

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, April 18th, 2018**

MINUTES

Present:

W. Chong
K. Yushmanova
J-P. Mahé
M. Messer
B. Jones
B. Harrison

Staff:

D. Johnson, Development Planner
M. Epp, Director of Planning
M. Holm, Manager – Development Services
M. Friesen, Planner
R. Fish, Committee Clerk

Guests:

1 Lonsdale Avenue (Rezoning Application)

Tyke Babalos, Babco Equities Ltd.
Krystie Babalos, Babco Equities Ltd.
John Hemsworth, Hemsworth Architecture
Dean Shwedyk, Hemsworth Architecture
Jonathan Losee, Jonathan Losee Ltd

123 East 23rd Street – Harry Jerome Neighbourhood Lands (Rezoning and OCP Amendment Application)

Oliver Webbe, Darwin Properties
David Jacobson, Darwin Properties
Andrew McMillan, Darwin Properties
Susan Gushe, Perkins + Will
Brent Welty, Perkins + Will
Frank Ducote, Frank Ducote Urban Design
Grant Falgren, PFS Studio

Harry Jerome Neighbourhood Lands Draft Development Permit Area Guidelines

Lance Berelowitz, Urban Forum Associates

Absent:

K. Bracewell, RCMP
B. Phillips

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

1. Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held April 3rd, 2018

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held April 3rd, 2018 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

2. Business Arising

There was a brief discussion around forming resolutions.

3. 1 Lonsdale Avenue (Rezoning Application)

The City has received a Rezoning application for 1 Lonsdale Avenue, located at the bottom of Lonsdale Avenue where it meets Carrie Cates Court. The application proposes a three storey commercial building to accommodate:

- A restaurant on the ground floor, and
- Two floors of office space above.

This rezoning application is to amend the current CD-377 Zone to support a variance for zero off-street parking from the nine required under the Zoning Bylaw (the loading requirements has already been waived in the current CD Zone). All the other features of the proposal is in compliance with the Zoning Bylaw and the Official Community Plan (OCP).

The OCP supports mixed use development along this eastern side of Lonsdale between Esplanade and Carrie Cates Court to a maximum density of 3.6 FSR, and a height limit of 13.0 metres.

Staff would like to receive feedback on the proposed building in terms to how the proposed building faces the street, how the highly visible south face fits with the context of the area, façade materials and how the building turns the corner with Lonsdale Avenue and the lane.

John Hemsworth, Hemsworth Architecture., described the project to the Panel:

- Want to make a building that responds to the relationship the client has to the site.
- CLT building, traditional warehouse style.
- Want to make a veneer and contemporary interpretation of it.
- Breaking up the front façade.
- Balancing with the requirements of passive house.
- Finding ways to temper the air coming back in while still meeting code.
- Wanted to open up the restaurant on to Carrie Cates.
- Entrances are off lower Lonsdale, common area with an elevator to the upper floors.
- Arrival spot from the elevators faces the large window corner.
- Enhance the liveliness and street life around the corner of Carrie Cates.
- Maintains a respectful scale.
- Balances off of the scale of the art gallery.

Jonathan Losee, Jonathan Losee Ltd. Landscape Architecture, reviewed the landscape plan:

- Existing curve has given us a wide boulevard to landscape.
- Existing old cherry trees along Carrie Cates to be removed.
- Opportunity to extend the precinct of the building to the curb.
- Upgrading the boardwalk end.
- Sidewalk patterning is remnant of upper Lonsdale in terms of banding, we have picked up that geometry.
- Placement of two new trees.
- Sidewalk café tied to the building, bistro type seating.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- If there was an opportunity to access the roof, would it affect passive house or height?
A: We're not looking at using it as a space for the building. There are still details to work out as far as roof access with passive house. We will want it to be a Net Zero building with solar panels.
- Staff: rooftop hatches do impact height calculations.
- Would parking be taken care of offsite? **A:** We presented a traffic study to ITC, they analyzed how much street parking and building parking there is. We need 9 or 11 parking stalls according to zoning. We are anticipating the owner of a business may be able to work out an arrangement in the parkade or hotel for a spot. The analysis shows that the increase goes from 11 vehicle trips per hour to 13 vehicle trips per hour which isn't that much. We are looking for tenants who won't need parking.
- Staff: it did go to ITC and they did get their support.
- Is there potential to do anything on the roof, maybe a live roof to add to the passive house requirements? **A:** There's so much insulation already. It adds a significant weight to the structure of the building. We want this to be an all wood building so all weight matters.
- To staff: any requirement for street furniture? **A:** Not aware of any requirements. Offsite is handled by engineering. We would have a requirement for bike parking.
- How high are the ground floor windows? **A:** 9.5ft.
- Windows on the 2nd and 3rd floor are floor to ceiling? **A:** The 2nd floor windows are up to desk height, the 3rd floor is floor to ceiling. Tall windows break up the view but we get light deeper into the building. Moving the pattern of the windows exposes the structure of the building as well.
- How deep is the canopy? **A:** 3.5 – 4 ft.
- Are these canopies demountable or continuing your structure from the inside? **A:** From passive house, we can't extend it out. It would have to be mountable.
- Glazing SN68 is very reflective glass, is the ground floor glazing the same throughout? Is that going to be too reflective to have the idea of transparency? **A:** As we go through the process, the intent would be to have as much transparency as possible but also meeting the requirements for passive house. This is still being drawn out. We are sensitive to this.
- What if the use changes over the years, would this affect the passive house? **A:** We would draft out a lease to reflect the terms of passive house. It will be very specific but we believe it will stay as a restaurant.
- Do you see this as a south facing building or west facing building, how did you address it? The patios go right down to the end and it seems you're cutting it off? **A:** We don't want to lose the 1 Lonsdale address. After much discussion, the entrance is

off of 1 Lonsdale so we looked at opportunities to extend the use of the restaurant onto Carrie Cates Court.

- Will the patio space on Carrie Cates Court be enclosed? **A:** Yes. It's a balance of what the restaurateur wants. It's a service issue for them to want to keep the patio there during the winter. Something permanent would be the best move though.
- Staff: it's still under review whether outdoor dining would be permissible. We don't see the bus route changing any time soon. There has been discussion to have bus routes go up Rogers Avenue but that is a steep slope especially in the winter.
- Where is bike parking? **A:** There are 3 outdoor bike parking racks; there will be negotiation with the tenants on what they want to do with interior parking.
- What about the staff in the restaurant? **A:** We would have to figure that out. It is a tentative layout. It's a tight situation on the ground floor as well.
- Where will loading trucks park? **A:** All the existing restaurants are serviced off of the back lane and this will continue. There will be a change to the layout of the lane.
- Staff: the lane itself is 20 ft. There is a hammerhead area which has had studies that shows trucks can get in and out.
- We have had discussions to set the delivery times to be before the lunch rush.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Going big with the trees will make a big difference. It's a very harsh environment, having bigger trees will give the building an old town kind of feel and will root the corner nicely.
- The opportunity to create roof access would be a great addition for a hangout spot for the office.
- Encourage the City to support the shared use of tables and patios along the street. It will make this restaurant front and street work to create a bustling civic environment.
- A shared vehicular and pedestrian space is important to make the pieces fit together and heighten the urban design of this piece.
- Add one more tree in the middle to get more of a canopy.
- Implementing a green roof from a visual point is encouraged.
- The parking exclusion is okay, there's plenty of parking and transit available.
- The design development still needs to be considered from Lonsdale to Carrie Cates Court, that disconnect is still there. Planning on public realm could use some improvements. The lobby space could have been to the south west corner and have that direct access there to have the patio space continue at the corner so that it's not a buffer between the restaurant and the street.
- Encouraged to do something with the roof, it will be very visual element from those who look down.
- Encourage the City to allow for a great patio.
- This is one of the best lower Lonsdale projects. Love the detailing, fenestration and rhythm.
- Have the streetscape be more playful and get to the 21st century.
- Encouraged to keep it simple.

Presenter's comments:

- Thank you for all the comments.
- We agree with the corner being enlivened. We will go back and discuss it. There's the historical sense of what this address means to the family.

- We will discuss the opportunity for a green roof. If we can include it we will look at it.
- In regards to the entrance, we see the restaurant spilling out into the foyer of the building, there will be a sense that the restaurant is there. The layout will have to become more accommodating to the idea of the corner.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the 1 Lonsdale Avenue Rezoning Application and recommends approval of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for the quality, thoroughness and thoughtfulness of the proposal and would encourage consideration to the following:

- Development of a more playful and contemporary sidewalk treatment;
- Arrival space off of Lonsdale to be resolved;
- Encouraged to consider a green roof application; and
- The inclusion of additional trees on the south sidewalk.

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

Carried Unanimously

4. 123 East 23rd Street – Harry Jerome Neighbourhood Lands (Rezoning and OCP Amendment Application)

The City has received an application to rezone the lands bounded by Lonsdale Avenue, 23rd Street East, St. George's Avenue, 22nd Street East, Eastern Avenue and 21st Street East, hereafter referred to as the Harry Jerome Neighbourhood Lands (HJNL). The application is for the comprehensive redevelopment of these City-owned lands, for which the City issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to the development industry, in order to help finance the proposed new Harry Jerome Community Recreation Centre (HJCRC) on City-owned lands on the north side of 23rd Street East. In addition to funding the new HJCRC, the development should demonstrate excellence in terms of design and lay the foundation for the development of a neighbourhood core along the northern portion of Lonsdale.

The total site area is 314,915 sq. ft. (95,986 m²) including Crickmay Park. The proposed density is 2.5 FSR across the entire site, consistent with the site's OCP designation as Mixed-Use Level 2 (Medium Density), which allows for a maximum density of 2.0 FSR and a maximum density bonus of 0.5 FSR when public benefits are provided. Based on Council direction, the City has encouraged the applicant to optimise the on-site public benefits in return for supporting the increased density. This additional density has been added to the proposed residential towers, with an increase in tower height.

The OCP amendments requested by the applicant are:

- Increase allowable maximum building height from 56m (18-20 storeys) to 81m (28 storeys)
- Extend the eastern boundary of the allowable maximum building height

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

- Concerning the orientation of tower T1, the City considers the potential impacts on the adjacent Crickmay Park, views to and from the new HJCRC and the new park, shadowing of the HJCRC, and views to the North Shore mountains to be critical. Staff would appreciate a discussion and guidance concerning the relative merits of the two general orientations (north-south or east-west).
- The design of the two towers, in particular T1 which the City envisages as an iconic gateway landmark with a distinctive shape and form, and the issue of architectural differentiation between the two towers, which currently appear very similar in size and design.
- The scale, massing and form of building M4: its close proximity to the proposed Green Necklace and public park, the proposed overhang of upper floors facing the park, and its massing facing Eastern Avenue.
- The north-south length of building M2, and whether the proposed entrance area recess and townhome patios/entrances are sufficient design gestures to achieve a desirable streetscape and pedestrian scale along the street.
- The public-private interface between building M3 (seniors assisted living & memory care centre) and the adjacent public park, including the proposed storm-water feature which straddles the park boundary.
- While it is noted that the proposed architectural style is still very preliminary and will be further refined at the Development Permit stage, staff would like the Panel's feedback on the proposed architectural style.

Susan Gushe, Perkins + Will, described the project to the Panel:

- We want to create a complete community and strong urban design.
- Diverse, affordable housing mix.
- Will create new public spaces and opportunities for public art.
- The scale of the project will be impactful.
- Our site will form the northern gateway to Lonsdale Avenue.
- Two 28 storey towers.
- 6 storey residential building for seniors.
- 5 storey commercial building.
- Large, continuous park.
- The rotation of Tower 1 (T1) increases the separation between the two towers.
- Did not want to have a twin tower scheme on the site.
- By rotating one of the towers we create the opportunity to differentiate the two towers.
- This will also allow for views the mountains and provide sun access as well.
- Rotating the tower helps set up an urban space for a restaurant. This area will be in shade with views to the park.
- There is retail opportunity off of 21st Street.
- M1 is non-market affordable housing.
- M2 is affordable rental housing.
- M3 is affordable, assisted seniors' rental housing.
- The commercial building has retail at grade with a grocery store and medical/dental suites above.
- There will be a restaurant at the base of T1.
- Tower placement minimizes the impact of shading on neighboring homes.

- Auto court access is off of 22nd Street.
- Mid-rise housing projects have at grade patios on all sides, giving units private green space, patio space at grade.
- Lobbies are at the center of the buildings, we've aligned the amenity spaces at the lobby spaces.
- Architecture is still to come but we want to keep with authentic materials in a contemporary modern way to speak to the unique nature of the north shore.

Grant Falgren, PFS Studio, reviewed the landscape plan:

- We are connecting the large green space with Crickmay Park.
- The approach to circulation is in response to an existing street network and grid.
- The green necklace is separated pedestrian from bike with many breaks along the way for those with disabilities.
- Animated edges with café, patio spaces and seating spaces.
- The central courtyard is shared by M1, M2 and T2, has private amenity spaces a children's play area integrated and storm features to catch water.
- Created an extension of the park into the private space.
- Clear delineation between private and public.
- We have private patios and planting along the edges and have added a significant number of street trees.
- Overall, we tried to create an integrated approach of the public and private realm with the green necklace, stormwater feature and the extension of the public park into the private area.
- Retaining mature trees.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Can you explain the decision making of where you have put the uses? **A:** This is an ongoing conversation with the City as to the phased take down of the parcels of land. As this happens, more will be possible.
- Why did you choose the upper corner for the small play area, it will get a lot of shade? **A:** It has to do with the uses in the building and adjacency for what's planned for the building. If we move to the north of T2 it will still have shadowing. We are considering this place a bit more private and for residential use.
- What's the floorplate of T1 and T2? **A:** 7500 sq. ft.
- Can that be reduced? **A:** The issue is where else we will put the density. The only way to do that is to go higher but it's not what we've proposed due to the sensitivity to height.
- Staff: these would be the tallest buildings under the OCP, we went to Council a month back and received direction saying 32 is too high however, we still want to achieve 2.5 FSR on the site. This is why we have 2, 28 storey buildings.
- Who maintains the park? **A:** It will be a City park.
- What is the estimated time of phasing? **A:** We would work over 6 months to develop a park master-plan, it would get built in a temporary configuration as each phase progresses and entirely built in the end.
- What phase is going first? **A:** The southern end would be first as they don't have buildings of significant use on them.

- Is it possible to lower T1 and put more mass in T2? **A:** In terms of T1 being a landmark tower, it should be higher. In terms of visibility, height and location, T1 will be the landmark tower.
- Is it possible to put more mass on T1 and less on T2 so they are differentiated? **A:** For T1 it's up against the boundary of Crickmay Park. We are trying to create distance between it and M1. Getting larger would not be advisable. It could go higher and skinnier.
- Is there a possibility for a 1 or 2 storey breezeway through the middle of M2? **A:** It's possible. We want to create a view by providing transparency with the lobby but not a physical break. The semi-private courtyard is a precious space for those residents. Putting a breezeway through here would permeate that space and erode the privacy.
- Is it possible to step the buildings back to be more sensitive to the existing development along eastern? **A:** M3 is stepped back to decrease the impact on the townhouses.
- Is this the same with M4? **A:** No, it's a different use because it's an office building. We tried to break up the massing at the ground level. We have exceeded the setback by 20ft all along Eastern Avenue.
- Are there any inspirations for the character of how the parks will be developed? **A:** It will have a continuous feel but will have differences with materiality and planting. Planting will respond and contribute to character.
- Any intent with landscape on the roofs of the buildings? **A:** This continues to be developed for M3 with the potential tenant. Within the tower we do intend to use the roof space for the towers. We intend the roof on M4 to have an amenity.
- The large auto court takes up a big chunk of site, how does the City feel about this for drop off? **A:** We don't have a lot of examples of this in the City, except with the Harbourside development. We don't have a specific policy about it.
- The parking entry from 22nd is serving all the buildings on north side? **A:** Yes.
- Where is the large stormwater feature coming from? **A:** Off the structure from the project but it needs to infiltrate from the ground, it's also coming from the roofs and parkade structure and stormwater from the park.
- It looks like there's room to save the Evergreen trees near M4, was this considered? **A:** Yes, the issue is the sighting, the land slopes which would hold the slope. The requirement to have north south access also hinders that. We are trying to create a better streetscape condition with more trees.
- Where are we with Harry Jerome Centre? **A:** We are proceeding in tandem, we have a draft concept massing for the north side which is being articulated and developed. The design would be proposed for north side in conjunction with this development application.
- Would it make sense to look at this under a LEED for Neighbourhood Development Program? **A:** We are looking at meeting the Step Code with consideration for LEED.
- Can neighbourhood development be done in conjunction with the recreation centre? **A:** We are open to this.
- Staff: we have been looking at all the principles and there's been discussion on energy goals and the social aspect of sustainability, greenery, gathering spaces etc. the intention is to make this part of the project as well.
- Is there a way to go beyond to look at exchanging energies for various functions? **A:** We've discussed energy storage with an LEC. There are other measures that are possible. There is a City requirement for hook up to LEC.

- Is there a way to enhance the space between the end wall of M1 and front yard of M2? **A:** We recognize the buildings are close. When we start to design them further we will bring that into mind.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- It would be helpful to see a more defined intention for the character of the areas.
- Create a strong understanding of the intent and precedent images to set the character.
- Set some guiding principles and intentions with planting, formality and non-formality.
- A tree master-plan is critical.
- A stormwater feature should appear throughout the site, showing how the water gets there.
- The large auto court is a waste of space that can be used as an amenity for those surrounding buildings.
- There's an opportunity to pull that to the south and cover the parking entry to create a bigger courtyard for the residents.
- Encourage a better north-south connection along M2.
- Further design development addressing the roofs.
- Test out the vitality of the large civic moves and how it would work. The patio on the south side of T1 could be smaller and more intimate.
- Support the circulation and moves with the open space.
- Create a public and pedestrian space where people will want to be, programming of these spaces is very important and the plazas around the building.
- Programming, mass and density is an issue.
- Make sure the two towers are different in form and character.
- Would like to see M4 be friendlier and less aggressive on the east end.
- In terms of form and character, it would be wonderful if they didn't all feel the same. There needs to be differentiation between the buildings, designed individually and variety and character.
- Massage floorplates to differentiate the buildings and their slimness.
- Maximize potential of site topography and change of elevation.
- If you move the lobby of M2 slightly north by a unit or two, it would clear an east-west pedestrian connection.
- Strengthen the access on 22nd Street.
- Consider the edges, each edge has to be treated respectfully with massing as well as landscaping, treatments with paving etc.
- If possible, step back M2 and use the southern part of the roof deck for an amenity space.
- Switching up the orientation was a good move.
If you cannot achieve LEED ND, consider an overall strategy between this site and other site with the exchange of energy under the banner of LEC.
- Streetscapes are important round the periphery.
- As you develop the project, consider other seasons, covered areas, colour, elements in the landscape and buildings to liven things up
- Have a stormwater management plan, celebrate the water and show it off.

Presenter's comments:

Thank you for all the comments.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning and OCP Amendment Application for 123 East 23rd Street – Harry Jerome Neighbourhood Lands and recommends approval giving general support for the direction of massing and site planning with consideration of the following conditions:

- Consideration of edge conditions, architecturally and in the landscape within the site and adjacent neighbourhood;
- Explore opportunities for additional height to T1 to set it apart as a landmark building and to provide noticeable differentiation between the two towers;
- Further design development of the interior courtyard surrounded by T2, M2, M1 and T1 including the parkade entry and auto court;
- Encourage visual and potentially physical porosity between buildings M3 and M2;
- Further review and design coordination with the Harry Jerome Recreation Centre in developing the plaza interface;
- Explore the development of an overall neighbourhood sustainability strategy with the Harry Jerome Recreation Centre to the north (LEED-ND?);
- Further exploration and development of pedestrian circulation to and through the site;
- Consideration of year-round seasonal impacts in all areas of the site;
- Further refinement of the overall site stormwater management features;
- Further design development of neighbourhood and precinct character is encouraged;
- Provision of a tree master-plan;
- Consideration of sense of place and uniqueness; and
- The inclusion of public art.

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

Break: 8:26PM - 8:36PM.

5. **Harry Jerome Neighbourhood Lands Draft Development Permit Area Guidelines**

Lance Berelowitz, Urban Forum Associates, gave an overview of the Harry Jerome Neighbourhood Lands Draft Development Permit Area Guidelines and requested the Panels input on the language of the guidelines:

- This is a high level rezoning and we are depending on the DPA Guidelines to frame detailed design development for each building and each phase.
- Guidelines are based on an initial version from the applicant.
- They have been reviewed by various departments in the City and received feedback from City staff.
- The layout and format of the DPA Guidelines follows City standard format for DPA guidelines.
- We are looking for your feedback on specific sections and clauses.

Questions and Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

Page 6 – 2.3 Water Conservation:

- For M3, the stormwater treatment is a nice treatment for a seniors' facility, this needs to be maintained on the building side.
- Can the line along M3 can be moved? **A:** The property lines are committed to delivering 0.9 hectares, there's not much flexibility.
- Is Darwin holding any of these buildings? **A:** Most likely.
- Consider softening the word 'impossible' so that both sides think it's the right place for it, subject to taking on all maintenance.
- Is there language to determine how much runoff they are trying to divert? **A:** No.
- Staff: there still will be a performance requirement, it doesn't have to be defined here.
- Replace the word impossible.

Page 9 – 3.2 Site Planning:

- I like the green necklace curve and bringing into the site.
- Does the green necklace go west to east along 23rd? **A:** We don't know if it will be on the north or south side of 23rd but probably north side of 23rd. It might not be achievable for them to align.
- It could be a classic s-curve and align with something across the street.
- The language should stay the way it is.
- Mid-block pedestrian crossing to align with future Harry Jerome connection.
- What does 3.2.8 actually mean? **A:** Looking for secondary routes within the sites.
- Identify what the nodes are on Lonsdale, the bus stops.
- Provide secondary pedestrian pathway access routes into and across site as design develops while preserving the larger pieces of open spaces.
- Guideline 3.2.9/3.2.10
- Maintain trees.
- Maintain trees at the lower left corner of 21st and Lonsdale.
- Improved street master-plan for trees.
- Mark the trees as mature heritage trees.
- In 3.2.10 the City has an arborist report to decide which trees are retained.
- In 3.2.9 refer to the City's' arborist report and remove 3.2.10.
- The south west corner of site trees will help scale sun exposure to M4.
- Do the trees go on public or private property? **A:** We wanted to do them on site on slab, should have a certain amount of soil volume or they can consider offsite.
- Could the central area use more trees? **A:** It depends on the programming, we could do a line of trees along the edge to provide some shading, 3 to 1 replacement, soil volume.

Page 10 - 3.3 Building Envelope:

- Where T1 and M1 land in respect to the building on the north side.
- Pedestrian connections, north-south and visual connections are important, this might be more important for the north side building.
- No change to the language.
- Guideline 3.3.7
- Orienting towers north-south.

- Is there any other hidden rationale for turning the tower? **A:** There was concern around it looking like twin towers. They desire the buildings are as far away from each other as possible to enhance marketability.
- Was there any discussion on having T1 at the corner of St. Georges and 23rd? **A:** No.
- Buildings should be oriented and massed to employ passive solar controls.
- Keep the four criteria and let them craft it; delete reference to north-south orientation.
- Guideline 3.3.11
- The 9m setback is changing to 6m.
- What about rain protection in that 6m zone? **A:** 3.3.16 on page 13 speaks to this.
- Does this include the east frontage of M4? **A:** There wouldn't be any obvious reason to have protection there, not on M3 either.
- Guideline 3.3.14
- Concerned with the proximity of M4 to the park, minimum of 6m from eastern edge of the green necklace to face of the building.
- Want to have enough space to have a ribbon of green.
- No change to the language.
- Guideline 3.3.15
- Add a point that it's important that the retail stays transparent, tenant plans have their main frontages be open with unblocked windows.
- We currently have it that 75% of frontage should be transparent.
- Add word predominantly 'translucent'.
- Guideline 3.3.18
- There needs to be a break in M2 to make it more of a pedestrian space and become a feature of the site.
- Could have amenity space above or on the other side.
- Guideline 3.3.20
- Buildings that interface with the public park.
- This probably only applies to M1 and M2.
- No change to the language.

Page 16 - 3.4 Building Design:

- Use precedents which are more appropriate, these are high end office towers, show residential towers that are done well.
- Verbiage is okay but T2 could take on a whole different form.
- Encourage and promote in the guidelines that it's not just a box.
- No change to the language.

8. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:58 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, May 16th, 2018.

Chair