Match up with the RT-1A zone for a height envelope top of plate maximum of 17ft opposed to 15ft. Maximum roof height of 33ft as opposed to 30ft.

### Liveable Suites & Coach Houses

- Different definitions for cellar versus basement. Basement is defined as a level that's between 1 and 5ft below average grade whereas a cellar is more sunken in at more than 5ft below average grade.
- Cellars are exempt from Gross Floor Area calculations.
- Proposing to allow for GFA exemptions for basement levels instead.
- Establish maximum allowable depth for levels with basement suites.
- Encourage suites to be raised more from the ground to improve their accessibility and accommodate more natural light and ventilation.
- Looking at allowing for larger sunken patios. The method that we use to calculate average grade allows for a combined exclusion of 100ft<sup>2</sup> for sunken patios. For a lower level to qualify for a GFA exemption, sunken patios are limited to 100ft<sup>2</sup> and duplexes only 50ft<sup>2</sup> per unit.
- Staff are proposing to increase this to 150ft<sup>2</sup> per dwelling unit. Duplex could have 150ft<sup>2</sup> patio per dwelling unit.
- Would maximize useable outdoor space.
- Permit non-habitable cellar level space in coach houses for storage purposes only.
- Allow for higher density of up to 0.5 FSR for purposes of adding a coach house.
  - What was the rationale behind the sunken patios? **A:** We didn't always limit the size, when people were trying to excavate significant portions, it was creating issues. It impacts it because we use it in our average grade calculation. Now we need to make sure there is ample outdoor space for these units.
  - Do you allow exterior access to cellars? **A:** We're playing with this idea, if we allow it, it depends on whether to restrict to interior access only or provide exterior access. The concern is that people may use it as a suite. We are trying to determine the best path forward. Storage may be shared by multiple people onsite.
  - Do you have size limitations for these? **A:** Yes.
  - If you put a stair going down, you're taking up more floor space.

- At grade level how do they layout? **A:** The largest coach house is 1,000 sq. ft. with the living room, kitchen and powder room typically on the main floor and bedrooms above. We don't allow for anything deeper than 4ft (crawl space), this would be a new provision. The access is something we would really have to layout.
- Staff: Cellar levels are proposed to be exempt from the GFA.

### Siting Regulations

- Decrease minimum required front lot line setback for all one-unit and two-unit residential zones to 20ft.
- Don't anticipate a major impact with this.
- Advantage of a more prominent street frontage.

### VisitAbility

- Introduce incentives for incorporation of VisitAbility features in principal dwelling units, secondary suites and coach houses.
- Three features include: no step entry, clear passage way on main floor and accessible bathroom on main floor.
- Suggesting between 50-100ft<sup>2</sup> floor area exclusion for the principal dwelling if you can meet these three features, 25ft<sup>2</sup> for a secondary suite and 25ft<sup>2</sup> for a coach house.

### Development Processing Streamlining

- Allowing 0.5 FSR for coach house development without Council referral.
- Simplify Duplex Development Permit Guidelines.
- Joint development permit/building permit application review processes for duplexes.

### **Questions and comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:**

- Have you thought of anything to address the side setbacks, with a taller built form, those will be tough spaces. Is there an opportunity to have a zero lot line with row housing? **A:** It's something we're considering. Through the Moodyville process, we have created the Rowhouse form. The density to get this form is .75. There might not be enough density to make this happen in single family areas. We have been hearing about semi detached housing which might work better in these lower density homes.
- Can you change recommendations back to metric moving forward? **A:** Yes, I think we will do both.
- I like the idea of the front yard setback.
- I like the idea of the group storage concept.

## **7. Input on Rowhouse Forms**

S. Smith and B. Hurley gave a presentation on Rowhouse Forms.

### Duplex Special Study

- 300 blocks East 13<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> St.
- Consideration of land use changes to permit other ground oriented housing forms including potential for Rowhouse.
- Engaging people in the community around this.

### Rowhouse Form

- Skinny, single family home lot.
- Each building is on a separate lot with a parking space on each.
- Fee simple (no strata).
- Accessory secondary suite and coach house potential.
- Strong street presence.
- Space and energy efficient.

### Existing Rowhouse Zone

- 0.75 FSR
- Minimum lot size
  - Min: 1615 sqft (150sqm)
  - Max: 3,600 sqft (334.5 sqm)

### Traditional Rowhouse Form on 50' Lots

- 147ft deep.
- Working within a 0.75 FSR response.
- Working out exemptions for cellars.
- 2.5 storey form.
- 2 stalls per lot.
- Rather tight buildings.
- Opportunity is to look at making a consolidated 100ft lot that has been split in the opposite direction and create very small lots, a lane like easement on the back end.
- There might be a way to get it as a freehold form.
- 20ft lane standard.
- Still create a reasonably accessible form.

### Traditional Rowhouse Form on 38' Lots

- Hard to make it efficient for a triplex on a consolidation on two lots.
- 19ft parking stalls.
- 4 units with coach house potential.

### Zero Lot Duplex Approach on 50' Lots

- Treating it as non-consolidation of the lots to get a Rowhouse like form.
- Create on a 50ft lot a zero lot line and two side by side units, the lots being 25ft.
- With potential to treat them as a duplex with emergency access along the side.
- Total of 8 units per 50ft or 16 per 100ft.

- 4 units per lot exists currently.
- Can you please re-define 'lock-off units'? **A:** It's like a secondary suite, but is required to have direct exterior access and be able to link to a primary principal unit but cannot be sold. It must be rented out as part of the primary unit.
- Is there a size maximum? **A:** Yes, minimum is 400, max of 40% of the whole.
- For the three households, how many cars will there be? **A:** Two, if you have a coach house in the back, there's only space for 2 vehicles.
- My previous interpretation of a coach house was that it was like a garage with a building above? **A:** Not for this jurisdiction, a coach house here does not require an internalized parking. Coach houses that we get applications for can have a component internalized for parking but it's inclusive for GFA.
- How is this different from the other applications with a duplex in the front and something in the back? **A:** The difference is the freehold tenure.
- These 50ft lots wouldn't be subdivided? **A:** There's the ability to be divided into 2 25ft lots
- There is a lot of cramming on the lots, how would a scenario like this one pass the lighting test of the Panel? **A:** By dropping the full quarter of density, it has created a different response in terms of how that would read on site. Based on the RS4B as a base idea, it has a 5ft setback as opposed to 8ft. These buildings are 20ft, enough for 2 bedrooms facing out or stagger to get light into the depth of the building.
- The yards in the middle, who do they belong to? **A:** It depends, we don't know yet. Each side would be able to get about 20x10ft, enough room for planting, trees and furniture.
- The larger units towards lane would have a front yard, no backyard and the secondary suites would have a little bit of a yard? **A:** It depends. Some may divide between front and rear yards.
- There will be an issue with looking into someone's suite. Allow some outdoor area dedication to the secondary suite will provide privacy and liveability.
- Our more common type has some issues when it comes to 150ft deep lot. For a much shorter lot, the shallow lot gives the ability for that intensification to play out with a space big enough and ability for a garage or parking pad in the back.

#### Questions and Comments:

- Part of what we're asking is how you feel each of these approaches would land on the ground? And if you know how the Rowhouses are hitting the industry and potential flags?
- The first two options are more appealing, they have a nice, fine grain to them. For the 3<sup>rd</sup>, I wonder if there's an opportunity to create a bit more difference between the front and back units. The back is shorter, maybe make it skinnier and taller? Maybe a volume difference or height difference? These units have the opportunity to be built independently of each other and designed independently and maintained independently. The building code has a lot of issues around fire separation and how zero lot line units are problematic. How to define these are serviced and separated is a key component.
- Staff: When we get into strata holding, a lot of these places become sterilized. It becomes hard to redevelop them for more intense use. One of the elements of a fin is that it's easy to separate ownership. When everything's combined, you have to talk to the neighbour and negotiate etc.

- For each Rowhouse there is a shareable agreement, and in the past the municipality had to sign off on the agreement as well which cooled off the momentum on pursuing this form. Since that's been removed we haven't seen much uptake in the region.
- Would these have features or a flat roof? **A:** There's no definition on that form as of yet. From a landscape perspective, 10x20 is not very big, if it was a flat roof, it would give an opportunity for development up there, like patio spaces? **A:** We want to find some paths to that. Desire for rooftop patio space is high and creates very high quality open space.
- In regards to the terracing going toward the street on both back and front, what about stepping down to more of a comb like pattern to give more atmosphere and more air and volume in the middle space? **A:** We need to be careful to ensure if there's a stairwell coming up, how it impacts the potential for effective bedrooms and where they will be.
- Moodyville has guidelines that encourage diversity, a developer buys a line of houses and redevelops and follows the guidelines but doesn't quite get the character we're looking for. How can we encourage that through design guidelines so we don't get repeating applications to ADP? How can we ensure granularity and differences? **A:** The guidelines are the basic tool, the threat of ADP is another tool. Trying to find levers to ensure design diversity is a key thing we are pushing for. If there is a way to individualize that process and out of a large scale development, that will do a lot more for unit diversity.
- Staff: Do you think we need design guidelines for this form? Could it be carved into the zoning? Response: Design guidelines would be critical for this since it's such a new form. The living lane in Moodyville would be interesting to see in this. **A:** The living lane has no space for programming. It would only happen at the gaps between parking stalls and there aren't many.
- There's an opportunity to allow for some elevated outdoor space, like a carport cover on these spaces with access on top of it? **A:** Fire separation components would come into play.
- Could there be a rooftop deck on the carport? **A:** Yes.
- Rowhouses have a wall with stoops, if you push closer to the lane and leave more yard space, with defined two edges and forget that one is a road and that one is a lane, this might be another approach.
- I appreciate the concept of this and see further integrations, the issue is the sites will cram things in and lose the grain. It comes down to FSR to the point of the developer, they want to max out on that. I don't think these are productive in this region because there's a cost profit ratio. These make sense as an urban ideology because it's been done. I would support this but it's the third idea of getting them crammed in there that doesn't make sense. Don't want to lose the articulation of the intent of what you're trying to do.
- Bring the street frontages maxed out so it's a rhythm or row across the street. Gives more space to the courtyard. In general I appreciate this and support it.
- Do you think it's jammed for all examples or a particular one? **A:** The bigger ones (third option) are a harder sell as a design rationale. It loses its grain on the street.
- Being able to have a development product be sold is a key piece of this. To subdivide on the lot without consolidation is something to look into as an element of how to move forward on this. This needs to have an effective individuality.
- Make the laneway frontage a smaller brownstone, have it terrace back towards the central area and add carport patios terraced off the lane to reduce the 20m wide parking zone down to 6, 7, 8 metres wide of roof decks. The only setback on the street frontage

is closer to the street edge, and the main entrance to the main unit is up a level and in. Don't be timid on the street frontage.

- These are guidelines that need to be hashed out.
- Staff: Any thoughts on why Rowhouse has not emerged as common form? **A:** The developer has a cost/profit issue.
- As a purchaser, the advantage is being able to do what you want with it.
- Is the parking the same for each lot? **A:** Yes.
- The reality is, there's probably more cars than what you're saying there is.
- If you have a family, chances is you will have 2 cars? **A:** We require 1 per principal unit and 1 accessory unit. Often, lots are big enough that you can put more than 1 car.
- You also have to accommodate the fact that it's not flat. This will have huge impacts on the site design.
- Further studies should be metric to align with CNV zoning by-laws.

*Break: 7:35PM – 7:47PM*

## **8. Harbourside DP Guideline Review**

M. Epp gave a presentation on the Harbourside Development Permit Guidelines. These guidelines, which have been adopted by Council, provide a framework for the review of Development Permits submitted for the four anticipated phases of development on these lands.

- Four parcels at the foot of Fell Avenue.
- Owned by Concert Properties.
- Formally a business park changed to mixed use development.
- Four phases over 10-15 years.
- Currently at first phase, lot D.
- 2009 OCP amendment application, conferred a density and height maximum.
- Received a complex zoning application – transportation studies, public open space studies, amenity agreements, and phase development agreements. Created development permit guidelines.
- Proposal has shifted over time about what mixed uses would be.
- At stages of detailed design for the first phase of the project.
- Neighbourhood with a different urban form, looking to create a dense development in midrise form.
- Maintain views to water and the north.

Guidelines:

### Environmental Component

- Stormwater management.
- Passive Design.
- Do a lot in guidelines and less in the zoning bylaws.
- Council has approved the rezoning.

### Form and Character Component

- Natural Setting.

- Views.
- Building Massing.

### Form, Height, Massing

- Setback at upper floors: 3m above 4<sup>th</sup> floor on south elevations of buildings.
- Podium and wings: 4 storeys at park and Spirit Trail except foreground buildings.
  - Two buildings to deviate from the guidelines.
- Rooftops: green roofs.
- Interconnecting forms.
- Base expression.
- Street detail.
- When was this devised? **A:** 5 years ago.
- We were going through at the time, pushing the envelope to get the best outcome in terms of sustainability in building design. We will consider that things have changed over time.
- You are encouraging the developer to deviate from the guidelines, have they responded to that guidance? **A:** We are encouraging them to differentiate their buildings. They don't have a signature building. When the first phase of the development begins, there will be questions in terms of how that phase aligns with the guidelines. There will be questions on balance with the guidelines.
- When it comes to the Panel for discussion, we won't want to question compliance or non compliance? **A:** There will be a memo with background and key questions on where we would like your feedback.

### Street Character

- A unique set of guidelines just on the streetscape on how they will look in the area.
- Area to experiment with the public realm.
- Came up with a shared space design for much of the area. Demarked with other means.
- Fell Avenue is where most of commercial uses will be. Active commercial frontages on both sides of Fell Avenue and will be the heart of neighbourhood.
- Is the City responsible for the street trees, sidewalks etc.? **A:** No, the City will maintain them. We won't take on the maintenance of certain things in the public realm. We are limited in what we can take on. On the private side there's more we can do in the design elements.
- All of the street frontages are public, built by the developer but maintained by City.
- The internal circulation cutting through the site is private but are publically accessible.
- Has there been talk or thought for some kind of terminus at the base of Fell Avenue? **A:** Yes. There have been many discussions on a new ferry dock that would provide service and enhancements. A public plaza integrated into public space to east and west. Anticipated to be flexible to be programmed for a variety of uses.
- Any ideas for a signature piece? **A:** Yes, an interactive piece has been discussed. A public art component is being considered.

### Lanes

- Private but envision being active, not service lanes.
- Have live work units that front them.

## Landscape

- Parklets.
- Industrial/Marine
  - Combine with contemporary components and accent them.
  - Has there been much discussion with Squamish First Nation about reaching out to draw on some sort of historical elements? **A:** They elected a new Council and one of the topics is member housing. They might want to go through a visioning process on the lands.
- Public Art Component
- Signage and Wayfinding
- Coordination with Kings Mill Walk Improvements

### **Questions and comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:**

- Where is the parking? **A:** It will be 100% underground. All four phases will have a single level of parking. Parking was a large part of discussion. We already have parking issues, changes will occur when the project comes forward.
- Obligation to get a transit service going.
- \$25 million in road works improvements.
- Who is the architect? **A:** MCM.
- Who is the author of the guidelines? **A:** Frank Ducote, Michael Epp, Lotus Consulting Firm.
- Is it going to be strict FSR for each lot or general for the entire project? **A:** Zoning bylaw is written that each phase has minimums and maximums for certain things. There's potential to move density within bounds from one phase to another. 2.05 can carry over and be realized on the next phase. It's hard to realize the density across all the sites.
- We don't want to pile up on one lot then get very little on the next lot or defer to another. **A:** There is a cap on how much can be moved around. There is more potential for commercial areas to move around density.

### **9. 645 St. Davids (Development Permit Application)**

The City has received a rezoning application at the above noted address to replace the existing single detached dwelling with the proposed four-unit, three storey townhouse complex with one of the units containing a lock-off unit. The intent of this proposal is to replace an existing single detached dwelling.

This is the second appearance of this application for the Panels review. The first review was back on December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2017 where the Panel made the following resolution:

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 645 St. Davids Avenue and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the issues listed below:

- Explore simplification of the articulation;
- Refine or simplify the massing;

- Explore design opportunities to make the parking area appear smaller or screened from view;
- Encouraged to explore alternatives to the grass pavers for some other type of permeable paving that will accommodate storm water management;
- Further investigate the vehicular access entry into Unit A to ensure usability;
- Encouraged to complete a traffic study to ensure maneuverability of vehicles within the site;
- Explore the introduction of motion sensors in the pedestrian areas to avoid pedestrian and vehicle conflict in the parking area;
- Consider moving Unit A northward or redesigning it to make it more functional;
- Suggest the courtyard for Units B and C be redesigned to address the lack of natural light and increase functionality;
- Explore the use of other roofing structural systems other than cantilevered roof I-joists;
- Explore more colour in the material palette rather than just at the doors; and
- Address the monotone colour palette.

The Panel looks forward to reviewing the applicant's response at a future meeting.

### **Carried Unanimously**

Staff asked Panel for feedback on how well the applicant responded to the December 13<sup>th</sup> motion and if the changes introduce additional comments.

Kevin Li Synthesis Design, reviewed the response to the resolution:

- Simplified the façade, massing and articulation.
- Introduced new bright colours that highlight unit identity.
- Redesigned the driveway.
- New roof structural system, low profile.
- Redesigned green pavers and replaced it with concrete driveway with banding.
- Improved vehicular access to Unit A with a wider driveway.
- Visually made the driveway appear smaller.
- Increased garage door sizes on the floor plans.
- Included door access to the courtyard to improve the Unit A functionality.
- Introduced flat roof with parapet wall.

Kevin Li, Insite Design Landscape Architecture, reviewed the landscape plan:

- Added motion sensor lighting on each garage door for pedestrian and vehicular access.
- Redesigned the courtyard.
- Moved the common courtyard to the front and provided better street appeal.
- Pushed Unit B and C courtyards further south which gives more natural light and added more planting which will soften the area.

### **Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:**

- Is the central courtyard shared between two units? **A:** Yes.

- How is it accessed? **A:** From the dining and kitchen area from Unit B, Unit C has a sundeck with stairs.
- They can walk through each other's courtyards? **A:** Yes.
- Any existing trees now? **A:** Yes one maple tree that is small that we are trying to keep.
- Indicating the banding is different colours, is it coloured concrete? **A:** No.
- What are the requirements for site permeability? **A:** Forward to Engineering.
- This revision is thought out because the bands double as the drainage strips for the water.
- Where does that go? **A:** Hooks into the City's storm management system.
- The courtyards have been modified, can you describe what you see as the function? **A:** Hanging out in the summer time with a barbecue, provided to ensure better liveability.
- Is there a gate in the middle courtyard at the street? Is it public or private? **A:** There will be a gate at the front, not necessarily locked though.
- It appears Unit C has an overlook to the courtyard that belongs to Unit B? **A:** No, there are clear storey windows above eye level.
- Any thinking how this lot adds more to the community? **A:** We've identified this as a landmark building with the colour and architecture. This new design adds up to the construction costs but we wanted to make it better. We have reclaimed a lot of the existing materials. Courtyard and open space design provide a lot of open spaces so it doesn't feel like a massive building.
- All patios are concrete? **A:** Yes.
- The architectural plans on upper floors and elevations indicate planters, where are they? **A:** We have taken out the green roof planters from the middle level but they are on the lower level now.
- Is there is a wall and fence along the neighbouring property? **A:** Yes.
- A retaining wall too? **A:** Yes, a low retaining wall.
- 6ft fence? **A:** Yes, a cedar fence.
- Is there any definition of territoriality into the parking area so it's not confused as a lane? **A:** We proposed a gate but it didn't work, we have the modern concrete to show definition. The trellis also helps for definition of boundaries.
- Is there any unit identification for first responders? **A:** Each unit number is on the front, we haven't decided if we will do A, B, C, D or 1, 2, 3, 4.
- Access to the Unit A garage, is that owner occupied? **A:** C and D probably will be.
- Are the courtyards between Units B and C, the two gates, one going west, one going east towards street, going to be locked? **A:** No.

**Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:**

- Not sure movement into Unit A garage is adequate for someone to back out.
- Minimum requirement doesn't mean its good, still driving backwards for a distance. That's a hard parking spot to use.
- It would have been helpful to show the application alongside the previous submission.
- Challenging sites, pushing FSR, connections and visibility.
- Still think it could be simpler, the roof protrusions do affect the façades.
- Seems like a flat façade that becomes busy. It needs design development to further articulate the vertical and horizontal to ease the articulation on St. Davids

- The corner aspect sacrifices the north and south elevation, it still needs one more step to understand it from the north view.
- No issue with variances.
- Articulation is successful, overhangs are good.
- As design develops, these types of treatments can have consistency around the elevations.
- Further finessing of the moves already made to bring a further development of what you've given.
- The red box on St. Davids corner is out there on its own versus the other ones that are centrally located, strikes as a breaking up of consistency that you started on the other three.
- Needs another layer of attention to bringing that consistency to all primary elevations.
- The landscape is harsh, large expanse of concrete paving in one colour will be unwelcoming and hard to use by the residents.
- Support the move away from grass paving, can do a finer grain but this is way out of scale and industrial.
- Encouraged to look at concrete unit pavers.
- Concerned with site permeability, consider other opportunities to address it.
- Patio spaces are very large, a portion of them could be done in lawn which would help with permeability and soften the landscape feel.
- Significant lack of large trees for a site of this size, larger trees along street edge is possible.
- Opportunity to increase planters quite a bit and propose trees to shade the paving.
- Not sure of the purpose of the secondary walkway in front of the units on St. Davids. It works for units at the ends to access patios, the two units at the front can be replaced with more planting.
- Central courtyard still not working for me, it's an improvement but right now it's no ones space, no clear definition on who it belongs to. Consider a center planter with planting to slightly enclose that space for Unit B, this would be helpful in designating that space to that unit.
- Courtyard for Unit C feels like a walkthrough space. If you stick with the parking scheme, that space near that courtyard can be incorporated to make it significantly bigger. The courtyard can be enlarged.
- Overall, review of the landscape in terms of usability, size of spaces, hard versus soft treatment to make it usable and enjoyable for the owners.
- This is a challenging corner.
- Make the orange element more substantial on the north-west corner.
- Nice to see some extra outdoor space, owners can soften up with potted plants and herb gardens. Rather than established planters now, owners can do it on their own.
- Courtyard B to C and sizes, suggest getting rid of the stair, first responders can get to each unit. Pull back towards St. Davids to get a shorter courtyard.
- To differentiate the two, put in a planter to soften it up with no overlook.
- Engineering to look the traffic analysis and weigh in on access to Unit A garage.

**Presenter's comments:**

- Thank you for all the comments.
- There are no large trees because anything within 5m of the intersection can't be more than a metre high.

- We tried to put some planters on the driveway and it didn't work because we want comfortable traffic for the vehicles.
- Will try to make it greener than it actually is.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 645 St. Davids and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Conduct a traffic analysis to be reviewed by the Engineering department and comment on ingress and egress from garages;
- Explore the overall articulation and expression both in the vertical and horizontal separations and elements between the units;
- Further investigate the general configuration, usability and identification of the patios;
- Consider eliminating the staircase from Courtyard B to Courtyard C;
- Further expression of Unit A towards the north;
- Consider softening the overall landscaping by scaling down the concrete areas and introducing a variety of paving incorporated with the concrete;
- Further investigate the permeability of materials;
- Consider adding more greenery between units and eliminating the secondary north-south sidewalk along St. Davids at the building face;
- Introduce more trees on site and larger trees along the St. Davids frontage; and
- Further overall review of the landscaping plan.

**AND THAT** the Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

**Carried Unanimously**

## **8. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:32 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018.

  
Chair