

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 Tuesday, June 14th, 2011

---

**MINUTES**

---

- Present:** T. Cailes  
K. Kristensen  
S. McFarlane  
M. Messer  
M. Saii  
B. Spencer  
C. Taylor
- Staff:** C. Laing, Planner  
C. Perry, Supervisor, Engineering Services  
A. Kurnicki, Streetscape Planner, Engineering, Parks and Environment  
S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk
- Guests:** **615 Mahon Avenue**  
Merdad Rahbar, Vernacular Design  
Tony Testini, Owner/Developer 615 Mahon Avenue  
**137 St. David's Avenue**  
Augustine Hii, Augustine Hii Architecture  
Bill Curtis, Bill Curtis & Associates Design Ltd.  
David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Ltd.  
**250-252 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street**  
Kevin Butler, Kd.B Design Studio Ltd.  
Denis Accili, Owner 250-252 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street  
**129 West 2<sup>nd</sup> Street**  
Victor Tam, Buttjes Architecture Inc.  
Edward Wong, Buttjes Architecture Inc.  
Alan Whitchelo, Fairborne Homes  
Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Ltd. Landscape Architects  
**318 East 12<sup>th</sup> Street**  
Karl Wein, Karl Wein and Associates
- Absent:** K. Kallweit Graham  
P. Kennedy  
Y. Khalighi  
Councillor Trentadue
- 

A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

**1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2011**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2011 be adopted with changes as discussed.

**Carried Unanimously**

**2. Business Arising**

There was a discussion on density bonussing. It was agreed that Chris Laing would ask Richard White, Director, Community Development, to come to the next meeting and give a similar presentation to that given to the Advisory Planning Commission.

**3. Staff Update**

CL asked the Panel if the staff memos attached to presentations were useful and asked for suggestions for improvements to the layout; what would help members make a better decision? It was mentioned that a list of specific variances and benefits to the community would be useful. Members were asked to email suggestions to S. Kimm-Jones.

C. Laing updated the Panel on recent developments.

212 Brooksbank (MEC): Final adoption was on June 13<sup>th</sup>.

1860 Lonsdale Avenue: 1<sup>st</sup> reading of the bylaw passed on May 16<sup>th</sup>. The Public Hearing will be on June 20<sup>th</sup>.

Low Level Improvement Project: Staff recommendations were reviewed at the June 13<sup>th</sup> Council Meeting. Council approved the proposed plans for the eastern portion of the road but deferred making a decision on the western portion of the road due to the impact on residents.

Lonsdale Avenue and 13<sup>th</sup> Street Safety Improvements: A report recommending implementation of the safety improvements at the Lonsdale Avenue and 13<sup>th</sup> Street intersection was deferred at the June 13<sup>th</sup> Council meeting pending more staff analysis. Changes to the intersection will have an impact on the streetscape design for the 1250 Lonsdale project.

1250 Lonsdale Avenue: At the June 13<sup>th</sup> Council meeting staff were directed to prepare bylaws for 1250 Lonsdale Avenue and 1112 Lonsdale Avenue. The applicant is looking at ways to fund the density transfer and what the City is charging.

61 Bewicke Avenue Rezoning Application: This application had first reading at the June 13<sup>th</sup> Council meeting and will go to Public Hearing on July 4<sup>th</sup>.

720 West 2<sup>nd</sup> Street (City Works Yard): A report on this project was reviewed by Council on June 13<sup>th</sup> and referred to Public Hearing on July 4<sup>th</sup>.

*Steve McFarlane entered the meeting at 5:40 p.m.*

#### 4. 615 Mahon Avenue (Rezoning)

A staff memo provided background on the project. The proposal is to rezone the lot from RT-1 (Two Unit Residential) to a CD (Comprehensive Development) zone based on the Low Density Guidelines and the Ottawa Gardens Heritage Conservation Area Guidelines. A Heritage Alteration Permit will be required. The project is generally supported by HAC. The applicant proposes to raise and relocate the existing building on the site and construct an infill one family dwelling at the rear of the site. Staff asked for comments on the form, scale, and use of materials.

The Chair read the Heritage Advisory Commission resolution.

Merdad Rahbar, Vernacular Design, reviewed the project to the Panel.

- The property is sited on the property line of a 36 x 100 ft. lot.
- The house is structurally sound; having an infill unit at the rear enables the economics of the project to work.
- Staff and neighbours are very positive about retaining the Cairns House.
- It is simple Edwardian architecture built in 1907.
- The house is known as the "blue house" so it will remain blue.
- The house will be raised 2.5 ft, moved forward 2 ft and 7 ft inside the property line to provide a walkway to the infill. Three bedrooms will be in the basement.
- The existing windows will be enlarged.
- There will be a 14 ft courtyard between the front house and garage.
- The Cairns house is 1560 sq. ft.; the infill unit is 1070 sq. ft.
- The deck will remain the same size.
- The Cairns house will have a dormer installed in the roof and a deeper bellcast overhang.
- The infill unit will have two bedrooms and two bathrooms, and an outdoor deck. The design is influenced by houses in Ottawa Gardens.

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

- Light to the basement.
- Development potential of the tennis court lot? Staff: Probably zoned for school and church.
- What is the overlook to the west? A: It is a garage.
- Do you need the two walkways; one to the infill, one to the heritage house? The path encroaches into the curb wheelchair ramp and will have to be reconfigured.
- Could the garage be a carport instead? A: In terms of privacy and massing the preference is for enclosed, secured garages.
- Will there be more contemporary detailing on the infill house? A: Yes, for trim etc.
- Materials to be used? A: We are trying to duplicate present siding as the old siding will be removed. The windows in the front house will be changed to wood. The infill unit will have horizontal siding, with vinyl windows. The garage doors will have glass panels to help beautify the lane.

#### **Comments of the Panel included but were not limited to:**

- The massing of the infill combined with the second garage seems too much; it would be more open with a carport.

- It is commendable to save a modest house. The infill house could be simplified; there are a lot of lessons in the Cairns house which should inform it especially the simplicity of the massing. The garage roof seems too high.
- There is room for improvement on the way the parking has been integrated; perhaps integrating the blue parking with the blue house and the red parking with the red house.
- I have concerns around the infill and the liveability of the outdoor space between the garage and the building, its liveability, relationship to open space, views etc.
- Future development of the tennis courts should be addressed in the scheme.
- I would support a non-conforming setback situation which might improve the southern side yard in anticipation of future development to protect against future shading of the open space.
- The outdoor space seems too small, there does not seem to be a place to have an outdoor meal for instance.
- The architecture is great; I do not think the landscaping is.
- The dormer is functionally appropriate.
- The space between the two houses presents challenges and does not offer any great benefit to either the existing house or the infill.
- The infill appears too complex compared to the simplicity of the original.

**Presenter's comments:**

- The existing overhang is only one foot and we need to increase it for rainscreening.
- We did not want the entrance to the infill unit off the lane.
- Concerning the tennis courts; the Church does not intend to develop in the next little while, so they will have to follow our design.
- We will take your advice to simplify the detailing.
- In terms of outdoor space; the infill unit compares in price to apartments around the corner so it has better outdoor space than them. It is a housing choice in between a townhouse and apartment. Everything added to the infill unit increases the price.
- We will take your advice and do our best to enhance the outdoor area.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 615 Mahon Avenue and commends the applicant for the quality of the proposal. The Panel recommends approval, subject to the approval, by the Development Planner, of the following:

- Simplification of the design of the infill unit including a reduction in the height of the garage roof and reconsideration of the parking strategy as a whole;
- Investigation of further attempts to improve the indoor-outdoor connection of the primary residence to the garden between the primary residence and the infill.

**Carried  
4 in favour  
3 opposed**

*There was a short break  
The meeting resumed at 7 pm  
B. Spencer left the meeting at 6:50 pm.*

## 5. 137 St. David's Avenue (Rezoning Application)

A staff memo provided background on the project. The applicant is requesting to rezone the property to a site-specific Comprehensive Development zone that would permit a three unit building with roof top decks. An attached three-stall garage with two uncovered stalls would be provided for a total of five vehicle parking stalls. Staff requested input on the roof top decks, the materials palette and the use of a trellis to accentuate each unit entrance especially the relationship between the trellis, public realm and private realm.

Augustine Hii, Augustine Hii Architecture, presented the project to the Panel:

- The site is in the south east corner boundary of the City and is in a block in transition with apartments, duplexes, townhouses, single family homes and triplexes.
- It is a wedge-shaped lot which slopes by 12 ft. north to south.
- They are proposing three 1300 sq. ft. units oriented to St. David's Avenue.
- The three units will step four feet per unit down the slope.
- The front yards will have patios screened with lattice work with a trellis and gateway entrance into each unit.
- The walkway on the western edge leads to the parking and garbage and recycling bins.
- Each unit will have a roof deck to capture the view with stairwells to provide screening.
- The finish is simple with a serene colour scheme.

David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Ltd., reviewed the landscape plan:

- There is an existing retaining wall on the west property line and an existing walnut tree at the north west corner of the site
- There is no sidewalk around the site; it will be added with street trees.
- We have tried to provide open spaces that are usable at different times of the day.
- There are private patios with cedar hedging at the back to deal with window wells and give everyone a reasonable patio and green space.
- There are 4 ft 6 fences on the north and south sides.
- Permeable paving is used on pathways and there may be a rain garden at the lower end of the west and east property lines.

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

- Only two of the units have light wells? A: Yes; there is a window at the front of the third unit.
- Can the stair well roof be angled? A: The building would be over height; you have to allow head room.
- What is on the west property line? A: A fence on top of the retaining wall.
- Is there a way to get up on to the roof top decks without the protrusion? A: You could have a roof hatch. We are using the element as a screen between the units. Staff: building inspectors have a problem with hatches.
- What about overview? There was a comment at the DIS re overview to the west. We have tried to open up the view as much as possible.

### **Comments of the Panel included but were not limited to:**

- The patio space of the northern No. 3 Unit will be very dark; I do not think the planting will grow; the patio should be enlarged.

- Nice outdoor spaces and opportunities to enjoy the outdoors. I like the use of trellises. The project is well put together.
- I like the rigour of the planning; the organization of a difficult site is quite clever.
- I am in favour of having more density on the site if it means that the resolution of the parking structure could have more rigour; it feels grafted on.
- The south deck seems detached from the unit it serves; you could open up the living room to the south.
- There is room for refinement on the roofs of the roof top deck entrances.
- The roof could be improved to make a strong scheme even stronger.
- I like the repetition of the access towers. The garage building feels foreign to the scheme and is not as strong as the other building forms. There should be a stronger connection with the landscaping.
- The basement in the No. 3 unit needs more light.
- The southern part of the site could be developed to be a smaller, more affordable housing type.

**Presenter's comments:**

- The residential building is at the maximum height.
- A small coach house would work at the south end of the site.
- We respect your comments about the parking and will look at the landscaping.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 137 St. David's Avenue and commends the applicant for the quality of the proposal, the materials and design. The Panel recommends approval subject to further consideration of some minor details:

- Further consideration of the treatment of the stair towers;
- Further development of the design to improve the integration of the parking area massing with the overall form of the building;
- The Panel would be supportive of increased density above the parking structure if it assisted in achieving point 2 above;
- Further consideration of options to enhance access to and/or use of the space on the garage;
- Further consideration of the landscape, paying attention to maintenance and shading;
- Improved daylight access to the basement of unit #3.

**Carried Unanimously**

**6. Lonsdale Streetscape Guidelines**

Alex Kurnicki, Streetscape Planner, Engineering reviewed the proposed revised Lonsdale Streetscape Guidelines. The current guidelines include a red brick band along the curb face; eventually the mortar breaks up, creating tripping hazards. Tree roots also cause extensive damage. Local sources for the brick have disappeared and the brick now has to be obtained from as far as New Brunswick and California. Installation of the brick is costly. The guidelines are intended for use from 3<sup>rd</sup> Street to the Highway.

Staff recommend the adoption of a simplified streetscape with a more durable and consistent walking surface similar to the Marine Drive Streetscape Standard with commonly used, durable products. Silva cells would be used with trees whenever possible to prevent heaving of the sidewalk.

The sidewalk is divided into three zones; the curb zone accommodates street furniture, garbage receptacles etc., and is divided from the pedestrian corridor zone by exposed aggregate banding. The "pedestrian corridor zone" is designed to reinforce the direction of flow north and south along Lonsdale. The flex zone is the space that will be used by outdoor furniture spilling out of businesses; this space will be "lost" if the width of the sidewalk is narrowed.

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

- The use of structural soil? A: There are better results using Silva cells which will enhance the urban forest canopy and improve storm water management.
- The accessibility of the corner drop curbs? A: Tactile warning pavers may be used.
- The side streets? The streetscape will continue around the corner at least to the lane.
- Flexibility in the guidelines? A: We are open to customizing corners with developers at major intersections.
- Will there be a plant list? A: Yes, The Marine Drive plant list will be used as it is the palette we use throughout the City. Trees will be chosen by the arborist using the Urban Forestry Master Plan.
- Do you irrigate the planters? A: We ask the developer to put in irrigation to cover the planters for two years for establishing; after two years they can choose not to maintain it. Our bylaws require adjacent buildings to take care of the planting (not the trees).
- Utilities? A: You can run utilities through the Silva cells.
- When would the guidelines come into effect? A: It will be an incremental introduction and may take up to 20 years for the whole sidewalk to be done and look uniform, but many developments are happening now so it is a good time to introduce them.
- What is the situation vis-a-vis canopies? A: The bylaw has been amended recently to allow for significant canopies.

**Action: C. Laing to report back to ADP on canopies.**

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

- The pedestrian permeability of the planters and how people get out of cars next to them; the relationship between vehicles and curbage. Smaller planters are easier to maintain.
- The aim of providing simple, reliable materials and practical guidelines has been achieved.
- I would encourage enhanced use of the Silva cells and that the full width of the sidewalk be maintained along Lonsdale as a public space.
- It is good that it has flexibility and creates rules that can be modified in certain instances.
- I like the rigour behind it and the surface texture changes.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the proposed revised Lonsdale Streetscape Guidelines and thanks the staff member for the presentation and supports the direction of the guidelines;

**AND THAT** the Panel endorses the use of the Silva Cell product, both for enhanced storm water management and tree growth;

**FURTHER** The Panel would like to encourage staff to further develop the guidelines with a view to incorporating an approach and integration of canopy designs into the guidelines and to further investigate pedestrian permeability of the proposed planting zones and their interface with parking spaces.

**Carried Unanimously**

## **7. 250-252 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street (Rezoning)**

A staff memo outlined the project(s). On the 250 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street parcel it is proposed to build a new principal one family dwelling with a rear yard infill. The lot would be rezoned from RT-1 (Two-Unit Residential) to a CD (Comprehensive Development ) zone based on the Low Density Guidelines and the Heritage Character Area Supplement for East 10<sup>th</sup> Street.

The existing heritage building at 252 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street would be retained with an infill one family dwelling at the rear. Dennis Accili , the owner lives 252 East 10<sup>th</sup>.

Kevin Butler, Kd.B Design Studio Ltd., reviewed the presentation boards for 250 East 10th to the Panel:

- The proposed new home is an 1800 sq. ft. single family that reflects and respects the neighbourhood borrowing details such as the covered porch, shed dormers, gables columns. The main entry is raised off the ground; the pitch of the front gable echoes the rhythm of the streetscape. Windows will be true-divided with some double hung.
- The infill unit is 800 sq. ft. with two bedrooms on the upper floor which is stepped back from the laneway. The massing has been kept simple in nature.

Denis Accili reviewed the 252 East 10<sup>th</sup> project:

- 252 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street was built in 1912 and is on the Heritage Registry. It is in very good condition.
- The rock foundation in poor condition so the house will be raised, a new foundation poured and then the house will be lowered back on to it.
- There will be a small one bedroom suite in the basement.
- The main floor will be extended on the north side approximately 5 ft. to allow space for a mudroom and to extend the kitchen.
- There will be three bedrooms on the upper floor and a small ensuite will be added.
- There is a nonconforming set of stairs; the applicant hopes to dormer out the roof to get into the attic space.
- The existing siding is 55 years old; the siding underneath is in good condition so the existing siding will be removed and the original siding renovated.
- The windows will be replaced with double glazing; they can be made operational but it would be expensive.



- Heritage colours will be used for the home.
- Infill B is a mirror image of Infill A with a slightly different roof line.

*B. Spencer rejoined the meeting at 8:50 p.m.*

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

- Storm water management? A: Probably something between the infill and main homes, we hope the site will absorb as much water as possible.
- How will the path be lit from the street to the back? A: It will be well lit with entry trellises, spot light lighting and edge lighting.
- Question for staff on the two infill houses; is the small upper floor dictated by guidelines? Staff: It is dictated by feedback from the information session and overlook issues. Applicant: We were told to keep the second level as far back from the lane as possible.
- Are they town homes? A: They are separate properties with a shared access agreement.
- Do they homes share the garbage? A: Yes.

**Comments of the Panel on 250 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street included but were not limited to:**

- The main entrance should be more open; it is very narrow.
- The new house is very skilfully put together; the design is well done and handles elements quite elegantly.
- Reconsider the overlook of the infill units for both 250 and 252 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street.
- The infill could be made stronger than it is. The scale is not working. The form and massing could be improved using details from the new home e.g. use of roofs, sheds, gables intersecting in a nice simple way. It would make the units look like they belong together.
- The garden space seems split up into little spaces that are hard to understand. More thought to the landscape would be good.
- The covered porch on the north side of the main building will make it feel dark; should it have a glazed roof?

**Presenter's comments:**

- If the height was not such an issue we could play with the infill; it should have a steeper pitch.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 250 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street and recommends approval subject to the approval, by the Development Planner, of the following:

- Further design development to refine the massing of the infill building to be more consistent with the massing of the proposed new house;
- Formalization of how the overlooking of the back alley is to be addressed;
- Continued work on the landscape plan to enhance the liveability of the outdoor spaces;
- Further work to ensure that there is natural daylight on the rear porch.
- Further development of the common space shared with 252 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street to address accessibility and maintenance.

**Carried Unanimously (Subsequently amended following adoption.)**

**Comments of the Panel on 252 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street included but were not limited to:**

- It is commendable to save a heritage building. The new dormer could be improved with glazing e.g. stained or frosted glass to let light into the stairwell and not impact the neighbours' privacy.
- My comments are the same as for the infill at 250 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street. The rooflines would be better if a simpler approach were adopted.
- The joint space down the middle needs more work to ensure it is navigable with wheelbarrows etc. Think about the location of the bay. Use good lighting.
- The back garden has a chopped up awkwardness about it. Think about liveability.
- The hip roof form on the infill does not work and is inconsistent with the other roofs.
- The restoration on the heritage building is very sensitively done.
- The design recognizes the individual identity of the buildings, but it loses consistency.
- The colour schemes are so strong for both infills that it goes a long way to differentiate one from the other and reduces the requirement to do so formally.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 252 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street and recommends approval subject to the approval, by the Development Planner, of the following:

- Further design development to refine the massing of the infill building to be more consistent with the massing of the proposed new house;
- Formalization of how the overlooking of the back alley is to be addressed;
- Continued work on the landscape plan to enhance the liveability of the outdoor spaces;
- Further work to ensure that there is natural daylight on the rear porch.
- Further development of the common space shared with 250 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street to address accessibility and maintenance.

**Carried Unanimously (Subsequently amended following adoption.)**

Following the vote there was a discussion on whether the Design Panel wished to review the revised designs for the infill units at 250 and 252 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street.

It was moved and seconded to amend the two adopted resolutions regarding 250 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street and 252 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street. The motion was carried unanimously.

The motions were re-opened for debate and were amended as shown below.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 250 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the following issues:

- Further design development to refine the massing of the infill building to be more consistent with the massing of the proposed new house;
- Formalization of how the overlooking of the back alley is to be addressed;
- Continued work on the landscape plan to enhance the liveability of the outdoor spaces;
- Further work to ensure that there is natural daylight on the rear porch.
- Further development of the common space shared with 252 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street to address accessibility and maintenance.

**Carried Unanimously**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 252 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the following issues:

- Further design development to refine the massing of the infill building to be more consistent with the massing of the proposed new house;
- Formalization of how the overlooking of the back alley is to be addressed;
- Continued work on the landscape plan to enhance the liveability of the outdoor spaces;
- Further work to ensure that there is natural daylight on the rear porch.
- Further development of the common space shared with 250 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street to address accessibility and maintenance.

**Carried Unanimously**

The Chair told the applicants that the Design Panel looked forward to review the designs for the two infill buildings and the response to the issues outlined in the motions.

#### **8. 129-141 West 2nd Street (Rezoning)**

The Chair read the motions passed at the May 18th ADP and the May 11th Advisory Planning Commission.

The design has been revised in response to the comments made at the May 18<sup>th</sup> ADP: the number of units has been decreased from 89 to 71, the massing has been shrunk, and the building reduced by one floor.

Alan Whitchelo, Fairborne Homes, Victor Tam and Edward Wong, Buttjes Architecture Inc., reviewed the project:

- The building has been reduced from six stories to five stories deducting 9400 sq. ft. from the project. It is now within the OCP guidelines.

- The issue of proximity to the neighbour to the east has been addressed by widening the eastern setback to about 20 ft. and the suites closest to the neighbour have been redesigned so that they face north and south rather than east. Direct-facing windows have been minimised with more punched openings rather than floor to ceiling openings.
- There is no longer the requirement for a density transfer from Presentation House; they will be purchasing some extra density.
- The height of the building is still below the 52 ft height limit.
- The sunken entry on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street has been eliminated and is at the elevation of the sidewalk
- The best response to the curved pathway was to acknowledge the pathway at the ground plan rather than curving the balconies.
- At grade access has been provided to the ground floor units at the south end of the building with patios and gates.

Peter Kreuk Durante Kreuk Ltd. Landscape Architects, reviewed the landscape plan:

- The plaza has been expanded; three areas of the site could be used for public art.
- A pathway system to access the southern units has been included.
- The paving materials are the same as used elsewhere on Lower Lonsdale.
- The public pathway now two metres wide. The lower walls of the building are shaped to reflect the curved nature of the path.

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

- The palette of landscape materials. A: Basalt granite flooring in the lobby, architectural concrete walls, natural grey hydrapressed slabs on the patios, concrete paver pathways, the palette in public areas will replicate that used for Jack Loucks Court.
- Access to units on the west side of the building; how about extending the path to Sky? A: Sky residents do not want the pathway to exist.
- How do you resolve people taking shortcuts? A: Still discussing how to solve it.
- Did you look at pushing the building back further? A: The stairway was also pushed back.
- Why did you take a floor off the building? A: To address the lobby issue. It was a recommendation from staff.. We also took a slice off the side of the building.
- What is the allowable FSR? Staff: It is 2.6 plus 3,000 sq. ft transferred from Jack Loucks Court.

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

- It is a very good response to the concerns of the Panel. The walkway needs more refinement in terms of detailed intersections.
- Disappointed no more than 4.2 ft was added to the path; it needs to feel more easy, natural and inviting. We should see public art.
- There is a richness of landscape material you could use e.g. using seat walls, granite instead of concrete, at the pedestrian level needs to be increased.
- Architectural expression is good especially on the south side; further to right it is a little bit uninspiring. It needs a more even hand throughout the project where it broadens and becomes more solid; could be improved. The site lends itself to a building like that.
- The punched windows need a little bit more finesse. Resolution of the pinchpoint has not been addressed enough; perhaps the junction could be opened up.
- Interior access to the southerly units still appears like a fire access corridor and needs more work.

- The "knuckle" in the middle of the pathway is awkward. Work on the transition there to make it easy.
- The pavers on the existing pathway should be re-furbished.

**Presenter's comments:**

- We will look at how to play up the vestibule entry for the ground floor units from the parking perhaps using richer of finishing materials. The nature of the stepping of the building does tend to cut the units off from the main floor.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 129-141 West 2nd Street and recommends approval subject to the approval, by the Development Planner of the following:

- Further development of the east walkway geometry;
- Further refinement of the architectural expression of the eastern-most protrusion of the building;
- Continued refinement of the landscape details and materials to create comfortable seating areas, including the resolution of lighting, street furnishing, and public art details and a full palette of details for the landscaping.

**Carried Unanimously**

**9. 318 East 12<sup>th</sup> Street (Rezoning)**

This project was previously reviewed at the Advisory Design Panel on May 18<sup>th</sup>; the design has been revised in response to the comments made at that review.

Karl Wein, Karl Wein and Associates., reviewed the project:

- Grates have been put in the sidewells to allow uninterrupted access to the rear.
- The retaining wall in the back yard has been stepped to allow more light into the basement unit
- The colour scheme was changed with a darker tone on the side and front and natural cedar gables.
- The size of the windows in the entrance was increased.

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

- The window wells? A: They were dropped to be level with grade and grates.
- Retaining trees? A: The arborist's report said that most of the trees were topped three or four times and most of them are hazardous.
- The rain garden; will it be dry in the summer and wet in the winter? A: Yes, it will collect water from the drain spouts. Staff: The plumbing inspector will require them to have an overflow into the storm system.

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

- Seven very large trees are proposed: four red cedars and three sequoias; smaller trees would be a better solution.

- I find it difficult when there is a rezoning to get enthusiastic about a scheme that is not architecturally superior, innovative or providing an overarching social benefit. The bar should be set higher and this design has not achieved that in my mind.
- It is a significant improvement on where we were last month but needs to go further in the treatment of the front entries; the connecting overhang in the centre bothers me. Each porch should be a little more distinct. Disappointing that the comments in our previous resolution about the trees and landscape do not appear to have been addressed at all.
- You have reduced the amount of daylight into the lower levels.
- The approach you have taken to get more natural light in the rear is a step in the right direction. The courtyards could go out further so that they are not covered completely by the deck
- Each porch needs to be more distinct.

**Presenter's comments:**

- The grates are very thin metal and do not take too much light away.
- The retaining wall is very gradual so there is lot more light coming in.
- Re the porch roof; the middle protrudes so it is not a flat facade.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 318 East 12<sup>th</sup> Street and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the following issues:

**THAT** the applicant address the item in the original resolution: "Revisiting the landscape plan and removing very large growing trees such as sequoias which would shade neighbouring properties, and to adapt the landscape plan to assure long term sunlight to the property."

**AND THAT** the applicant further address the architectural resolution of the front entry porches.

**Carried with one opposed**

**10. Other Business**

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, July 20<sup>th</sup>, 2011.

Chair

