

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, May 19, 2010**

MINUTES

- Present:** J. Bitar
T. Cailes
K. Hanvey (Chair)
K. Kristensen
B. Spencer
S. Standfield
C. Taylor
K. Terriss
- Staff:** G. Venczel, Development Planner
C. Perry, Supervisor, Engineering Services
S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk
B. Westmacott, Planning Technician
- Guests:** Steven E. Forrest, Adera Development Corp.
Dale Staples, Integra Architecture
Jon Losee, Jon Losee Landscape Architects
Robert Tarnowski, LGCA Board
Greg Rohland, LGCA Board
Gerry Blonski, Gerry Blonski Architect
Cheryl Gardiner, Gerry Blonski Architect
Foad Rafii, Rafii Architects
F. Mark Almazan, Rafii Architects
David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture
Jordan Kutev, Architect
Bob Heaslip, Development Planning Strategies
Cameron Murray, Topographics Landscape Architecture
- Absent:** Councillor Trentadue
Y. Khalighi
-

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 April 21, 2010

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held April 21, 2010 be adopted with one change as discussed.

Unanimously Carried

2. Business Arising

Design awards: G. Venczel told the panel that the date of the presentation of the Design Awards is at the pleasure of the Committee. It would be good if it happened this year. It was agreed that, unless there is a conflict, the award will be judged at the August ADP meeting and presented at the September ADP meeting.

Action: G. Venczel to confirm the date of the Environmental Award and discuss the timing with Gary Penway.

3. Staff Update

700 Marine Drive

The 3rd reading passed unanimously. Staff is waiting for the covenant to be prepared.

EastSide Mario's

The case was made that, due to financial hardship, a decision on the signs should be made as soon as possible, therefore, Council approved the proposed signs which were amended following comments from ADP.

Green House Gas (GHG) emissions passed 4th reading. Municipalities are now required to address GHG emissions; the section on energy was changed in the Official Community Plan.

G. Venczel introduced Barb Westmacott, Planning Technician, who was attending the meeting to observe the review of the 735 W. 15th presentation.

4. 735 West 15th Street : Rezoning

The Chair reviewed the motion passed by the Advisory Planning Commission at the May 12th meeting.

G. Venczel provided background on the project. Rezoning from industrial to residential CD zone and OCP amendment from Industrial to Residential Level 4 - 1.4 FSR residential. Site planning is very good and addresses many issues. There is a City policy discouraging repetition.

Steven Forrest, Adera Development Corporation, presented the project to the Panel:

- Adera representatives attended the Marine Drive Town Hall meeting.
- The project is about the best in West Coast design.
- "Live West Coast" – lifestyle

- Urban amenities surrounded by creeks and mountains.
- Secret neighbourhood.
- Target market finds it cool to live there.
- Represents a new period in West Coast design – strong modern architecture in natural surroundings.
- Floor to ceiling windows.
- Roof top access.
- Resident community garden; Adera is prepared to fund it for two years to get it running.
- Public art will include water features, paver stone stream and will be accessible to public.
- There will be private picnic and play areas.
- In recognition of the heritage building Adera propose to thoroughly document the building and put an onsite plaque.
- Live West Coast will include a fitness facility.
- The project will be a new benchmark in sustainability: Built Green Gold and to be certified as LEED for homes.
- Hydronic heating is very expensive, \$10,000 per unit, which does not make project viable.
- Will talk about solar panel heating for hot water which would result in 23% energy savings.
- There will be a donation of CAN Car Co-op vehicle with free membership for all purchasers.
- Level 2 adaptable homes in 5 units on 15th street.
- 10% of homes will be under \$300,000.

Dale Staples reviewed the architecture:

- Mosquito Creek is to the west, there is a co-op building to the north, an industrial site to the east, and the Noma development to the south.
- 735 is a transition project between higher and lower density projects.
- The buildings are oriented north-south which provides a breakdown in the scale of the project along the street and creates courtyards which can be seen from the street.
- Single level studio and two bedroom units on the ground level, with two-storey, two bedroom units above.
- Unit size range from 450 to 1000 sq. ft.
- The architecture echoes the styles of Ron Thom, Fred Hollingsworth and Arthur Erickson.
- Mixture of concrete siding and cedar.
- Two storey glazing and punched window elements.
- Small development which originally was monochromatic; some window elements have been flipped and the option of bay windows has been introduced.
- The colour scheme for the middle building has been changed by reversing the colours used on the two other buildings.

Jon Losee reviewed the landscaping:

- The main landscaping relates to the West Coast modern theme with straight line landscaping, the use of water.
- The landscaping is formal along West 15th with long horizontal lines, arbours, and pergolas as entry features.

- It is layered landscaping and clipped hedges; the constant edge treatment is a unifying feature.
- Due to the grade change the courtyard to street aspect will change and pedestrians will see subtle differences.
- At the corners there will be bio swales diagonal to the site along driveway.
- There will be a water feature at the corner of Mosquito Creek Lane and West 15th, with a meandering pathway, dry stream bed or rain garden.
- Clipped hedges in the courtyards add to privacy.
- On the east of the project will be a functional outdoor space; programmed with a playground, fruit orchard, a gathering area with picnic tables, community gardens, separated from residences with hedges and low fences. There will be espaliered fruit trees against the wall to the industrial site.
- Native-weighted plant list. An ET Manager Module irrigation system, which uses weather forecasting to determine when to water rather than a timer system, will be used to irrigate the gardens which will result in cost savings of 50%.
- Low level lights lighting paths, stairs etc.
- Bicycle parking at corners and in the parkade. There is the potential to provide additional bike parking.
- Units below grade will have pergolas and hedging to protect their privacy.
- The usual parking allocation is 60 stalls; the plan is for 67 plus visitor stalls. Focus groups have indicated that some owners would want more than one stall. A number of the stalls can be used as storage for outdoor equipment.
- A private water feature would have to be approved by Engineering as it is on public land

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Why have you been asked to reduce the number of parking stalls? (A: It has been mentioned that people walk everywhere, but our focus groups ask for more parking.)
- Can you clarify the CAN Car program? (A: It is a non-profit group; people have memberships and drive for user fee. This would be the 4th project we have introduced CAN Car.)
- How do you access the park on the east side? (A: Stairs at either end) No access from Buildings 2 and 3? (A: Perhaps we could put in a ramp.)
- Is the park on the east side a separate lot? (A: No, it is part of the parcel.) No problem in freeing up the space? (A: Cost issue, the parkade is really expensive and drives the cost of the project. The originally proposed density was too much for Planning and Council so we are able to create the community garden instead.)
- It seems you have some unfixed space which now has an extremely rigid plan. What about spreading out or jogging the buildings? You have set an artificial boundary; I dislike projects where the parkade drives the project. (A: They are very small buildings, stepping becomes arbitrary, it would have more benefit with longer buildings.)
- How are Buildings 1 and 2 accessible? (A: There is level access to the adaptable units) You have to go all around the buildings to access them from the parkade? (A: Staff – there is on street parking.) Can it be designated handicapped? (Staff: Possibly for everyone, not just the units.)
- The cycle parking, is it uncovered? (A: Downstairs in the parkade, it is not covered outdoors.)
- Can someone in wheelchair get out of the parkade? (A: There is a low slope from parkade. You cannot have an elevator in a stacked town house development as there is no common corridor.)

- Staff: I am intrigued by the Built Green program – can you briefly highlight it? (A: The program focuses on energy efficiency with 30% plus energy savings, increased insulation in walls, indoor air quality, 50% fluorescent and Led light features, water conservation, etc.)
- With respect to the Ron Thom building you mentioned documenting it, to what purpose? (A: This point was raised by the APC, that there been some community record of it.) Have you looked at ways that you could utilize part of the structure in your development? (A: It is past its life expectancy. Extensive money is spent on maintaining it. We have considered some type of community feature e.g. documentation and onsite plaque.)
- Is public art being discussed? (A: Yes, it is not extensive at the moment; we are thinking about the private/public transition areas. The water features are pushed to the boundaries and there are view corridors from the street due to the orientation of the buildings.
- C. Perry: Engineering generally supports bio swales as long as they are maintained.

Comments of the Panel included but were not limited to:

- I want to commend the applicants on the rich palette and exterior architecture.
- I have some concerns about circulation of site, especially access to east site and overuse of stairs. I realize there are grading challenges. Access from parkade is not good; going round the whole building will not be easy for older person carrying shopping for example.
- Would like bio swale to function.
- The children’s play area only has two small pieces of equipment; can it be something more interesting? I like to see natural features. The rest of the site is really interesting.
- The development is very appropriate for the area.
- I don’t really have concern re repetition, although the amendments do add value and variety to the development and street. The orientation of the buildings is successful.
- I like the stepping of the lower units to Mosquito Creek.
- I like the materiality; it works well and is appropriate for the form.
- The roof access hatches are a little odd. The form seems inconsistent, incongruous with the expression of the rest of the development.
- Buildings 2 and 3 facing the lane seem to have a second-rate finish, flat with second-rate materials; does not serve well for people looking at them. They should be better considered.
- I agree about the accessibility; the community garden definitely needs wheelchair access.
- The Community Garden is a great opportunity to have a useable piece of landscape but the path through the lawn breaks it up into two less usable spaces. It might be more functional if it didn’t break up the lawn.
- The green space needs more useable play area, assuming it is meant to be family-oriented and quite heavily used. Maybe a playhouse could be an art opportunity e.g. in the style of Ron Thom. There should be free space to run and for children’s activities. Why bother with just two things? Why have two paths?
- It is quite hard edged along the lane. There should be plants draped over the wall to make it softer and greener.
- There is an unfortunate rigidity; maybe the landscaping could have been freer in its layout and massing.
- I cringe when you say put solar panels, where would they be and what would they be like? They are a significant element of the design.

- It is good to control the irrigation; I saw plants being watered during the recent downpour.
- I am less concerned about the rigid building because it is a small project with a textured façade
- I am bothered about the accommodation of wheelchair access in the project. Accessibility needs more work.
- I have no problem with solar collectors as long as they are integrated with the architecture.
- It is a compact project and some components are not ideal. I prefer the architecture to the Noma project; it is more refined.
- I do not have a problem with the repetition of architecture as the project is not large enough to be able to absorb a high degree of heterogeneity from one building to the next. I would argue in favour of a more restrained approach. The slight modifications such as bay windows are generally pleasing and fit the project.
- I would reinforce the comments on accessibility. Should the overall grading of project be looked at again? I understand the challenges and trying to mitigate them. Membrane repair on parkade deck will be a big deal.
- Grade separation into unit courtyards and semi-public area is very exclusive and will keep people out of those spaces; should you push it down to reduce some of those transitions? It would be good to have more access.
- I cannot evaluate the effect on the lane of replicating the wall from the Noma residences. I would recommend further exploration of grading on the site generally.
- Is there a shadow analysis? The courtyards are narrow although facing south; they will be quite shady.

Applicant's comments:

- Re: the roof hatches: the original proposal had penthouses but we had to reduce the height of the project. They are not visible from the ground level. They will also have built-in planters
- Re: the Children's play area: there are parks nearby. Our experience with the Noma development is that very few people with children buy into stacked town home projects because of the stairs. The residents at Noma want to rip out the playground. Generally couples, younger people, those downsizing buy into developments liked these. Larson Park is half a block to the north.
- We agree that the hard space along the lane needs softening.
- The idea of solar panels was brought up by APC. 15 solar panels would be required. There is room on south side. The panels would be high up and would not be visible. They would 40 inches or under in size.
- Re: accessibility/grading: this is tough, there is the high cost of going deeper and the water table level is very high with a creek under the site so there is not a lot of depth to go. We may lose some of the accessible units if we push down as they would have to have stairs.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application and OCP amendment for 735 W. 15th and recommends approval subject to the approval, by the Development Planner, of the following:

- the blank wall of the car park to the lane be addressed with further detailing potentially with planting and screening;
- the elevations to Buildings 2 and 3 facing the lane to receive additional articulation in keeping with Building 1;
- accessibility to the community gardens and to the site generally be developed further to provide universal access;
- the planning of the community garden area be reconsidered to provide a larger more usable central space;
- if solar panels are located on the project, they be integrated in a very considered and careful manner addressing visibility from surrounding properties and public spaces and overlook issues;
- extensive interpretative documentation be undertaken for the existing Ron Thom building;
- further consideration to ensure water features are functional in terms of storm water management

Defeated
4 – In Favour
4 – Opposed

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application and OCP amendment for 735 W. 15th and although supporting the site development concept feels the following items have not been adequately resolved:

- the blank wall of the car park to the lane be addressed with further detailing potentially with planting and screening;
- the elevations to Buildings 2 and 3 facing the lane to receive additional articulation in keeping with Building 1;
- accessibility to the community gardens and to the site generally be developed further to provide universal access;
- the planning of the community garden area be reconsidered to provide a larger more usable central space;
- if solar panels are located on the project, they be integrated in a very considered and careful manner addressing visibility from surrounding properties and public spaces and overlook issues;
- extensive interpretative documentation be undertaken for the existing Ron Thom building;
- further consideration to ensure water features are functional in terms of storm water management

Carried unanimously.

There was a short break at 7:00 pm.

Craig Taylor and Barb Westmacott left the meeting at 7: 05 pm

5. Lions Gate Christian Academy (Temporary Use Permit)

The Chair read the motion from the May 12th APC meeting.

The site is on Harbourside waterfront at 925 Harbourside – the CD - 359 Zone. The current zoning allows schools but not temporary buildings. The OCP designation is commercial, which includes private schools.

Rob Tarnowski, Vice Chair, Lions Gate Christian Academy (LGCA), reviewed the project:

- LGCA has been in operation on the North Shore for 15 years.
- It is a non profit organization and has grown from 15 students to 250 students.
- It has been in its current location (the former Maplewood school site) for 6 years.
- They have been looking for a long term solution and were hoping to use school board property; as of February we were informed we had to find a site for 250 students.
- Tight timeline.
- Going from current location to operating school in September – compressed schedule
- Prefabricated modular structure.
- Moveable but not portable classrooms – integrated prefabricated building would look like a normal building from the outside.
- Gym consists of metal trusses covered with fabric with asphalt floor.
- Easily erected and removed.
- Temporary operations within cost constraints.
- Also looking for long term solution for next 20 years to lease or purchase.
- Parking for 52 stalls including 2 handicapped.
- Members of staff require 25-30 parking stalls.
- The setting is the star, not the building; keeping it low and open.
- Clad with cement board and will match the appearance of buildings next door.
- Low key colours to blend into the site.
- Significant portion of the building will use refurbished modules the majority of which come from UBC and a school in the interior.
- School facilities will be made available to community groups.
- Parking will be made available to general public during non-school hours.
- The property is fenced – will be using gravel portion not whole lot.
- Students remain on property at all times.
- The parking lot will be maintained as a crushed gravel surface for water permeability; also able to leave lot as it is found.
- The building will be set back at the rear of the lot.
- The building will have a maximum height of 12 ft; the gym will be 34 ft high.
- Landscaping is designed to be temporary.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Will plantings be above or below surface? (A: Some in the ground but mostly planters.)
No irrigation system? (A: No)
- What is the maximum time you might stay there? (A: Lease is only for four years.
Temporary Use Permit allows for 2 years and 2 year extension. The land is expensive.)

- How do the children come to school? (A: Most by car, carpooling, Translink bus service to Bodwell.) No one walking? (A: No. 99% North Shore residents.)
- Are you doing any paving at all? (A: The gym floor and the handicapped parking spaces will have paving stones to provide a firm surface.)
- Are there outdoor recreation programs? (A: We will be using the fields by Lucas Centre. We bus the children there; currently do that to 29th and Lonsdale).
- Have you discussed with Bodwell the opportunity to share the facilities? (A: Yes; still in preliminary stages, we hope there are things that can be shared.)
- I am curious about the kindergarten play area; is it temporary? (A: It is a removable structure – metal bars etc. and will be moved to the permanent location.)
- There is equipment on stringers which can be placed on rubber matting.
- How big is the kindergarten children's play area? (A: 42 ft x 25 ft)
- Are we permitted to comment on the quality of the building itself? Staff: the units have already been chosen. (A: The units are being completely refurbished.)
- What is the heat source and is there air conditioning? (A: Individual gas units. The central core is also heated. Roof top air conditioning units.) Each room has access to windows? (A: The classrooms are on the outside and are not air-conditioned. The windows can be opened.)
- Are services in place? Water/sewage/gas/Telus/Shaw? Staff: All services are installed to the property line.
- The vinyl canopies on the south elevation; are they for protection from the sun? (A: They are generally for egress and access to the gym door, acting as weather protection as the gym is a separate building. They also help with sun management for the windows.)
- How fixed is the modular planning? Is there any latitude to move things around to get a usable play space? Do you really need a separate children's play area? (A: We like to have a separate playground for kindergarten and Grade 1 children and keep them away from the older children. The tot lot is comparable to our current playground.)
- What is the status of the buildings with the Building Department? (A: There is CSA approval on each building and there will be pre-construction and pre-development meetings. Life safety and egress issues will be addressed.) Staff: LGCA do have to get a building permit. What about heating in the gym? (A: There is wiring for heat/ light etc.)
- If the modules are previously used, did you explore the possibility about making a two-storey building? This would allow some internal classrooms to be on the exterior. (A: This would pose some challenges and be very costly. There would be foundation issues. It would make it a challenge to leave the site as is – would have had to have concrete foundation. All major classrooms are on the exterior and at the rear; the interior rooms are study rooms, meeting rooms etc.)

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- I am concerned about outdoor learning opportunities? Is there some way of increasing play value, learning by installing boulders, logs, somewhere to sit? Not much for kids to do at recess. I encourage you to spend some money to enhance it e.g. by installing a half court basketball court.
- I would like to see the disabled parking spots relocated right next to the access ramp.
- It would be nice to see more space between school and gym.
- The fact it is modular should not limit it from being a good environment for learning and an interesting school. It could be a better environment with more consideration of some of the other issues.

Shira Standfield left the meeting at 7:40 pm.

- There are very few places to sit and for children to hang out. There are lots of interesting temporary things you can get e.g. fast growing trees can be purchased.
- The play space is very spartan and needs more attention.
- What colour is it? (A: Beige, off white to blend with Spa Utopia.)
- Is there a lunch room? (A: Students bring their own lunch and eat it in the classrooms.)
- I understand the financial pressures to have this solution for a 2-4 year period but if this building is going to be part of the City fabric for 4 years there is a reductive quality about it. Every element that could bring joy to it has been expunged from it. I would have a hard time having my kids spend the next 4 years in this building. There is a barrack-like quality to the building. I wish there was something more that could be done.

Presenter's comments:

- We will look at enhancing the central core area e.g. by using interlocking stone or asphalt to create some separation.
- The front entrance vestibule is a fairly large area and is designed for kids to congregate, especially in bad weather.
- We agree with park benches, more planting, tables for gathering areas.
- We can do things to make the building more interesting e.g. by extending the "wiggly lines" to give a point of visual interest.
- We can improve the colour of the exterior to give it more life.

Tony Cailles left the meeting at 7:50 pm

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Temporary Use Permit Application by Lions Gate Christian Academy for 925 Harbourside and recommends approval, subject to the approval, by the Development Planner, of the following:

- improved treatment of the play space areas;
- reconsideration of the colours on the exterior, perhaps with a view to introducing more vibrancy into the exterior expression of the building;
- relocation of the accessible parking spaces westward and closer to the accessibility ramp location;
- work with an expert in children's play to develop the outdoor spaces.

Carried unanimously

6. 83 Chesterfield Avenue – Rezoning

The Chair read the motions from the APC meeting of April 14th and the ADP meeting of April 21st.

The Planner told ADP members that there is nothing further to add from last month.

Foad Rafii, Architect, reviewed the project answering concerns raised by ADP on April 21st.

- They have concentrated on the issues in the resolution of April 21st.
- The SE corner has been opened to provide a tiny commercial space.
- With regard to the concerns expressed about form and colour, they have massaged the design of the building and planned a totally new colour scheme which is more interesting and lively.
- The corridor has been opened up by adding a window and planter box to the north end of the corridor.
- The location of the courtyard cannot be changed by moving it to the east; this would mean units on the property line with no windows. In its present location to the west of the open air corridor, the courtyard is protected from the prevailing wind coming from the east on rainy days; on sunny days the wind comes from the west.
- The use of the courtyard from an active to passive use. It has been treated as a space that would be overlooked with a stepping stone pathway for visual interest. The trellis on the west wall has been changed to a metal trellis from wood. There is a small water feature to give animation to the space. The centre of the courtyard has been built up with a retained edge for soil for planting. There will be a reasonable amount of western sun in the courtyard during the summer. The majority of the plants are shade tolerant with some flowering plants.
- The streetscape has been changed to reflect additional commercial space.
- The planter on the corner defines the corner. The planters on Chesterfield are smaller and will allow some form of infiltration to allow water to enter from north.
- They have kept the seat wall elements.
- The area between the commercial area and courtyard cannot be opened up as there is a two-hour fire separation requirement.
- Regarding solar gain at south, an eyebrow will be installed over the windows to protect them from the sun. The windows on the lane have also been narrowed to half the previous size and will get less sun. They are looking for a high class glass with low solar gain factors in the glass.
- They have talked to the Planning Department who have agreed that the space designated for the Manager's Office could be changed to commercial if there is demand for it.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Thank you for a succinct summary of your response to the resolution
- I support the courtyard for light into the building. Could there be a window over the kitchen sink so that people could see over the passage? (A: We are contemplating it – need the fire rating for it. Would like all the units that can to have a view into the courtyard.)
- I am curious about the landscape plan and corner commercial unit at SE corner; is it surrounded by utility boxes? (A: They are all at grade at the moment, flush with the sidewalk.)
- I am wondering about the exposed aggregate treatment? (A: The treatment matches what is in front of the cinema. We will do whatever Engineering wants with the sidewalk.)
- What is the issue with public art? Is that now replaced by retail? (A: There will be a placard showing the heritage history of the building.) Staff: Public art and heritage items are considered two separate items. Public art is not a component of rental housing. Comment: Maybe the hydro boxes will be wrapped with heritage photos.

- I am looking at the pavement treatment; there is a very humble palette of materials on the sidewalk and side of the building. The textures you encounter with your body are really important. (A: We will do what Engineering to ask us to do)
- What is the idea behind the second floor planter with a tree? Is the planter irrigated? (A: It will not be a tree, but plants. Rain will reach the planter.) Is there a second canopy at the second level? (A: it is the eyebrow.)

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- You have pretty much answered the concerns raised at the last meeting. It has improved and will be an asset to the community.
- I strongly encourage as much visibility, connectiveness and views from the corridor as possible; not just blank walls and no windows.
- There is also a blank wall on the commercial space. Indoor spaces at the ground level do not connect to the courtyard.
- I am looking for more texture on the plane.
- This is a competent solution. In this context this is not a bad solution.
- We were also concerned about what happens when they build next door. Staff: If there is an adjacent property development, Planning would look at having a complementary space. Planning would probably strongly recommend that they wait until there is a larger property available.
- We like being listened to. You have responded very nicely to the comments expressed last time. The project is better for it. The project is stronger than we saw it last time. It is a very good urban building and a badly-needed project. It is great that it is providing rental housing.
- Regarding the material palette: the detail and level of architecture in the façade is greatly improved. I am worried about the orange; it should be brought closer to the bronze family of colours.
- Regarding the landscaping; I am not a fan of planters adjacent to the building, they just wind up being a repository for litter. I do not think they improve the urban quality of the building. I like the gridded pattern of the glazing in the commercial units. I recommend you try to peel back some of the vegetation against the building. Let the building be the building.

Presenter's comments:

- We are working on the overlook into the courtyard; we do not want to use cheap glass or glass block and are looking at "fireguard" glass. For the units behind the corridor, it is a matter of cost. In principle it is a nice idea, but we are not sure if the value is there to put useful vision glazing in the kitchen area, perhaps in the doors instead.
- Regarding the planters, we put them in because of storm water management in the development. Staff: Engineering probably will not let you put the planters in that type of structure; perhaps they can be replaced with a planted bed, not a raised seated area. (A: We will work with staff on it.)

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 83 Chesterfield Avenue and recommends approval subject to the approval, by the Development Planner, of the following:

- review with Engineering of the landscaped treatment of the boulevard and the manner of storm water drainage;
- In the final review of the colour palette for the building have the colour labelled EIFS2166-30 Bronze tone more closely resemble the colours as presented in the application package (and not as presented on the sample board).

Carried unanimously.

There was a short break at 8:40 pm

7. 651 West 14th Street (Rezoning)

The Chair read the motion from the April 14th APC meeting.

G. Venczel provided the staff context. The rezoning application is from single family RS-1 to a CD zone consisting of four attached townhouses. There is an FSR of 0.75 which is permissible under the OCP.

Jordan Kutev reviewed the project.

- He did the rezoning for the corner of 14th street. The owner of the current property approached them about developing their property.
- They have tried to transition the green space from the neighbour to the property, and design yards with enough separation, privacy and sunlight.
- There are some stairs due to the grade differential.
- The APC felt that the 4 parking units at the back were not desirable and recommended allowing for maximum south exposure and increased visibility to lane.
- They have moved 2 parking structures and introduced a carport with trellis. This has opened the living room to the south.
- A clean, contemporary look was the basis for the architecture, including modern- looking canopies for the roof and skylights for the rear building. The exterior will be finished with Hardie Plank and extruded aluminum reveals.
- The grade differential between the patios and green space allow for privacy and sunshine.
- They have tried to increase thermal values and the use of recycled materials as well as higher energy windows, low flush toilets, low energy lighting.
- Impermeable paving is used throughout the landscaping.
- High end finishes are used throughout the project.
- The entry has been redesigned to allow for additional light in the living areas.
- The lower unit has been raised 6-7 ft. to minimize the grade differential.
- The project is designed to 1st level of adaptability.

Cameron Murray reviewed the landscaping plan:

- There are existing willow and magnolia trees on the boulevard; the sidewalk curves to accommodate the trees.
- Permeable paving is used throughout with trench drains in the courtyard and at lane for very rainy days.
- Curved walls create 4 courtyards.
- Columnar trees (beech, flowering cherry) are used to create green curtains. The use of vertical trees creates definition and privacy. The trees will add seasonal changes to the landscape and lots of colour.
- The design includes seating alcoves and perennial garden walks along the sides.
- Removing the two parking stalls to the south opens up more space and lets in more sun.
- Gates and trellises planted with vertical vines are used at the entrances.
- The plan tries to match the grade of the neighbouring property.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- The spaces seem different, how big is the space building to building? (A: 34 ft, there is a big roof overhang.)
- Do you need the overhang on the north building? Have you done a shadow review? Would the patio be shaded?
- The family rooms in Unit B had little light before, now there is a window which looks over a parking space? Does the trellis cover the parking space? Are they looking at parking for the front unit? (A: Yes.)
- An open carport is not as nice as having a garage. The situation is odd: the people in Unit B are looking at Unit A's car.
- I am not clear on the outside material? (A: It is horizontal pattern Hardie Plank siding with vertical aluminum channels.)
- It will have a very panelised look? (A: It is a more contemporary approach with a more commercial look than residential. Planning Department asked for the buildings to be similar to the neighbours yet different.)
- Looking at LA3 cross sections; are the trellises going to be part of the landscape? (A: Yes, we are using vertical elements (trellis, pin oak) due to the constriction of the space.
- Staff: I commend the use of a lot of permeable pavers, is it possible to make part of the garden area, a rain garden, which would take a lot more rain than the pavers? (A: The area is restricted once allowance is made for circulation and courtyards with useful space for family gatherings, there is not much space left. The gardens are terraced with a 6 ft transition. We could look at a water garden instead of the heather planting.)
- I am a bit concerned about the overlook from the patios: A units looking down into the living room patios of the B units, have you raised the B building? (A: Yes, by 6 ft. We hope that the hedge will help prevent the overlook.)
- Question to staff re cellar? Staff: Cellars are exempted as they don't add massing to the building. What about using the space as bedrooms, there is no access except up through the house? Could they be turned into basement suites? Staff: Habitable rooms are allowed in cellars. The design would have been cross-referenced with the Building Code. The site will not allow for exterior stairs.
- Can you give clarification on the glass canopy on units 3 & 4, is it flat? (A: Yes with a gutter.) Why not a sloping canopy? (A: The canopy is in line with roofline and has a minimal slope of 1 or 2%.) I would recommend a reasonable slope to prevent debris collecting on them.
-

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Where the two family room windows overlook the parking stalls, should they be shallow with higher sills to hide the cars?
- My first impression of the building to the east, the open space seemed very constricted on this site compared to the other lot, it seems quite tight. Staff: The space is pretty close to standards. If that is so, you've done well with the landscaping; I would encourage you to continue the detailing with the trellising and bring some kind of rain garden into the bottom garden.
- In terms of the buildings the panelling looks a little flat especially in a residential neighbourhood; maybe it will work well with the detailing It is not as warm as I would want to see
- There is a degree of resolution in the drawings that gives one confidence it will be well executed. It is thought through well; there is a rigor to it. I note there is a relaxation for front and rear setbacks. I would support an even greater relaxation to the front setback, but you may not want to do so because of aligning with the neighbouring building. The material palette, glazing, quasi-commercial appearance to detail in the building gives a toughness to the detailing that I like.
- I am not concerned with the low slope of the glass canopy; it will need to be maintained.
- The uppermost storey on Unit B uppermost story steps inward with a thin and projecting edge; I am not quite sure how it will be executed, expect you will be able to work that out.

Presenter's comments:

- These are good comments. We will look at the windows at the back and look for higher end glazing.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 651 West 14th Street and recommends approval of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for a thorough presentation.

Carried unanimously.

Julia Bitar and Colleen Perry left the meeting at 9:30

8. Other Business

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, June 16th, 2010.

Chair

C:\Users\EPARROTT\AppData\Roaming\OpenText\DM\Temp\CNVLIVE-#188399-v1-ADP_Minutes_2010_05_19.docx