

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, July 19th, 2017

MINUTES

- Present:** B. Checkwitch
K. Bracewell, RCMP
P. Maltby
J.P. Mahé
K. Yushmanova
A. Man-Bourdon
- Staff:** D. Johnson, Development Planner
B. Hurley, Planner 1
R. Fish, Committee Clerk
J. Braithwaite, Development Technician
- Guests:** 242 West 6th Street (Rezoning Application)
Sara Theuerkauf, Proscenium
Hugh Cochlin, Proscenium
Donald Luxton, Heritage Consultant
Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Ltd.
- 1730 Chesterfield (Rezoning Application)
Graham MacLean, MacLean Homes
Josh MacLean, MacLean Homes
Luis Zunino, Garcia Zunino Architects Inc.
Marcela Zunino, Garcia Zunino Architects Inc.
Lena Chorobik, Viewpoint Landscape Architects Inc.
Tom Grunewaldt, Building Manager
- 407 West 16th Street (Rezoning Application)
Karla Castellanos, KCC architecture and design Ltd.
Randolph Rigets, Karl Wein and Associates
Sarab Kaler, KLR Building
Harry Lee Haggard, Harry Lee Landscape Architect Ltd.
- Absent:** J. Geluch
B. Phillips
B. Harrison

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:38 p.m.

1. Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held June 21st, 2017

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held June 21st, 2017 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

2. Business Arising

- The Director of Community Development is retiring. The retirement party is planned for August 16th, the same night as the August ADP meeting.
- Considering options to reschedule the August meeting to a different date in August or have two meetings in September.
- The Panel agreed to have two in September. The additional meeting will be decided on at a later date.

3. Staff Update

D. Johnson reviewed the status of ongoing development projects.

4. 242 West 6th Street (Rezoning Application)

This application is seeking to rezone this 6,001 square foot (50.00' x 120.02') lot from the current RT-1 (Two-Unit Residential 1) Zone to a Comprehensive Development Zone to permit a three-unit development. The project consists of a heritage house that will be converted into a two unit building fronting West 6th Street and an additional single unit infill building in the rear yard. Three surface vehicle parking stalls are proposed to the East of the rear infill building that would access the lane. This site is designated Level 3 (FSR not to exceed 0.75 times the Lot Area) in the Official Community Plan (OCP). This development is also located in the Ottawa Gardens Heritage Conservation Area and is subject to that area's Guidelines. This is the project's first submission to the Advisory Design Panel and has been evaluated concurrently by the Heritage Advisory Committee on July 18.

Staff would be interested in the Panel's input regarding the following:

- The design and façade of the buildings as they respond to the West 6th St.;
- The visibility of entrances and the sense of arrival for all units;
- The design treatment of the heritage building as it related to lane and neighbours;
- The design treatment of the infill building's façades and landscaping;
- Appearance and design of the lowest level extensions;
- The rear courtyard and parking design and treatment of multiple levels;
- Sustainability and energy performance commitments; and
- Livability and CPTED responses in this revised design.

Hugh Cochlin, Proscenium Ltd., described the project to the Panel:

- Our goals are to be family friendly with an activating laneway, planning for growth.
- We want to provide an opportunity for a range of housing densities, diversified in type, size and location.
- There is a two bed unit on the west side, a three bed unit on the east side and a two bedroom infill unit.
- As for sustainability development goals, the building retention is working towards this. It uses environmentally friendly materials, with an Energuide rating of 80 or above for the infill house.
- High performance windows, LED lighting and water efficient fixtures.
- Located in the historic Ottawa gardens.
- Our goal is to preserve the house; we are dealing with an existing building that needs a little TLC. It has been neglected and will need a high degree of preservation and rehabilitation.
- Treatment of all the listed character defining elements include colour scheme, repairing materials as required, restoration work with restoring things to the house that aren't heritage friendly. We want to enhance the heritage character.
- The house is preserved in its existing location but will need new foundation and will not be raised from current location.
- Maintaining existing materials on the exterior.
- In regards to massing, the height is a 2-storey structure but has a basement.
- We will extend with the new build portion on the ground level, reinstate the existing entry route, are keeping the two bay windows, large roof, the curve of the shingle and porch defining elements.
- We are following heritage guidelines with a cedar roof and the shingles are all the same.
- The elements are to be distinctly new of this time period but still within the heritage guidelines.
- There will be black anodized windows on the infill but on the heritage house there will be a reinstatement of the heritage windows.
- There will be addressing at street level and second addressing at the doors.

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

- The existing sidewalk and front boulevard have been retained.
- The front yard space is broken into a semi-private patio space.
- Accessible from ground level.
- Hedging along the west side of property to infill house, taller trees.
- Separating two units with hedging and a privacy screen.
- Screen planting on the rear to separate from the parking.
- It is a multi-purpose space that will evolve over time.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- The extension of the basement facing West 6th, why have you done this and how was it received by HAC? **A:** It is to increase square footage. The alternative was to move the building forward but we felt that was more intrusive and less respectful – this way the house stays in its original location and doesn't disrupt its relationship to the street.

The idea is through the terrace landscaping plan that there will not be a lot of visual impact. Moving it forward would have done this. This was felt as the best approach. The HAC comments did not impact that part of the design.

- Staff: The major question was the nature of the entry and how it connected to the overall design.
- I like the fact that you have added modern components in the heritage aspect, could you add more stone? **A:** There is an opportunity yes, if we want to. Now we're using the heritage stone and reutilizing it on the heritage building, but we could bring a stone element through.
- For the infill, what's limiting its size? It seems small, can it be larger? **A:** If we start to grow it, it will go over the allowed FSR. We agree it is tight, but it allows views through the corridor.
- Staff: We are treating this as a triplex as opposed to two independent units. There is a distance between openings that they are trying to attend to and at the level above the terrace; those are separated back to more common distances for a coach house. They also have the parking to reckon with.
- Is the unit liveable in current size? **A:** It's contained within its current size.
- Any chance of providing greenery on the carport roof? **A:** Yes.
- The retaining walls on the street side, what is the material? **A:** It is shown as cast concrete with hedging to screen them off.
- Is the Infill building hardie panel? **A:** No, we are proposing flat panel with a half inch reveal.
- With long term weathering, will the paint fade well at same rate? **A:** It does fade to a very nice lighter colour.
- For the infill site, the terrace adjacent to that, can you show the separation between that terrace and the terrace for the resident unit? **A:** The infill suite should have a two point access system, the front door access is at grade and you can step up to go to the carport level.
- You access infill unit from the street, up the stairs and down the backside of the house then approach at grade and the carport up the stairs? **A:** Yes.
- Will there be a spot for future electric cars? **A:** Yes.
- In the front door of the units I don't see a place to put coats? **A:** Interior layouts are in flux and will change but yes there will be a coat closet.
- The bedrooms don't show dressers, are the bedrooms capable of having dressers? **A:** Yes based on the units we've worked on, these are very generous.
- How do you transition to east and west properties? **A:** The neighbour will most likely want a fence, now it is just the site slipping down. On the other side we are building a terracing system and retaining wall, both sides are hedged.
- What is the east side unit access? **A:** You walk up the stairs and the door is there.
- On the west side, can you walk up side? **A:** Yes, up the stairs to the front door, and access to the secondary suite is below on the side.
- Do you have a heritage consultant on board? **A:** Yes.
- The corner window extends out; did the heritage consultant have anything to say about that? **A:** We have more latitude to do this – it is an intervention which helps to distinguish it as something not original.
- Does the carport shelter work structurally? **A:** It will be interesting to see if it does, we are working on this.
- What is the material of columns on the canopy? **A:** A wood column system, but it may be a steel element to steel plate and the wood will be a decoration.

- For the black anodized windows, is there a cream or white trim? **A:** Yes.
- In regards to the window on upper floor, are you happy with that proportion on the back? **A:** It needs more resolution.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Recommend the use of more stone.
- The secondary suite entry needs weather protection or recessing of the door.
- Above it, the closed in veranda at the entry is all glass. It's a lost opportunity to put a powder room in.
- The design of the carport has exciting details.
- There's a suggestion of a trellis in the landscape plan, coordinate and bring that throughout.
- The concrete walls could use simple articulation, something to speak to the overall neighbourhood character. They look a bit cold and modern, give them a contemporary look.
- Play with the plant selection, bring more traditional plants, roses would help the project blend in and give it a modern twist.
- Infiltration is a concern. There's an opportunity to use permeable concrete unit pavers.
- Green roof idea on top of the carport is a great idea.
- The carport is great, it allows flexibility and growth. It provides openness.
- Make sure the language of openness and visual permeability enhances the livability.
- The address signage is busy on the west side; make sure there's signage for the lower unit.
- Maintain a line of sight on the movement predictor pathway with clear and concise signage.
- This is a great project with a lot of effort put into it and a considered interplay of old and new.
- Achieved density without looking tightly fit.

Presenter's comments:

Thank you for all the comments.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 242 West 6th Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Ensure clear signage on the street front with clear delineation for the infill building;
- Consider the inclusion of a trellis in the landscape;
- More articulation and detailing of the concrete walls in the landscape;
- Inclusion of permeable paving;
- Consider a green roof on the carport;
- Ensure that landscape does not encroach into the path to the infill property;
- Review the possibility of including stone in the base walls;
- Review the possibility for a canopy above the lock-off suite entry; and
- Consider design development regarding the functionality of the glazed porch.

The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

Carried Unanimously

5. 1730 Chesterfield (Rezoning Application)

The site is in Central Lonsdale at the S.E Corner of Chesterfield Avenue and West 18th Street, a block away from Lonsdale Avenue. It is currently occupied by a wood frame 3-storey rental building, of 30 years old, comprising 42 rental suites of 1 and 2 bedrooms. The intended project is an 87unit rental building, six-storey wood frame over 1 level of underground parking. This project proposes the development and replacement of rental units as a public benefit.

This is the second appearance of this application for the Panels review. The first was back on May 17, 2017 where the panel made the following resolution:

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 1730 Chesterfield and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the issues listed below:

- Review the setback issue to help the livability of the lane side patios;
- The facade treatment and the articulation of the façade materials needs further design development;
- Explore different railing as an opportunity to articulate the façade ;
- Explore the opportunity of using partial roofscape for public amenity as well as decrease heat island affect ;
- Look at the unit floorplans with regards to livability and furniture layout;
- Explore the opportunity for electric outlets in the parking area for both cars and e-bikes;
- Explore possibility of a car share stall or designated spot for signage in front;
- Explore public art contribution for the project;
- Explore setbacks on upper levels;
- Exploration of natural light in stair wells;
- Consideration of increased interior and exterior amenity space ; and
- Tree replacement should strive to replicate the character of the existing trees being taken out.

The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

Carried Unanimously

Staff asked Panel for feedback on how well the applicant responded to the May 17th motion and if the changes introduce additional comments.

Luis Zunino, Garcia Zunino Architects Inc. reviewed the response to the resolution:

- We moved the whole building towards the line of setback at Chesterfield.

- We are 20ft at Chesterfield which give us more space on the lane at the back.
- In terms of façade, we produced subtle changes by simplifying the corridors of the building and worked on the columns in the corners.
- We worked on improving the design of the main entrance and canopy.
- We modified the windows at the 5th and 6th level and eliminated the bars at the windows.
- Unified the shape and size of the windows on the 5th and 6 floors.
- Incorporated guard rails with glass in the whole building.
- Incorporated a roof patio with planting for the community in the building.
- Combined with change in the interior of the buildings, we moved the amenity room from second floor to the 6th floor – it is close to the main stairs so people can access and use the roof area at the same time.
- We provided natural light to the main stairs.
- We reviewed and incorporated the furniture which was one of the requests.
- We incorporated six electric car spaces and 19 e-bike spaces with the possibility to expand those connections.
- The owner is committed to discussing a car share opportunity with the City.
- We dedicated the corner of 18th and Chesterfield for public seating and public art.
- We maintained setbacks at the north and south of the building.
- The main staircase has natural light from the top.
- The amenity space has a balcony and is connected to the roof.
- We made changes to the design of the tree placement.
- The movement of the building gave us 19 or more feet of setback in the rear.
- The canopy is close by to the property line now.
- We simplified the corridors.

Lena Chorobik, Viewpoint Landscape Architects Inc., reviewed the landscape plan:

- On the street we added evergreen trees.
- We added a public seating area in the corner and a public art piece to commission.
- Will be using reclaimed wood on the benches.
- Mixture of deciduous and evergreen trees.
- We enlarged the entry to building making it a gathering space with benches.
- Private gardens have become more usable; generous backyards with planting.
- Added a garden on the roof. The size of the space is related to what's underneath. It will be a hot sunny spot so we've provided trellises and shade trees on the south side of the seating area.
- Added a raised vegetable garden for residents as well as a tool shed, work table and compost bin.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Has further building code analysis been done for the rooftop? **A:** Yes, it's possible.
- Is there glazing around stairwell to bring light? **A:** Yes.
- Can you bring the work table and gardening sink together? **A:** Yes.
- How does the amenity space relate to the unit beneath in terms of noise? **A:** It will have to comply with code and be insulated properly.

- Are the outdoor spaces on the back extensions? **A:** Yes, there are fences between. What separates the patio from the greenspace? **A:** Long planter wall and planting in the entire area separates the neighbours.
- What is the grade difference? **A:** 18 inches.
- Are you using windows certified by the Passive House Industry? **A:** No.
- On the roof, do you require two exits? **A:** No because of the size.
- Are the elevators hydraulic? **A:** Yes.
- On the elevations it looks like the corner columns are orange, some are different, is that shading? **A:** Yes, they are all the same colour.
- Unit J, would the plan work better if the bedrooms were interchanged? **A:** They require one of the bedrooms to be accessible, it could be modified but we decided to make one accessible, however it could be either.
- Will the hydro transformer be a shield to the parking lot? Will it be clearly visible with a clear line of sight from parking lot stairs? **A:** The hydro will be 4ft high. The space between the hedges will be 8-10 feet, large and open enough for clear view.
- Is that the same for the other stairs coming out? **A:** Yes, all low planting in front.
- What is purpose of the lane running down the lawn? **A:** It's meant as a usable and private area for residents to come out and use the space.
- Is the material for the soffit a fiber cement product with wood finish? **A:** Yes.
- Does it have easy trim? **A:** Yes.
- Is it lap siding or flush? **A:** We were thinking to lap siding between the floors, there was discussion of potential shrinking in the building. Lap would absorb better. We can discuss this more in detail. The long term conditions of the property are a concern.
- When the drawings were developed was the intent that it would be lap siding? **A:** Yes.
- Easy trim will be anodized aluminum? **A:** It could be galvanized metal. At this stage we don't go into a deep study of the details of the building. After the study we can come up with a definite way of solving the corners. We want to show a very thin line of metal in general.
- I'm questioning the authenticity of the rendering. I wonder if that's what's going to be delivered to the City? **A:** The final product will have great details in the building. We are confident to produce the details in the rendering.
- In the write-up you talk about high performance windows, can you tell us more about the windows? **A:** No, not yet. Only a basic consultation has been had so far. We will do the windows that are required for building code. It's not going to be a specific window for Passive House but we are supposed to meet the energy modelling. We will finalize the decisions of the window later.
- In the sustainability statement, you checked the box in the yes column, is it accurate? **A:** Yes.
- Is the soffit material the same as the wing wall? **A:** Yes, it could be that or a metal one.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- The success of the project will be in its details.
- You've made good moves with the amenity close to the rooftop garden and the addition of a rooftop garden.
- The improvement made to the landscape is in a good direction.

- With the level six amenity space, there's an opportunity to have a stronger relationship with the roof deck so that if there's an event happening, part of it could go upstairs.
- Add benches or a picnic table so the amenity has a reason to spill out to the roof.
- Would like to see more garden plots on the rooftop, it needs a trellis or shade structure.
- Suggest looking into the opportunity to have the amenity space on the ground floor close to the lobby so it's closer to where the energy is and can spill out to the outdoor space.
- The rooftop space needs more seating, a small space like this still gets used.
- The greenspace is great on the east side, consider that a child may be accessing it and add a small step stair for better access.
- Thank you for addressing all the comments from the panel, the project has improved.
- It's difficult to know what products will be used which makes it difficult to critique.
- It's good to hear that you are standing behind the details and their development.
- More can be done with the amenity space on the 6th floor.

Presenter's comments:

- Thank you for comments from two months ago, the project is better now.
- It forced us to do a little more work.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 1730 Chesterfield and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Consider further development of the amenity space and its possible connection to the roof space;
- Explore the possibility for more gardens on the roof space;
- Consider the possibility of having the amenity space on the ground floor;
- Ensure that if the amenity space is on the roof, that it has a substantial STC rating on the assembly;
- Consider making the lobby space more conducive to social activity; and
- Review of access to the greenspace at the back and the possibility to add stairs.

The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

Carried Unanimously

6. 407 West 16th Street (Rezoning Application)

This is an application to rezone the site from One Unit Residential to a Comprehensive Development to accommodate the development of a three-unit townhouse.

This is the third appearance of this application for the Panel's review. The first was on July 20, 2016 where the Panel made the following resolution:

“THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 407 West 16th Street and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the issues listed below. The Panel looks forward to reviewing the applicant’s response at a future meeting.

- Further review of massing, proportions, materiality, colour and detailing to create a better relationship with the context and neighbouring developments;
- More accurate representation of the project in the renderings.”

A second appearance took place on October 4, 2016 where the Panel made the following resolution:

“THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 407 West 16th Street and thanks the applicant for the resubmission. The Panel feels that the following concerns have not been adequately resolved or explained and looks forward to further review at a future meeting:

- Further review of massing, proportions, materiality, colour and detailing to create a better relationship with the context and neighbouring developments;
- The submission of a material board with the updated materials and colours;
- Provision of a layout with furniture for units B and C; and
- More accurate representation of the project in the renderings.”

Karla Castellanos, KCC Architecture and Design Ltd. reviewed the response to the resolution:

- The intent is to introduce something more contemporary.
- We have provided a solution with sloped roofs.
- We changed the materials so they blend a bit better with neighboring homes.
- The interior of the units has not changed much.
- We have provided decks at the back of the units.
- The front unit is accessed from 16th Avenue and will be clearly indicated.
- The back units have a presence on 16th Avenue on the left side of the property, with pedestrian access to the units at the back.
- We created privacy and separation between the two back properties as they enter through a walkway.

Harry Lee Haggard, Harry Lee Landscape Architect Ltd., reviewed the landscape plan:

- There are rain gardens along the covered area with hydrangeas on it and maples on either side to soften the look to tie it together and provide screening.
- The plants will have good colour through the year.
- There will be a lot of native plant material.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- The access to the rear is by the pathway at the side? **A:** Yes.
- What is running along the side? A fence and gateway? **A:** Yes.

- Is the middle garage accessed through the front? **A:** They will access through a walkway in the front center.
- How steep is the driveway from garage to lane? **A:** It is basically level to the back lane; there is a minor slope for drainage.
- What's the difference between street and lane? **A:** 214.2 in the middle 210.4 in the back.
- The summary shows six parking stalls, where is the sixth? **A:** It will be double parking in the center.
- Will the site coverage be 35% or less? **A:** We will need to get back on that, do not have the correct number.
- Can you see the units in the back from the street looking head on? **A:** We pushed the units to either side to get a better view; you can see half of the door from the front.
- What is the material of the central walkway? **A:** Concrete.
- Is the retaining wall to create separation? **A:** Yes.
- The back units' bedrooms are below grade, what is the solar access? **A:** It is good.
- Is there a need for a guardrail? **A:** Yes
- What happens if there is a fire? **A:** The front unit has access from the outside and in the bedroom you can get out from the window.
- How accurate is the material of the cladding? **A:** It is 80-90% accurate.
- You indicated a checkmark for a play space and habitat restoration, where is it happening? **A:** Throughout the site, we have native plants and flowers, a play place can happen on all greenery parts.
- What is driving the angle of the roof? **A:** It is a response to the bylaw height requirements and a mirror of neighboring homes.
- Have you reached the max height? **A:** Yes, we are within the bylaw setbacks just at maximum right at the bridge.
- Are you hitting the maximum FSR? **A:** Yes.
- Because of the height and FSR, the basements being where they are, are they not counted with the FSR? **A:** Yes.
- Is there any opportunity to have some kind of green roof on the garages or have them be accessible from the units? **A:** We did provide that as accessible before but there was a concern with providing privacy between units and neighbours – we retracted that idea.
- Staff: There were concerns with neighbour overlook with the roofs that are exposed. We would consider a green roof for the garages.
- I'm confused about the solar orientation on B and C facing east and west? **A:** We do have the constraining issues of the property itself and have taken the best advantage that we can.
- Do you think future solar collectors will happen with asphalt roofs? **A:** Yes, we can allow for that.
- Do you think this project is a high quality project that's contributing to our community? Or are you just asking for rezoning so you can build more? **A:** I do believe this is not a high end home but it's an adequate home for the neighbourhood. We will meet the standards of the area and improve it by providing a new finish in the façade versus what is there right now.
- In your report you talk about the building being durable – how is this different from a typical project in that it's more durable? **A:** The quality of the building adheres to different levels of stringent rules; it goes through building inspections and a national home warranty. The windows are high efficiency with a lifetime warranty.

- Is there anything that's not typical construction? **A:** 2x6 walls.
- That's still typical construction.
- Can you talk more about the environmentally friendly materials you've used? **A:** Some will be green materials, like the finishes inside the home, flooring and paint.
- What makes them environmentally friendly? **A:** Green certified vinyl, the paint will not be oil based.
- Where will there be green certified vinyl? **A:** On the windows.
- You checked off amenities for seniors users, can you explain? **A:** The front unit is accessible – easy access from the street without stairs.
- You're not actually constructing something that is usable to seniors? **A:** Unit 8 has a living room area that could be converted to a bedroom so they don't have to use the stairs.
- So the response to make it usable is to make the living room into a bedroom? **A:** Yes.
- Is it awkward to have the stair and landing right in front of the window? **A:** Below the stairs will be a small chunk of window. We may have to revise the height of the window and raise the seat of the window.
- Will the paving be permeable? **A:** Yes, especially in the parking area.
- You checked off in the checklist that plans allow for social interaction, how does it promote this? **A:** It will start from the parking garage. At the main entrance there will be an opportunity where there is greenery; this will create a sense of community. There are coinciding public spaces at the entry points.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Have robust entry points well visible from street level.
- When first responders come, if there is low level signage they must be able to see unit identification, especially for the units at the back.
- There is no plan that shows how the space works between unit A, B and C.
- Privacy for the outdoor living space for B and C is not very private as well.
- There is a lack of clarity; there are discrepancies from page to page of the package.
- All the materials are very dark, it could feel imposing.
- Not all the items are resolved, I don't have confidence we will see the improvements suggested.
- There's a lack of permeability.
- Consider moving the middle parking space to make greenspace.
- Ensure it blends with rest of street. We need to see more imagery that shows that.
- To staff: To fit in the context, was a slope roof suggested? **A:** A flat roof did not correlate with other buildings in the area.
- Staff: There are two ways of measuring building height, one on the side and on the ridge itself. It is maxing on the roof plate on the exterior walls, not the ridge.
- The basement rooms are not liveable. As a rezoning, ask planning to look at how much these can be elevated above ground without triggering added floor space to the FSR to make them more livable.
- Staff: We look at windows to extend above the grade.
- Look at access to the garage roofs, unit A has to go somewhere.
- Staff: To meet minimum requirements, it would need 3 stalls.
- Would recommend going to 3 to make the roofs more appealing and accessible.
- Put in solar collectors.

- Make the materials more natural. Use cedar shingles and wood siding.
- It's really hard to understand the presentation without the context, the model is difficult to read, a lot of elements are lacking; railing, context and landscaping.
- There is a lot of density and bedrooms. If all are 4 or 5 bedroom, you need to do better job of providing amenity and putting in so many parking stalls doesn't need to be the priority.
- Open spaces don't seem to work or be usable right now.
- The low grade bedrooms are a hazard and have not been thought out.
- There are houses next door with high pitches and they look fine. The roof shape seems to be off.
- The site needs to flow better. More development needs to happen to bring elements together and be a livable project.
- The presentation is not complete. It lacks the context and landscape. The design elements are not represented at all.
- I question whether the project was ready to come to the Panel at this stage.
- It lacks quality and is below all the presentations we've seen on the Panel.
- The corridor divides the space in-between and goes against notions of social interaction.
- There is a disagreement between the Panel and project team whether all items on the checklist are represented in the project.
- There are questions on durability, the content of materials and construction are checked off on the list but we don't see how it will be carried out in the project.
- There is an attempt to make the materials appear natural but they aren't.
- We can't recommend council approve this project if there isn't more effort in creating a more quality project.

Presenter's comments:

- We have had limitations with the renderings, I understand but that's our software.
- We've tried to lighten up the materials with the board and sketch up in the package.
- We agree the colours are darker than what they will be. Our hope was that the board would clarify those questions.
- In terms of the walkway, this is a rezoning application. There is an intention of what it could become.
- We've created those fences and hoping there will be green growing in there.
- We need to find a common ground. We are not at the level that we can develop the detailing.
- Every turn with the Panel has been a no.
- We've changed the colours to a softer colour, explored different solutions.
- We need to find a solution in the form of the building so we can further develop it.
- We need have a path that we can follow, not shut doors all the time.
- For the materials, walk way and bedrooms at the back, this is common practice in projects in the City.
- We can explore access to the garage roofs but we have to set a common ground on what the solution could be to make it work.
- There is an opportunity to make a community space in the back.
- We would like to develop more in the courtyard. The garages aren't a great space to do that.

- There could be space in the middle to share planting.
- There needs to be more clarity as to durability. Hardy panels are proven to last forever if the detail is well done. If we incorporate natural materials then durability will go down.
- We are hearing opposite comments now from what was said before.
- Would like to have clarity of what to do if we move forward or not. We need something more concrete.

The panel had an informal discussion on how to move forward with a motion.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 407 West 16th Street and considers the design has not been significantly improved upon since its previous presentation and now recommends rejection. The Panel reiterates its previous concerns, of which the following remain outstanding:

- The units at the rear are blocked off by the units at the front and the identification of the units is problematic;
- The parking at the rear will create conflict;
- The material choices are cumbersome;
- The roofs at the entry and living area are awkward;
- The space outside the living rooms should have privacy;
- The plan doesn't indicate how privacy is created;
- There is a significant lack of clarity in the presentation;
- The materials are too dark and imposing;
- There is a lack of finesse in the design and the presentation;
- There is a lack of resolution in the materials and detailing;
- There is a lack of visual permeability from the front property line to the rear;
- The rear massing is too large;
- There is a lack of clarity about how the form and character fits in with the context;
- The Panel finds the basement bedrooms unliveable due to a lack of natural light;
- The flat roofs over the parking stalls should maximize potential;
- The materials are man-made but are trying to appear natural and the project should use real, natural materials;
- The project lacks appeal;
- The project doesn't sufficiently describe the landscape;
- The items in the checklist are not clearly represented in the presentation itself;
- The project can do a better job of providing amenities;
- The site design is unusable considering the density on the project site;
- The below grade bedrooms are unresolved and hazardous; and
- The presentation should be of a higher quality.

The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

Carried Unanimously

7. Design Award Nominations

- D. Johnson will send out a package with a list of the nominations.

8. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:10pm

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, August 16th, 2017.



Chair

