

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, March 19th, 2014**

---

**MINUTES**

---

- Present:** B. Allen  
K. Bracewell, R.C.M.P  
H. Besharat  
A. Epp  
B. Harrison  
A. Larigakis  
P. Maltby  
M. Messer  
D. Siegrist  
Councillor Bell
- Staff:** E. Adin, Deputy Director, Community Development  
M. Lynch, Manager, Planning Development  
C. Perry, Supervisor, Development Servicing  
M. Epp, Planner 2, Community Development  
S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk
- Guests:** **Foot of Lonsdale Public Open Space/Presentation House Gallery**  
Heather Reinhold, Manager, Waterfront Project  
Reid Shier, Presentation House Gallery  
John Patkau, Patkau Architects  
Joseph Fry, Hapa Collaborative plus others  
**313-315 West Keith Road**  
Augustine Hii, Augustine Hii Architecture  
Bill Curtis, Bill Curtis and Associates Design Ltd.  
Kevin Connery, Landscape Architect: Blue and Green Design Studio  
Mira Kaikov, Owner  
**175 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street – Marlborough Tower II**  
David Sander, Hollyburn Properties  
Don Redden, Redden Management  
Richard White, Project Consultant  
Foad Rafii, Rafii Architects Inc.  
Frank Marino, Rafii Architects Inc.  
Randy Sharp, Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architecture  
Lisa Van Haastrecht, Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architecture
- Absent:** M. Saii
- 

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:05 p.m.

**1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held March 19th, 2014**

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held March 19th, 2014 be adopted.

**Carried Unanimously**

**2. Business Arising**

None.

**3. Staff Update**

E. Adin reviewed relevant planning development, project and policy items from the February 24<sup>th</sup>, and March 3<sup>rd</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Council meetings.

*H. Besharat left the meeting and returned with the delegation.*

**4. Foot of Lonsdale Public Open Space / Presentation House Gallery**

M. Epp introduced the project which was previously reviewed at the November 20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

Staff asked for the Panel's comments on the proposed plaza and building design considering the larger context of Lower Lonsdale revitalization. Specifically, staff requested feedback on the proposed materials for the gallery, its contextual sensitivity and relationship to existing and proposed adjacent development, the treatment of the western façade abutting the Spirit Trail, the functionality of the ground floor space below the cantilevered portions of the building, the articulation and differentiation of the retail units, legibility of entryways and public and private view impacts.

Heather Reinhold, Manager, Waterfront Project, reviewed the proposed open space at the Foot of Lonsdale and the response to the ADP motion of November 20th:

- The project will be going to Council for referral to Public Hearing with a plan to begin construction in the fall of 2014.
- The public art contribution has been increased to \$500,000 from \$235,000.

John Patkau, Patkau Architects, reviewed the changes to the Presentation House Gallery design:

- The building height has been reduced by five feet.
- The building is relatively small in relation to surrounding buildings such as Lonsdale Quay, the ICBC building, the Pinnacle Hotel. How the building appears from above is very important.
- The plan for the ground floor has been adjusted. The community outreach space has been moved to the second floor with outlook to the south.
- The lobby is on the east side and café wraps around to the south. The glass on the south façade has been wrapped around the corner to the west side which gives more connection and penetration to the interior of the building from the Spirit Trail. Retail has

been added to the north-west corner. Carrie Cates Court is now animated with the relocation of the gallery store to the north-east corner.

- The footprint of the upper floor has been reduced by 100 feet by adding a small mezzanine space.
- The height of the gallery space has been reduced by six feet and is now flat with a constant roof height of 14 feet rather than rising to 20 feet at one point.
- The stair that used to be on the western edge has been turned around the corner.
- There are views into the café on the western side of the building.
- Interior lighting will be limited to the soffit of the overhang of the building.
- They are working Keith Panel Systems developing panels for the exterior.
- The soffit is very important due to the significant overhangs; polished aluminum is proposed.

Joseph Fry, Hapa Collaborative, reviewed the landscape plan:

- The size of the tidal plaza has been expanded.
- The Spirit Trail pattern has been applied to help wayfinding.
- They are working with Golder on the design of the intertidal bench so that it is cohesive with the rest of the design.
- Schematic lighting will include laneway lighting suspended over the lane and lighting in the soffit.
- The parking on the west laneway has been realigned with Washington Marine Group to allow for open conditions for pedestrians. Views into the lane are open. The lane is compressed for about 20 metres between the Washington Marine Group and the gallery which acts as a gateway to the trail with views to the water.
- The laneway aligns with the laneway across Carrie Cates Court.
- There will be an opaque fence between the Washington Marine Group and the walkway.
- The dock will remain in place with a tidal storm water garden over the structure to capture and filter storm water.
- Basalt paving will probably be used in the tidal plaza.
- The mega bench will be faceted to accommodate different levels of comfort for seating; it will be constructed with a steel substructure with four variables in the seating structures. Wood is a durable material to use for the bench.

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

- What is the reason for the height change? **A:** The curator did not like the height of the gallery so we lowered it to 14 feet from 20 feet.
- The public walkway is still metal grating? **A:** Yes.
- Will public art be incorporated into the panels? **A:** It is a possibility. We will see what the artists develop.
- What is the water feature? **A:** The feature will have a series of computer-generated water programs.
- You describe the intertidal bench; has the decision be made that the PGE station will not be there? **A:** No; Council has not made that decision.
- Will there be a mural on the north side of the building? **A:** We have three to four themes included in the public art strategy; it has not been decided.
- Is there exhibition space at grade? **A:** The actual galleries are on the second floor; there will be art on the main level: the large wall on the inside face of the lobby, the shop area and a small panel inside the glass of the north face of the building on Carrie Cates Court.

- How does the building meet the ground plane? **A:** 85 to 90% of the building has glass right to the floor, the exception is the mechanical and shipping and receiving areas on the west side.

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

- I am excited by the project. It will be a wonderful addition to the City. It is in scale with the site. I like the massing and saw tooth element. I like the openness of the ground plane. I am intrigued by the finishes. It will put us on the map internationally.
- I am very interested in the raised planter area in terms of habitat and improving the site ecology.
- The changes to the west side have addressed the concerns with regard to the Spirit Trail. I like the changes at the north-west corner. The trail moves through the site reasonably well.
- I question the incision in the concrete at the tidal park; I wonder if it is necessary or enhances the plaza to have the level change. It could be an impediment to the activities.
- The overhang is a strong architectural gesture and presents a challenge with regard to daylight for the café but the reflective soffit will help. Use lighter concrete to bring light into the building. Perhaps increase the height of the soffit; the higher the soffit the better the experience.
- The entry is in an appropriate place.
- The mega bench is an interesting feature; there should there be more opportunities to penetrate through it.
- I am very excited about the project and the amount of art work. Fantastic job.
- Make the foyer as big as possible to maximize the space.
- Use art on the large walls. I love it.
- I support the mega bench; the design is better than before.
- I would encourage abandoning the idea of jets in the water feature; it is old fashioned and will diminish the feature. Do something unique; maybe consider another element for the water e.g. misting systems to create fog on a sunny day.
- Very well done; it will be the “gem” of Lower Lonsdale. Some of us wanted the building taller. It is well handled; the west side has been opened up.
- With regard to wayfinding; you want the trail to meander a bit.
- The usability of the mega bench is great. I have a problem with the materiality of it being wood; it will become wet and carved with initials. The form is perfect; very well done.
- I would like to feel more confident about the tidal features. It needs to be very successful, maintainable, proven out. Make sure it works. Has it worked before?
- Thank you for the thorough presentation; it has come a long way from the first time.
- It is going to create a lot of natural surveillance. I echo comments about art on the west wall; you do not want to attract graffiti or vandalism. I encourage anti-skateboarding measures as it can cause nuisance issues at night. I like the lighting.
- Possibly use a reflective art feature from the ground under the soffit for more light.
- The usability of the mega bench is extremely important; the angles and how you sit needs a lot of exploration to be done right. I would support the use of wood but it has to be treated properly and maintained.
- Porosity at the edges is brilliant and adds to the flavour of the building.
- The way it meets the ground plane is very exciting.
- The art plan has huge potential. I hope it is not about one piece but more contextual that could help all the spaces.
- Council will want to see the PGE alternative.

**Presenter's comments:**

- It has been a very interesting process and ongoing discussion with the Design Panel has been very helpful, giving an opportunity to look at project and think it through. The information has allowed us to develop our understanding of the project.
- We appreciate the feedback and guidance. The editing of the bench and tidal plaza is important and we will continue to do it. We are working with detailed habitat biologists and hope it will provide places for mussels, barnacles etc. It will be visible at low tide and will disappear at high tide.
- There will be a PGE option for Council's decision.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the proposed design for the public open space at the Foot of Lonsdale and the Rezoning Application for the Presentation House Gallery and recommends approval of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for the quality of the proposal and the Panel commends the applicant for a thorough presentation.

**Carried Unanimously**

*M. Epp left the meeting at 6:15 p.m.*

*The Panel had a short break at 6:15 p.m.*

*The Panel reconvened at 6:30 pm.*

**5. 313-315 West Keith Road (Rezoning Application)**

Staff reviewed the application which is a seeking to rezone the lot from One-Unit Residential 1 to a Comprehensive Development Zone to permit a three-unit development consisting of a two unit building fronting West Keith Road plus a single unit infill building at the rear.

Staff asked for the Panel's input regarding the proposed density, the height envelope variances, the modification of the ground plane and proposed finished grades relative to the City boulevard and neighbouring lots, the adequacy of landscaping given the infill unit's front door is not visible from the street, the integration of the roof decks in the building design, the area, location and design of private open space.

Augustine Hii, Augustine Hii Architecture, outlined the proposal to the Panel:

- There is currently a duplex on the site with duplexes to the west.
- The site is 50 x 140 feet and slopes eight feet from West Keith Road to the lane.
- The proposed duplex is set 25 feet back with the infill unit with a two car attached garage off the lane. The street addresses will be West Keith Road marked by a lantern feature.
- The portico of the infill will be visible from the street.
- Roof decks are set back to give privacy to the neighbours.
- The design has a contemporary character and the scale and massing is compatible with neighbouring buildings.
- There is no direct overlook between side windows and neighbours.

Kevin Connery, Blue and Green Design Studio, reviewed the landscape plan:

- It is a tight space with limited room. The design uses layers of planting with shrubs and grasses and has no lawn. It is a “pollinating-friendly” landscape plan with seasonal variety. There are two outdoor patios for each of the front units with space for people to use in the mornings.
- The design keeps very similar grading relationships to what already exists but small modular walls will have to be added.
- There is modular lighting to show access to the rear unit.
- Permeable pavers are used in the open parking places.
- The neighbour’s fence may need to be replaced during construction.
- There will be “living green” roof trays on the deck.

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

- Where are the grades different from existing? **A:** At the side there is a slope so it is about a foot higher; we are trying to get a flat walkway down the side and will probably have to remove the current retaining wall.
- How many parking spaces are there? **Staff:** Five are required and four are proposed.
- Where are the garbage facilities? **A:** Each unit has its own recycling and garbage area
- Where is the portico? **A:** It is tucked behind; there is a stairwell to the roof decks.
- You appear to be exceeding the FSR and building height is a little bit higher. What is the lot coverage excluding the parking? The separation between the infill and the main building is what? **A:** We worked closely with the Planning Department on the site coverage.
- The infill seems to intrude in the parking; will the size work? **A:** The width will work; it is wider than it should be.
- **To staff:** What about the architectural character; does it fit? **A:** The general guidance is that heritage designated character areas have to fit. For other streets it depends on whether a unified character is emerging. Where it is varied, there is more support for different characters.
- **To staff:** Will there be secondary suites in cellars? They will not be able to rent out the cellar units? **A:** No.
- Why did you locate the patio for the infill where it is? **A:** We wanted a forecourt for a courtyard entry and to preserve the other area as a green garden.
- Why sedum trays for the roof rather than something more robust? **A:** We did not talk about adding additional load to the roof.
- Do you have a storm water management plan? **A:** Yes.

*Councillor Bell left the meeting at 7:10 p.m.*

- Are you using Hardi-board? **A:** No, it is a cementitious material which is thinner than Hardi.
- How are you handling the reveals? **A:** It will be a flush reveal; almost a shiplap joint.
- It is a screen on the infill or a window expression on the north elevation? **A:** It is a window with vertical mullions.
- What is the railing on the balcony? **A:** Wood slats.
- What is your energy goal? **A:** It will conform to Energuide 84.
- **Question to staff:** Is it ok making it look like a duplex? **A:** We prefer asymmetrical approaches to duplexes. It will read as a duplex from the street. The low density development guidelines apply to this project.

- You only show two “sign” lanterns not three. **A:** There will be street addresses at the front but you will be able to see the infill portico from the street.
- How high is the fence? **A:** The fence along West Keith is three feet high. Plants on the side are hip level or lower.
- The portico is two metres below the entry on West Keith? **A:** Yes; the roof will be at 2.2 metres.
- Will the portico announce the entry from West Keith? **A:** It is a challenge; we tried to widen the path.
- Is there an opportunity to have a door directly from the garage into the infill unit? **A:** The main unit will probably will have the indoor garage. The open spaces are partially covered.

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

- It is extremely important to clearly delineate the units for first responders; especially the third unit given the view from West Keith Road.
- The circulation from the parking to the front units is not the best as you have to go into the cellar and then upstairs.
- I am not sure you will be able to get your garbage out to the lane if a car is parked. There needs to be another place for it.
- The location of garbage facilities is problematic with the grades.
- I am not sure about getting by the parking at the back. Parking is an issue.
- I like the style, massing, the uniqueness, and the colour palette.
- I am struggling with how the design does not address the non-symmetrical aspect.
- Perhaps design development is necessary around the spaces e.g. not having garbage facilities next to the back patio.
- It is a good application.
- The site can take the proposed density with this type of architecture. It is what it takes to provide an affordable unit above the garage. Moving towards denser affordable
- I think the projection into the height envelope is warranted because of the quality of the design.
- The landscaping is extremely well handled, well thought out including colour, seasonal, high quality. I appreciate the thoughtfulness of the design. The no lawn approach resonates.
- Two of the garbage areas can be reconfigured and accessed from a different location.
- There is sincerity about the architecture with its own vocabulary of design. This is well crafted architecture and design. I appreciate going to EnerGuide 84.
- I think the colour scheme could be more fresh. I like the lightness of the roofs.
- The façade across the front of the garage needs further design development. I would encourage extending the corners of materials meeting each other and consider using a reveal material in between the boards.
- If staff thinks that there could be a modest adjustment in height, I think it is fine because the top floor is stepped back; there may be a possibility to change the sloped roof to a flat roof.
- A family will probably move into the larger units; the patios at the front are a little small. There is enough space to increase the size to make them usable without impacting the landscape.
- The patio for the infill is on a direct route to the garage; it would benefit by being moved and screened from the pathway.

- I would encourage looking at the loading on the roof and increasing the depth of the planting area for something more robust e.g. tomatoes.
- Have a look at the storm water management plan. There is a lot of vegetation; you could incorporate capturing rainwater and using it for irrigation.
- The parking for four is enough; I would even suggest three parking stalls.
- It is a well thought out project with good use of space on the site. It makes the most of the built and landscape areas. Each unit has a reasonable garden space. Making patios bigger would compromise that.
- Going higher in FSR is what you need to get three units. 0.6 FSR would compromise the units.
- I find the stair turret a little unconvincing in how it relates to the architecture. The design is weakest at the roof level. I do not think it is out of context with some of the other buildings on the street.
- The roof line could be simplified by integrating some of the smaller roofs into a single butterfly roof. There could be issues with flashing roofs so close to each other.
- The two outdoor parking stalls are too narrow especially when trying to get by with garbage.
- Could you add a stair on the outside of the house to access the main level instead of the residents having to go through the basement?

**Chair's summary:**

- The Panel thanks the applicant for a very thorough application.
- Concerns expressed included identifying the rear unit from the street and that the entry to the rear is challenging.
- There is a circulation issue with garbage facilities.
- Form, character, style and approach are supportable. Perhaps it is heavy on the site but we are moving in that direction.
- There are concerns about getting more light into the two rear patios by raising them up.
- There is full support for four parking stalls.
- The liveability of rear units is very important.

**Presenter's comments:**

- We thank the members for their comments. We cannot see anything that is not achievable in design development. We see the challenge of garbage and recycling at the main house and had looked at other scenarios for the placement of garbage and recycling.
- We appreciate the thoughtful comments.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 313-315 West Keith Road and recommends approval of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for the quality of the proposal.

**Carried Unanimously**

*The panel had a short break at 7:50 p.m.*

*H. Besharat declared a conflict of interest and left the meeting at 7:50 p.m.*

*The Panel reconvened at 8:00 pm.*



## **6. 175 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street – Marlborough Tower II (Building Permit)**

Staff reviewed the proposal which does not require a rezoning application as it was rezoned in 2005 as part of the Civic Plaza project. The applicant is proposed a 12 storey residential rental tower on a two storey podium. 130 dwelling units are proposed with 70 underground parking stalls. Additional parking will be provided at 144 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street, another rental property owned by Hollyburn Properties.

Staff asked for the Panel's input on the relationship of the podium to the street frontage, the location of the vehicle access, the treatment of the building at the southeast corner in relation to the Civic Place Mews.

David Sander, Hollyburn properties, introduced the team.

Richard White told the Panel that the project has been in process for over 10 years. It is part of a master plan that allowed the City library to be built as part of a land swap with Hollyburn Properties. The current proposal, Marlborough II, is part of the CD 505 zone which includes City Hall, the library, Vista Place and Marlborough I. There are minimal design changes from the building approved 10 years ago.

Foad Rafii, Rafii Architects Inc., outlined the proposal to the Panel:

- The previous design has been modernized.
- It has a slightly bigger floor plate but the 80 foot distance has been maintained.
- The current townhouse character at grade to the south on Chesterfield Avenue is maintained in the proposal and is around three sides of the development.
- The building has a 10 foot setback on Chesterfield Avenue consistent with the southern development.
- The south elevation has to be built to the zero lot line or the parking will not work; it is a patterned blank wall with a 10 foot walkway between it and the other building.

Randy Sharp , Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architecture, reviewed the landscape plan:

- They have been working with the City on the choice of street trees.
- The design has good lines of sight to meet CPTED requirements.
- The main lobby entrance is up to the curb on West 14<sup>th</sup> Street.
- Benches wrap around the corner and will repeat elements from the nearby playground.
- There is a nice Interface with the City parking lot.
- The existing trees to the south will have to be moved temporarily, but will be replanted after construction
- There is an outdoor amenity area on the 15<sup>th</sup> floor.
- The parkade entrance is at the lowest point of the site on Chesterfield Avenue. It will be right in, right out.

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

- Is there secured residential parking? **A:** Yes.
- I appreciate the level of detail. The gates on the townhouses go across the public pathway; can they be changed to go inwards? **A:** Yes.
- What is the design rationale around the building entrance on the north side? **A:** We made the decision 10 years ago; I think it was to animate West 14<sup>th</sup> Street.

- What storm water management are you planning? **A:** Storm water from the patios will flow into the perimeter landscape. It is a tight site; there is a generous landscape area along Chesterfield Avenue and we are using part of the boulevard to absorb the runoff. The roof top will have a substantial amount of gravel to delay storm water release.
- What was the design intent and material choice of the trellis on the roof? **A:** It is aluminium painted to look like wood; there will be climbers planted on it.
- Did you consider having an area on the roof sheltered from the rain? **A:** Part of the trellis could be glazed. The climbers are at the perimeter.
- There are only four handicapped parking stalls; will you need more? Is that an issue? **A:** The current zoning asked for one stall per unit which is more than most rental buildings. We will try to do more. We are going to reorganize the parking across the street to provide more spaces.
- Will the walkway to the south be well lit or will it be a bit of a tunnel? **A:** Half of it will be open to the parkade ramp which will be lit. We will incorporate wall scones on the wall.
- What is the seven foot Right of Way which you have built over? **A:** Hollyburn owns the Right of Way. **Staff:** We allowed the encroachment; it is a service and utility ROW.
- There is no other curb cut between 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Streets? **A:** Yes.
- The energy code is ASHRAE 90.1 2010. **A:** We will comply and do energy modelling.
- The amenity room on Level 1 opens on to a raised patio; what are the plans? Is there any area for small children? **A:** Not specifically.
- What was the original setback on the south? **A:** There was a larger setback in the original proposal.
- **Question to staff:** The stalls in P1 and P2 are 8 feet wide which seems narrow. Is it possible to adjust the parking stalls so they are more usable and friendly but the number would decrease? **Staff:** Council have approved this design. Any changes would result in another public process. We are working with the applicants to move columns further back with three or four stalls between columns. Council may be considering making changes in the Zoning Bylaw but that would not apply to this application. Any changes would be voluntary.
- Is it possible to program more activities on the roof not just sitting and dining e.g. urban agriculture? **A:** There are three foot wide planters, access to water etc; it could be easily converted.
- What are the passive design features on the west and south façades? **A:** We reduced the size of the windows; there are no overhangs.

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

- The podium is two storeys and seems to relate reasonably well to adjacent buildings. It is appropriate.
- Vehicle access is appropriate on the downhill side.
- Nothing special has been put at the corner of 14<sup>th</sup> Street to mark the relationship to Civic Place Mews; I do not think it is that significant an entry point. Could it be marked in some way with landscaping?
- I find the trellis on the roof to be a fairly weak design element; the building needs a more significant element at the top. Public amenities on the roof are a good thing. Setting back of the building from the outside is appropriate. It is not elegant in terms of massing of the building.
- Thermal bridging decimates the energy performance of a building; I think it will be a big challenge to meet the energy codes. The energy utilization of the project based on ASHRAE will have an impact on the materials and will probably cause another material selection.

- I like the location of the access to the parking being as far away from the intersection as possible.
- The podium feature setback is quite appropriate in keeping with the Vista building.
- I like the context of the building and the overall form. There are a significant number of mobility units. You are addressing the concern of affordable housing.
- I am concerned the concrete eyebrows may be problematic to maintain in the future
- The trellis on the roof should be to the south and does not seem to fit with the building; it needs to be rethought. You should add something to shield people from the weather.
- I do find the south east corner foreboding but am not sure how you might treat it to make it more inviting. Maybe public art could be incorporated to make it more inviting.
- I find the entry on 14<sup>th</sup> and parking ramp acceptable.
- It is really a gateway to the 14<sup>th</sup> Street plaza. It is not a gateway building. It is very symmetrical, very even on all facades. I strongly recommend the architecture reflects a corner turn on the corner.
- The massing on the south east corner does not work and needs to be revisited.
- It is a successful podium height but the project materials lack a level of detail and it is difficult to tell what the detail is. It looks stark; you may be able to introduce a canopy at the second floor line to create smaller scale relating back to the street.
- The vulnerable point is the south east walkway; it has limited surveillance and a movement predictor that forces people through it.

**Chair's summary:**

- Basically the podium fits quite well but there is definitely a concern on the south east corner and how it might be opened up.
- The energy performance of the building will have to be looked at and passive design measures should be considered.
- There should be programming for the roof and more shelter for outdoor gatherings. Give residents more reasons to go there. As an amenity for a rental building it is a real bonus.
- There is an opportunity to gather rain water on the roof, perhaps in rain barrels.
- There is basic support for the form and character.
- The building fails at the corner of 14<sup>th</sup> Street; there should be consideration on it wraps around the corner.
- It is a very contextually important building in the block.

**Presenter's comments:**

- We have heard lots of good comments. We did not want to revisit the symmetrical building which was approved by Council. I cannot see how to make it a corner building without redoing the design. Everything else is doable.
- All the landscape comments are very helpful. The location of the trellis towards the north is because that is where there is the most light because the building behind throws a huge shadow.
- You are suggesting more development on the roof than was approved originally. It has to get through the zoning check.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the design of 175 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street – Marlborough Tower II and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Planning:

- Further development of the roof elements including programming and for design consideration of the trellis;
- Consideration of the energy performance of the building with preliminary energy modelling prior to moving too far into detailed design;
- Further design development of the southeast corner area to address CPTED issues, including provision of additional views into that area, if possible, from the building; and
- Review of the width of parking stalls; eight feet per stall appears to be too narrow.

**Carried Unanimously**

**7. Other Business**

None.

**8. Adjournment**

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

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014.



---

Chair