

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, October 18<sup>th</sup>, 2017**

---

**MINUTES**

---

- Present:** B. Checkwitch  
J.P. Mahé  
A. Man-Bourdon  
B. Phillips  
P. Maltby  
J. Geluch  
K. Yushmanova
- Staff:** M. Friesen, Planner 1  
D. Johnson, Development Planner  
C. Perry, Supervisor, Development Servicing  
T. Huckell, Committee Clerk
- Guests:** 2121 – 2137 Chesterfield (Rezoning Application)  
Simon Richards, Cornerstone Architecture  
Gesa Zellermann, Cornerstone Architecture  
Ronaye Matthew, Cohousing Development Consulting
- 210 – 230 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street (Rezoning Application)  
Keith Hemphill, Rositch Hemphill Architects  
Japheth Bondoc, Rositch Hemphill Architects  
Anca Hurst, Rositch Hemphill Architects  
Alyssa Semczyszyn, Jonathan Losee Landscape Architecture  
Michael Reed, GWL Realty Advisors  
Geoff Hue, GWL Realty Advisors
- Absent:** B. Harrison  
K. Bracewell, RCMP
- 

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

**1. Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held September 20<sup>th</sup> and October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2017**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held September 20<sup>th</sup> and October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2017 be adopted with amendments requested.

**Carried Unanimously**

## **2. Business Arising**

None.

## **3. Staff Update**

D. Johnson reviewed the status of ongoing development projects.

## **4. 2121 – 2137 Chesterfield (Rezoning Application)**

The City has received a development application to rezone 2121, 2129 and 2137 Chesterfield Avenue to support 27 residential units within a five storey, stratified, townhome and apartment building, over one level of underground parking, storage and secured bicycle parking, and a mezzanine that includes storage and a workshop.

The site is located on the west side of Chesterfield Avenue, just north of 21<sup>st</sup> Street, and is one block west of Lonsdale Avenue. The site is adjacent to Wagg Creek Park, and is well connected to public transit, active transportation routes, commercial areas, and public services and amenities.

The development is being led by a cohousing development group (Driftwood Village Cohousing), which has resulted in a proposal that articulates significant social/common areas and that embraces ideas contained with the City's "Active Design Guidelines" and "Sustainability Checklist".

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

- The proposed site design including: setbacks, overlook, and location of cohousing amenities;
- CPTED concerns;
- Architectural style, the application of façade materials, and the proposed colour palette; and
- The proposed landscaping plan, in particular: restoration of the ravine bank; interaction with Wagg Creek Park; location and size of the children's playground; and landscape as a buffer to existing and future neighbours.

Simon Richards, Cornerstone Architecture, described the project to the Panel:

- The project will have self-contained units with lots of common facilities.
- Five storey building, consistent with massing in OCP. Determined to be a good neighbour.
- Chesterfield is a great fronting street, while the rear of the site slopes down to Wagg Creek.
- The lower two or three stories, while technically apartments, have been designed to have a townhouse character.
- The neighbor to the north (2145 and 2149 Chesterfield) has concerns regarding access to the laneway behind the property, and has had an informal agreement with the previous owners of 2137 Chesterfield. The Driftwood Village Cooperative has indicated that they want the neighbor to the north to maintain access in some way.

- Communication and circulation were important concepts in the design. As much as possible, worked to allow apartments to have a view of the creek.
- We think a rain cover can be afforded for the atrium area; otherwise, it will be an open air space. The entire space is being designed to encourage encounters.
- The plans are relatively standard two and three bedroom units, with a small common area on the 5<sup>th</sup> level.

In the absence of the Landscape Architect, Simon Richards reviewed the landscape plan:

- On the ground plane, there is a fair amount of hard surface, which will be augmented with green spaces. The middle of the atrium will feature planters.
- The west side, associated with a view to the creek, would be a children's play area.
- Trees and landscaping will be completed along the front street.
- Full sideyards have been developed; the parkade under the building will not encroach upon.
- The sideyards will be richly planted as a buffer.

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

- Staff: will there be any street widening? **A:** Some, which will allow for us to have street trees, and a wide boulevard on the curb side. A potential future bike lane.
- Are power lines staying? **A:** Yes.
- Any way to get some natural light into the parking spaces? **A:** Likely, if it is a high enough priority for the cohousing group.
- Is the outdoor BBQ and seating area totally covered, and if not, is there a way of ensuring that could be done? **A:** Could be, if it was a priority of the group. It is already a tight space, so reluctant to put more mass-consuming elements in there.
- Is there any appetite for electric vehicles and bikes? **A:** Yes; we would like to put in as many outlets as a reasonable service would provide.
- Are you tying into the LEC? **A:** No; it's our intent not to. Find it is redundant to the passive house requirement. When you're passive, you're already down to around 10% and it doesn't make any sense to have a central system.
- Any thoughts of rainwater harvesting on the roof? **A:** We don't plan to put in additional infrastructure. Not convinced of the efficiency of storage water; there are rules about treatment that become cumbersome. All of the plants chosen will be Hardie, to use small amounts of water.
- Not clear on the relationship with the neighbour to the north. **A:** This site was originally encumbered by a 15m setback. The laneway provides a driveway for the neighbour to the north. Basically, the City will take the corner in question as a statutory right of way to ensure access. For now, the driveway will be allowed to continue to be used as a driveway. It will be grandfathered until the property is sold and/or redeveloped, at which point we can't predict what might happen.
- How will the property access Wagg Creek? **A:** It will more or less pass through the right of way in the northwest corner. There is an obligation of the developer to redevelop the lane. The fence structure will likely be a simple picket-type fence, something you can see through.
- Could you elaborate on what you're doing to encourage residents to take advantage to the proximity of Wagg Creek? **A:** Building on top of the parkade, to raise the public plane. Recognize that it's not the development's creek, but main thing is to ensure

- residents are as aware of its proximity as possible. T-shaped atrium; even though a narrow view, you always have a sense that the creek is there.
- Will the proximity of the Spirit Trail be a consideration, to emphasize that it's there? **A:** It honestly hasn't been a big influence; it's more of a background project that is coming along.
  - Is there a plan to incorporate a public art process? **A:** Possibly; this would come out of the cohousing group who are a very community-oriented group.
  - What are the parking dimensions in the parkade? **A:** We followed the requirements outlined by the bylaw; 8.2 feet wide and 18 feet deep.
  - There is a common laundry; does each unit also have their own? **A:** Each unit would be plumbed for it. Many are comfortable with common facilities.
  - Are all walkways covered on the upper levels? **A:** Yes.
  - Will the lane be redeveloped with a gravel surface? **A:** Yes; it must be permeable due to the proximity of the stream.
  - Do you anticipate assembly challenges on how to separate the building envelope from the underground parking space? **A:** No; we've essentially been creating a "blanket" of insulation; we may actually be over-insulating. The real challenge is workmanship and airtightness.
  - Are the decks outside of the envelope itself? **A:** They are over inhabitable space; mostly stacked. We just frame them so they are not overlapping.
  - Any concern with respect to a glass roof in proximity to Wagg Creek; i.e. tree debris after a storm? **A:** Not really; it is sloped back; we've kept it a really simple shape. One edge will be anchored to minimize damage during an earthquake.
  - Can you see the building from the park when you're in the lane? How much thought have you given to the rear? **A:** It depends on where you're walking. We do have an obligation to rebuild the lane in a permeable form. Appropriate species will be re-introduced. Planting is very thick through here. We are treating it as the rear of the building.
  - How will the stair down the northernmost back of the building be controlled, by a gate or a fence? **A:** For security, yes. It will be controlled somehow.

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

- Predict some initial impact (multi-family in single-family zone), but a wonderful project; supportive.
- Great to see more cohousing, working with the people who will be living there
- Love the kayak storage.
- Not entirely sure about the covered atrium; after a stormy day, lots of clean-up; people more likely to be inside anyway.
- The more light you can get into the units that face the courtyard, the better.
- Would like to see more variation in the painting.
- Would be nice to see more development of the main entry (more of an announcement of it as an entry point).
- Would encourage more native planting; also vary treatment of the retaining walls on the sides of the property (planting currently a bit formal).
- For the garden facing the lane, would suggest trees as well as native shrubs, creating a more pronounced transition into that streamside area.
- Kids sandbox seems quite close to a window of one unit; consider pushing it over to decrease conflict of users.

- Suggest making the most of access opportunities to the lane and Wagg Creek, physical ways to encourage people to get out and enjoy.
- Perhaps pay a little more attention to the walk back up the stairs to the main entry, connecting those two amenity spaces.
- Applaud any efforts to integrate art into the design of the project.
- Really appreciate the attention being paid to cut-outs, for daylight to enter the stacked decks in the corners.
- The open staircase is great.
- Surprised by the colour palette; expected more variety.
- Appreciate access to the roof; even consider two BBQs side by side.
- Like the courtyard “active living”, a good fit in the neighbourhood.
- Look at getting some natural light into the parkade.
- Would like to see the recycling area become more of a common room.
- Breezeway off Chesterfield might be an opportunity for public art.
- If you do certify (passive), highly recommend not tying into LEC.
- Would encourage more features such as rainwater harvesting, electric cars/bikes.
- Make some attempt to introduce real wood.
- Courtyard connections to the west could be played up.

**Presenter’s comments:**

Thank you for all the comments.

- We are struggling to keep the glass in the atrium (alternative: soggy moss).
- We went back and forth on the sideyards. With it being a semi-public space, and considering the grade between the buildings, we ultimately decided to plant up with the idea it could be replanted at a later date.
- This group is big on recycling; they’ll end up doing even more than we have in mind.
- Regarding colour, I do a lot of ECE (Early Childhood Education); important not to overstimulate. Keep it subdued and let the colour come from the children’s imagination.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 2121 – 2137 Chesterfield and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Explore ways to develop a more interesting treatment of the cement fibre volumes on the east façade (Chesterfield);
- Explore more variation in the paving treatment;
- More design development of the entry hall;
- Implement more native planting in general, and more variation of planting at the side walls;
- Explore using native trees at the native garden pathway at the lane (not just shrubs);
- Consider whether sandbox may be too close to the adjacent unit;
- Improve transition and access from the courtyard to the lane and Wagg Creek Park to the west;
- Explore opportunities to integrate art into the design;

- Explore more variety in the colour palette;
- Explore methods of getting natural light into the garage;
- Attempt to make the recycling and garbage area a more social space;
- explore more renewable energy additions (e.g. rainwater, electric bikes, electric cars, PV installation); and
- Explore the use of natural wood.

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

**Carried Unanimously**

## **5. 210 – 230 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street (Rezoning Application)**

The City has received a development application to rezone 210-230 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street to support 160 unit rental apartment units within two five to six storey buildings, with a common amenity area connecting the two buildings. The proposed buildings are to be located over one and one-half levels of underground parking that includes storage, secured bicycle parking and a common workshop.

The location of the subject site is on the northeast corner of East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and St. George's Avenue, one block east of Lonsdale Avenue. It has good connections for public transit and commercial related amenities.

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

- The proposed site design;
- The proposed setbacks of the building and the shadowing on adjacent properties;
- The application of façade materials; and
- The proposed landscape plan.

Michael Reed, GWL Realty Advisor, introduced the project to the panel:

- We are a wholly owned subsidiary of Great West Life. We invest in real estate on behalf of pension funds. Properties are professionally managed; very focused on management on-site.
- Very excited to have this site a few blocks from the SeaBus. Want to maximize the number of rental suites in our current constrained market.
- One big issue is parking access. We have asked for parking access to be off the low side, which in this case means the street instead of the lane.
- Central hub connecting the two buildings is a critical component of the design.

Keith Hemphill, Rositch Hemphill Architects, described the project to the panel:

- A very walkable location; excited.
- The current buildings have run the course of their lifetime.
- Explored a lot of parking access options; ultimately concluded we need to come in off 2<sup>nd</sup> Street.
- Have made an effort to distinguish the two buildings as unique, each with a different character.
- Working hard to reduce the impact of shadowing.

- The parking on the north is fully below grade; on the south side, fully at grade.
- The central access and control point is needed from a managerial point of view (purpose-built rental).
- Can develop direct bike access to the street; have also provided a “bike lounge” type of room.
- Outdoor amenity space is between the two buildings, because it is at grade in the lane, have tried to locate certain functions (e.g. garbage and recycling) central to both buildings.
- Amenities haven’t been fully programmed yet, but the space will allow a large variety of uses (fitness, entertainment, social gathering and urban agriculture).
- Strong desire to animate the lane and create a pedestrian friendly environment.
- Each of the two buildings is equivalent in massing and size to the buildings to the north.
- Also want to ensure the buildings on the lane side are just as articulate as on the front side.
- Intent for the materials is to use a high quality palette, to break up the long façade through the use of colour and material.

Alyssa Semczyszyn, Jonathan Losee Landscape Architecture, reviewed the landscape plan:

- Have tried to take components (walkability, connection to community, infrastructure for things like cycling) and help create something that contributes to the streetscape and walkability of the neighbourhood
- Different palettes on the two sides, to support the desire to illustrate that each building is unique
- Rooftop a great opportunity to have a meeting point between the two buildings; room for some opportunities mentioned earlier (gas fireplace, urban agriculture); can be used by a variety of people at the same time.

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

- A couple of studio units overlook the outdoor area. You’ve got some landscape screening, but how will that visually and acoustically allow those units to use their private space? **A:** The planting will be raised, so there will be a physical division. Also tried to organize so that those units’ views orient away from that public space.
- With respect to sustainability and energy efficiency, your plan is to just meet the minimum? **A:** We’ll add as we get to detailed design. Energy code these days is already a pretty high bar, but we will look for every opportunity to improve.
- Heat recovery ventilation is ticked as “no”. Don’t want to help with greenhouse gas emissions? **A:** We haven’t got through the design variables yet, so we didn’t want to make a commitment we couldn’t live up to.
- Are you at the parking threshold? Any relaxation with bikes? **A:** Developer is meeting the bylaw requirements. The only relaxation is to allow car entry off the street.
- Any car sharing? **A:** We are looking into some different scenarios. We would like to encourage less car usage, but have proposed beyond the bylaw minimum requirements, to take pressure off the streets. Haven’t seen evidence that people are entirely giving up their cars yet.
- Regarding materials, is there brick on the lane side as well? **A:** Yes, on the ends, but we didn’t take it all the way around the back. All public faces will have a substantial amount of brick.

- Any opportunity for real wood? **A:** Debated significantly about that; wanted to avoid the “Whistler timber” look, but could select something with a wood grain look.
- What is the area designed along the laneway? **A:** The loading bay. We’ve tried to make it look pedestrian friendly. Rentals have a lot of turnover; in our client’s experience, it beats the building up a lot. We wanted to get the loading off the street and put it somewhere convenient. We were able to stage on the property as opposed to on the city allowance.
- Will planters in the rooftop amenity space block views towards the water? **A:** Not really; keep in mind the building is not exactly north/south.
- There’s discussion about play areas? Lots of different units; studios right up to a four-bedroom suite. **A:** Yes, on the lower level. Because it’s a compact space, we wanted something multi-use. Probably some rubber for surfacing. Trying to have something that adults could go and use in the evening too. Will be natural materials.
- Could you describe a little about what you feel the benefit of one FSR is by way of amenity? **A:** The one FSR that is available under the OCP for additional density (1.6 plus the additional one) gives us the opportunity to compete. In Vancouver, it is very difficult to buy land for purpose built rentals. We simply can’t meet on the purchase price of land. When the City came in with the OCP and offered for purpose built rentals, that leveled the playing field a bit and we could acquire a site. We’ve been largely priced out in the Lower Mainland for rental units.
- Have you thought of any opportunities to have access from 2<sup>nd</sup> Street up to the lane, for the public? **A:** Yes, but the challenge is where does it go to and from? From laneway to street, basically. There is space on the east end of the site, which is effectively mid-block; we could potentially do. But right through the middle of the site, it didn’t make much sense.
- Have you considered an amenity garden area, on the central portion of the main roof of the building? You could provide a small rooftop area that doesn’t have any overlook issues. **A:** To put an amenity space on the roof of mail buildings, you’d need a stair. That’s considered a 7<sup>th</sup> storey in building code; changes the whole constructability.
- Will there be street tree requirements? **A:** Yes; we are proposing street trees on the back boulevard, not front, because there’s a sewer/sanitary main only 1m down. Usually that infrastructure is in the back. This constrained us a little.
- Opportunity to put in boxes? **A:** There’s a concern around view and visibility, but we did explore this; we’re proposing patches of planting. Also, there’s parking there; we want some permeability. Will probably have a few trees; skinny with a high canopy.
- With respect to the level 3 amenity, is there a possibility to put some permanent concrete planters in there? Or was it a conscious choice, to have them all movable? **A:** They’re pretty permanent. Really movable only if you need to fix something; can’t really just pick up to rearrange the furniture. Also, since the building is held and maintained by Great West Life, there is a need to maintain the membrane, etc. We did back and forth a bit, but since they’re holding the building for such a long time, there are cost-benefit issues.
- Are there not energy performance requirements to rezone? **A:** In order to get the density bonus, one consideration is energy performance. Similar projects are currently coming in at Ashrae 90.1 2010 (and exceeding). When the BC Building Act kicks in, probably a level 2 to begin with will be required. Because this will be a part 3 building we will be requesting a higher energy performance than they are currently coming in at.
- Is it a wood platform frame? **A:** A combination of things. A concrete level.
- Did you explore mass timber? **A:** Not on this particular project.



- What is the proposed heating system? **A:** We will connect to LEC. Some sort of hydronic system.
- Any consideration of public art project? **A:** There is no requirement at this stage, but we will try to incorporate when we can. Not in the plans at this stage.
- Are there other buildings on this street, with similar parking access off the street as opposed to lane? **A:** Moodyville has access off the lane, but we (staff) support this design.
- Will the reveals and trim overlap the front of the Hardie panel? **A:** No, we have found that overlap tends to lead to maintenance issues. Our reveals are the same colour. Gives a higher quality impression, plus it actually is higher quality.
- Are the guardrails face-fastened from the front? Would you be amenable to an alternate railing system that is not face-fastened, or a system where the glass extends further down? Articulation of balconies is so important. **A:** Some are, yes. We don't want a railing system that comes down through the membranes. We're trying to create strong horizontal lines while also considering climbability issues.
- Is the soffit material painted concrete? **A:** Probably a vented vinyl. We will explore the durability, economics, and aesthetics of the materials.

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

- This building is so close to Moodyville, this significant project should at least meet the Moodyville levels of design, if not surpass. Lots of opportunity to show leadership here. This building needs to meet Step 3 of the Code, or Ashrae plus 25%.
- Wonder about the LEC, how the boilers might affect floor plans. You should potentially address or consider now. May or may not throw a wrench into your program.
- Would love to see you consider some solar panels, to offset common space costs.
- There should be some form of public art, in a project of this scale in this location.
- Indoor air quality; should find some way to ventilate. There are some ductless systems coming out now, would urge you to consider. Would improve comfort.
- Appreciate the large indoor connecting space. Lots of very usable patio spaces on first level.
- Happy you were able to move the driveway to the street; does make for a much better lane experience.
- Regarding the landscape approach, there's a strong language on the first level, it would be nice to see some consistency that comes up to level 3. Feels a bit chaotic right now.
- The one area where you can really see the view; give more space to the shared amenity. If the planters are that difficult to move, think hard about where they'll end up. Definitely ensure irrigation.
- Encourage more design development on the decks, to really ensure it brings people together.
- Found the planting plan quite overwhelming. Two buildings with different identities; I applaud you for trying to bring more variety, more flowering plants into your palette but perhaps more rigour to ensure the identity of the project, a common thread for each building so it doesn't look haphazard.
- In the kitchens, consider designing with drawers instead of doors on cupboards. Can get difficult to reach in the back.
- The 3D renderings are really great; they explain well how the project fits into context. You weren't interested in having a big entry structure, but I think that would be

advantageous, if there were something there. Maybe a light feature, something to draw your attention?

- Would encourage you to put some more thought into the possibility of creating some public connection through the central location, where the two buildings meet.
- Appreciate the amenity space, looks fantastic; bike access to the street is great.
- Appreciate that the building is all rental.
- At grade patios are a great way to liven up the street, but take into consideration people exiting into the laneway; ensure good sightlines, for people stepping out and vehicles moving through.
- The inclusion of two studio patios constrains you at the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor outdoor amenity space. It will get good sun from 2pm onwards and will be a popular spot; a great opportunity that hasn't been capitalized on yet.
- Garden plots are a great idea, but if you can't provide 30-40 for 160 units, maybe consider not doing them at all, but rather creating a much more inviting outdoor amenity space.
- Be careful with synthetic turf; can be really cheap looking. There are other materials that aren't that much more expensive. Be careful how you mix the genuineness of materials you're using.
- Glad to see the two buildings aren't mirror images of each other, but the east one does a better job of breaking up the façade. The three distinct panels on the east one pop out and break it up; perhaps try to incorporate some similar design language on the west one.
- Amenity areas are great; a good example of what condo design should look like.
- Like the recycling / garbage room out in the open; would recommend a counter space there, for sorting etc.
- Would try to bring in a little more brick in the lane; more texture, more tactile materials. You're making that lane a focus for people, more than just for cars.
- Consider making the roof over the entranceway more of a green roof, or some mix of materials.
- Nothing about this building that is contextual, unique to North Vancouver, so want to make sure that it's done in a tight, rigorous, beautiful way. Since it could be anywhere, it needs to be done well.
- Feel there is a loss of opportunity at the linking space between the two buildings, where something more interesting could happen.
- Feel the treatment of the guard rails is important. Would really like that to be done in a way which complements the building, doesn't seem like something that's been tacked on. There are some good examples of guard rails in the neighbourhood, on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street; would encourage you to take a look at those.

**Presenter's comments:**

Thank you for all the comments, some of which I can guarantee we will take up.

- Regarding the front entrance; we can definitely make that "more".
- Regarding the living lane, in a past project, we provided a "pedestrian safety zone", to distinguish it as different from pavement; some dedicated room for people, some dedicated room for cars. Definitely the idea is to make it visually evident, zone distinct. We will work closely with staff here.
- Green roof over entry is a great suggestion; it has potential. We will continue to work on that aspect as well.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 210 – 230 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- That the building should be held to a higher standard re: energy performance (Step Code 3);
- Further explore mechanical ventilation systems and relationship to LEC, HRV, and indoor air quality;
- Strongly encourage applicant to find ways of incorporating public art into the project;
- Address concerns regarding the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor amenity space and the privacy of adjacent patios / adjacency to public space;
- Address concerns regarding the BBQ space, making more of the space public and functional (i.e. less garden beds);
- Further design development with regards to the functionality and usability of the common space;
- Encourage more street trees;
- Less sporadic and more vigorous approach to the varieties of planting;
- Encouraged to do something more substantial at the entry space, to capitalize on that opportunity that occurs between the two buildings;
- Further design development to ensure good sightlines between the property and laneway to ensure safety;
- Ensure that the materials and construction of the exterior elevations, particularly the ones that face the street, are done in a high quality manner;
- Specifically address the face mounted guard rails and the vinyl soffit;
- Consider wrapping the lane façade with more brick, at least at the first level; and
- Consider drawers in the kitchen space instead of opening cabinets.

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

**Carried Unanimously**

## **6. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2017.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair