

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 Tuesday, October 4th, 2016**

MINUTES

Present: J. Boyce (Chair)
B. Checkwitch
K. England
J. Geluch
S. Gushe
B. Harrison

Staff: D. Johnson, Development Planner
S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk
J. Braithwaite, Development Technician
H. Evans, Planner 1
C. Miller, Planner 1

Guests: 117 West 23rd Street
Greg Voute, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.
Erik van der Putten, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.
Bill Harrison, Forma Design
Josh Bernsen, Forma Design
Ronan Hegarty, Consultant
Richard White, Richard White Planning Advisory Services Ltd.
Mike Rakis, Owner
Michael Rakis, Owner
Alec Rakis, Owner
Stephen Rakis, Owner

407 West 16th Street
Karla Castellanos, KCC architecture and design ltd.
Randolph Rigets, Karl Wein and Associates
Sarb Kaler, KLR Building

703-819 East 3rd Street
Cyrus Navabi, Qualex-Landmark Northern Ltd. Partnership
Tyler Thorne, Qualex-Landmark Northern Ltd. Partnership
Stu Lyon, GBL Architects Inc.
Aida Kudic, GBL Architects Inc.
Christopher Phillips, PFS Studio
Richard White, Richard White Planning Advisory Services Ltd.

Guests: 600 East 3rd Street
Robert Ciccozzi, Ciccozzi Architecture
Troy McNamara, Ciccozzi Architecture
Vicki Chou, Fairborne Homes
Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Ltd.

Absent: K. Bracewell, RCMP
P. Maltby
A. Man-Bourdon
A. Sehwoerer

The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m.

B. Harrison left the meeting and entered with the delegation.

1. 117-125 West 23rd Street (Rezoning Application)

This application is to redevelop three properties and build a five storey residential building with 40 residential strata units. 2.16 FSR is proposed. The applicant would acquire a parcel at the rear to provide access to the parkade in exchange for a 10 foot strip on West 23rd Street given to the City.

Staff asked for the Panel's input regarding opportunities to exceed the energy efficiency standard, the relationship to surrounding buildings and streets and the impact of the height and mass, the proposed palette of materials and colours, the relationship of the building to the West 23rd streetscape, potential for public art, and the potential to accentuate entry points to the ground level units, and improvements to the liveability, social interaction and active design components including the circulation inside and outside the building, the quantity and quality of indoor amenity spaces, the quality and usability of outdoor amenity spaces and the bicycle and storage facilities.

Greg Voute, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc., described the project to the Panel:

- LEED Silver equivalency is proposed with the building meeting ASHRAE at a minimum.
- The project meets Official Community Plan guidelines and fits well in an area that has five three-storey buildings.
- There will be 7 one bedroom units, 28 two bedrooms and 5 three bedroom units.
- The parkade will be built under the lane which is why there is a land swap.
- All ground floor units along the lane and West 23rd Street will have front entry doors and patios.
- The main entrance is located in the centre of the building close to a glazed stairwell to encourage use.
- The main interior amenity space is a gathering space located in the lobby. The second amenity space is a private viewing garden, located between the neighbouring building and western façade.
- The design concept is West Coast contemporary with large overhangs, a large expanse of windows, heavy timber at the entrance which is carried into the lobby, natural materials and brick at the base with a clean contemporary form.

- The design is constrained by the setbacks so the building is a rectangle; materials and colour are used to deemphasize the height. The elevation is broken into segments at the corners and in the centre, constantly changing to create interest. The darker colour at the top of the building creates a recessed look, with midsections pulled out to create deep recesses for windows and further break up the mass.

Josh Bernsen, Forma Design, reviewed the landscape plan:

- The walkway on the north has been realigned along the property line; trees line both sides of the walkway.
- The ground level patios step down to the walkway.
- The private patios are delineated by hedging and retaining walls.
- Columnar evergreens buffer the building along the lane to the east.
- The south facade ground level patios step down to the lane with a similar planting scheme.
- On the west side the two primary amenity spaces are connected by a north south walkway and side entrance to the building. One space is an active, sunny space with urban agriculture and benches to provide opportunities for social interaction. The second space is a quieter, shady, contemplative space with artificial turf.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- What is the bonus based on? **Staff:** The Community Amenity Contribution. The inclusion of rental units is under discussion.
- Have you done an energy model? **A:** Not yet.
- How do you define LEED Silver equivalent? **A:** By following the guidelines.
- Will you be verifying each LEED credit? **A:** There will be a consultant to verify.
- Why would you not be LEED certified if you are doing all the work? **A:** We are going to hire consultants to achieve it. We do not think the certification really means anything but we want to get to that level.
- What about the neighbour to the west? **A:** It is a rental. He does not really have any objections.
- How does the landscape contribute to the streetscape? **A:** There are street trees which are a continuation of the trees to the west. There are opportunities for neighbours to interact. There is a custom bench seating area at the entry lobby. The City is asking for an extra 10 feet so we are doing the best we can on the site. The study on the City improvements will not be completed until next year.
- What is the soffit material? **A:** Wood, which will be treated for fire.
- Any other energy efficiency measures? **A:** We have hired an energy and sustainability consultant and will do an energy model. We are confident in our ability to meet LEED Silver. In order to achieve ASHRAE we have to make mechanical systems more efficient. We will be recommending in-floor heating which is very efficient, and high-efficiency windows.
- Are you using Hardie Panel 2.0 with colour matched reveals? **A:** Yes.
- Have you talked about being able to achieve the window sizes with vinyl? **A:** We hope we can achieve them. We may have to add structural posts to support the vinyl.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Thanks for the presentation. It is a good looking building. The approach to sustainability could use a little work. All the elevations are the same whether facing north or south.

There is not a lot of shading considering the size of the windows. I am surprised you do not have continuous insulation which would help with energy efficiency.

- Overall it is a good presentation. The massing is ok considering what may happen around it. It is a huge vertical block without a lot breaking down the form, but is still successful.
- It would be good to include ideas for public art.
- You are showing cedar on the public bench; it does not wear well. You should use a harder wood or look at a composite.
- If you want to keep the hedging at front low, taxus would be better than cedar.
- Equisetum hyemale looks better in California than here.
- Populus tremuloides will send up shoots everywhere; you will need to add a root barrier.
- You are relying a lot on festuca grasses; from a sustainability point of view you should add more year round flowering and berries.
- The garden needs a shed and hose.
- I do not believe you will meet LEED Silver; there is too much glazing in the wall to window ratio. You need more solid wall. You might want to run an energy model. On the top storey you do not need floor to ceiling glazing; pick up the sill of the glazing, it will not hurt the view.
- The envelope is quite well detailed. Keeping the building modern and clean will come down to the details, getting things to match. It is a nice little building which will benefit the neighbourhood.
- It is a nice presentation and professional package.
- I do not like to see LEED equivalency. You are doing all the work and should certify; the cost will make sense.
- Look into Built Green; it would be nice to get a Certified Green building in the City.
- It is a great spot for the building.
- Fibre glass performs better for glazing; the cost goes up for reinforced vinyl. Raising the sill helps with internal furniture planning.
- I like the form and character and the break-up of the materials. It will be a good addition to the corner.
- I appreciate the details in the front entrance; carrying the timber into the lobby. Aligning the elevator helps people move in.

Presenter's comments:

We can change the windows and talk about changing the glazing. Public art will be included. The bench will not be cedar. We have had a lot of success with equisetum hyemale. The populus is all on slab. Re sustainability; we want to achieve better than Code and will do whatever we have to do e.g. making the windows smaller or increasing the efficiency of the walls. We have not got to that level of detail yet.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 117-125 West 23rd Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner.

- Review and look at the sustainability approach in terms of certifying rather than equivalency;
- Look at Built Green BC standard as an alternate to LEED;
- Review the potential for continuous insulation to help improve the building envelope;
- A review of the window to wall ratio to improve energy efficiency;
- Review the floor to ceiling glass and introduce higher sill height for liveability and improved energy performance;
- Ideas for public art on the streetscape;
- A review of hedge material at the front of the building;
- Provide planting to support habitat for birds and bees throughout the year; and
- Review storage shed inclusion for the community garden equipment.

The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

Carried Unanimously

B. Harrison rejoined the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

2. 407 West 16th Street (Rezoning Application)

This application was previously reviewed at the July 20th meeting of the Design Panel.

Staff asked Panel for feedback on how well the applicant responded to the July 20th motion and if the changes introduce additional comments.

Karla Castellanos, KCC architecture and design ltd. reviewed the response to the resolution:

- The interior layout has not changed much from the last presentation.
- Re context: they consulted with the client. The colour was softened to be more compatible with the neighbourhood, but they are still keeping the modern look.
- The front windows were enlarged to take advantage of the sloped ceiling and capture more light.
- The joints were reviewed to line them up with the windows, balconies and windows, and clean up the look.
- A feature was added to the rear buildings to make them more interesting.
- Eight foot screens were added between the back balconies for privacy.
- A pony wall was added at the front entrance to clearly identify each unit from the exterior.

As the July 20th motion contained no comments on the landscape plan, the delegation did not include a landscape architect.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Why could you not make major changes to the massing? **A:** The client is comfortable with it and the method of construction. There are flat roofs in the neighbourhood. He is familiar with flat roofs.
- You can do a variety of massing under the same roof; why could you not do a different arrangement of massing?

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- I find this very bulky, not well articulated, not well detailed. The layout and circulation are not bad. I do not support it in view of how it sits on the site and interacts with the neighbourhood.
- I do not think your answer is adequate to address the comments from the Panel from last time.
- The building has a blocky and awkward appearance. Not much has changed. I did not support it last time and so do not support it this time.
- Massing and materiality have changed very little. You have changed the colour, but not for the better. I do not know if it fits with the neighbourhood because the images are hard to read.
- It is not very legible. It is very hard to read the renderings of the elevations.
- I have a concern re liveability; the living room has doors leading out to the patio. You cannot place a couch in that room due to placement of the fireplace. I question the liveability so am not in support.
- The renderings are not helping you. There are programs which have better quality.
- There are no major changes to the massing of the building. The building should be a precedent in terms of quality, refinement of details. There are some changes from the last time but not enough to warrant support.

Presenter's comments:

Last time I did not get the impression that we had to revisit the massing. In terms of the roofing, the client's concern is having lots of roofs at different height rather than having a continuous roof. There are different options for design, in terms of roof articulation. The massing is not tremendously big. I think we are in the middle of what is already in the neighbourhood. We thought we had improved the renderings from last time but need to upgrade our system. In terms of the layout I think there is furniture that will fit. We can do some layouts. We could provide a model if it would help.

It was regularly moved and seconded

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

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

Carried Unanimously

3. 703-819 East 3rd Street / 746-758 East 2nd Street (Rezoning Application)

This application was previously reviewed at the June 29th Design Panel meeting.

Staff asked for the Panel's input on the interface with Moodyville Park, the building setbacks to support street and park interfaces, the composition of the central building including townhouses, and the balance of diversity and harmony of the material palette.

Stu Lyon, GBL Architects Inc., described their response to the Panel resolution:

- They have looked at the project and have made some serious changes to it.
- The FSR is 1.7 which is slightly lower than the previous design by about 5,000 sq. ft.
- The two storey amenity building has been moved to the corner of building A to create a passageway between Buildings A and B.
- The design has been changed from three very similar buildings to a hierarchy of buildings with the centre building completely revised. It is set back from street and has a pitched roof and stronger corners. It could have been built separately from the other buildings. It is like a manor house. This has brought more green space to the front of the project and creates a much stronger break in the façade of the three buildings, creating a sense of incremental growth.
- The number of townhouses is the same, the ones in the new building have a different frontage on the park which breaks up the park frontage, and a more robust design.
- Details from the middle building are echoed in the other two for consistency.
- The artificial wood product has been removed and replaced with real cedar under the soffits and the balconies.
- Window shapes have been modified.
- Lapped Hardie Board has been added to the top floor façade.
- The brick on the project has been raised up to the second floor.
- The central building has different windows which are echoed in the other two.
- The blank wall has been broken up with a planter.
- The east end of the project has more windows to animate the façade more.
- Stairs now lead from the project down to the park edge.

Christopher Phillips, PFS Studio, described the landscape plan:

- The design provides a positive edge in the interface to Moodyville Park, but the park is still in design stage.
- The East 3rd Street landscape has changed to a more formal approach with a double row of trees, following more direction from the City.
- The bigger set back of the middle building gives more variation to the landscaping.
- The new connection between buildings A and B drops a storey to the park. Greenery along the edges gives privacy and a wooden seating area at the end of the passageway provides an opportunity to sit in a sunny spot and overlook the park.
- The eastern corner at Queensbury Avenue has been relaxed with the ground floor units set back and the gateway opened up.
- The second connection includes a contemporary version of the flumes which were there before.
- A sustainable approach to planting has been taken with more native plant materials reflecting the plants in the park.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- How is the design innovative? **A:** There is a sense of incremental growth with a hierarchy within the project. We are trying to imbue it with a little bit of a story.
- What is the story around the manor house in terms of Moodyville? **A:** It is invented; we could not find a lot of stories that easily applied to four storey buildings. There is a bit of industrial heritage in the windows and brick is a heritage kind of material with a very durable feel to it.
- How does the revised architecture look like a North Shore setting? **A:** We are building it into the North Shore in to a slope. We are trying to use indigenous materials like wood which is also used in inside spaces, and are using a red brick which is a local material.
- How is the fire lane going to be incorporated into the project? **A:** The park design is developing; there will have to be access to service the park on the level surface. It will be a path wide enough for a fire truck. The discussion is ongoing with the City.
- What is the landscape doing to create a distinct sense of place and to be innovative? **A:** We have looked at the history of the site and are using the flume, big platforms of wood to represent the past. Accessibility is important.
- Is there access from the south side to the amenity space? **A:** No. There is a driveway underneath it which raises it.
- Is there a precedent for red brick? **A:** Yes; Clayburn Brick was the original Lower Mainland brick manufacturer. They only made red brick.
- How do you do cedar soffits? **A:** It is a four storey wood frame building.
- Was there any consideration to breaking it up into four buildings? **A:** No, the efficiencies did not work in four buildings.
- In your opinion do you honestly believe that this is not going to be too much mass and form? **A:** East 3rd Street will be completely different in a few years and will be all four storey buildings.
- Is it liveable? **A:** It is totally liveable; we have been doing six stories, four stories is very manageable. There will be a big change on the street.
- I struggle with the mass in the context. I question the guidelines and where it is going. **A:** Decisions have been made on where density has landed. We are still only 1.7 FSR which is not that high in terms of the region.
- Will public access through the building be secured by a ROW? **A:** The path between buildings A & B will become a public right of way through an easement. The second passageway will remain private.
- The treatment will need to read differently for both passageways to show the difference between public and private space. **A:** People will become used to it. I think most people will enter the park through Queensbury or Moody.
- Is there an opportunity to re-use the wood from the trees being removed in the landscape? **A:** Good idea. There are a couple of cedars which we could use.
- I like the red brick; did you consider different materials that would have the same kind of history? Metal relating to the ship building or more wood? **A:** It is too large to use much more wood. We looked at stucco and are still discussing it as an option. We do not think metal panel would work and would only use steel in small quantities as it is expensive.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Thank you for your presentation. Showing the comparison of the changes is very good.
- I think there is more innovation in the landscape than in the architecture. We will probably have to live with the form and character. I think more can be done with the architecture to bring it down and how it meets the ground. The breezeway is good.
- Any reuse of materials is good. I like the move in pulling the manor back from the street.

- If there is any way to break up the massiveness of it, I would be in favour.
- The landscape is really well done and artfully references history with good movement between the buildings and the park. I have never questioned the landscape.
- I think the architecture is not as successful in creating an authentic sense of place. The manor house looks invented. I know you are acting on our suggestions. You have changed the form of the one building; it looks out of place, an anomaly. It does not seem like it came from the place.
- I agree about the massing. I look at the almost consistent roof line and the massive front which does not encourage people to walk down the street. I find it unsuccessful.
- I do recognize the changes that were made: the passageways, cedar in the soffits; they are good and will make a difference.
- I appreciate the effort to make significant changes and recognize there has been a lot of work on the detailing to break up the mass.
- I struggle with how it is creating a distinct sense of place. I think it is going to take a lot of creativity. Unfortunately you are first project to be reviewed.
- The landscape is well done and meets the Moodyville Guidelines. However, I have seen large timber platforms and flumes before. It could be more innovative.
- Comment to Engineering: work to minimize the effect of the hard surface next to the project would be great.
- I appreciate the work that has gone into the resubmission. The Guidelines ask the applicants to be innovative and think about architecture that has a distinct sense of place.
- Missing from the architecture is an analysis of what Moodyville is and it is not a manor house; I do not think they are looking for a made-up story. I like the brick; how can you use it in a way that is modern and innovative?
- I find the vocabulary of Building B problematic. I would expect a page of design analysis. The building could be any place, any time. There is nothing that talks about it being innovative and forward thinking. It is a generic multi- family four storey building.
- You have the challenge of being first and setting the bar for other applicants.
- This is a good example of how resubmissions should be presented to compare and contrast the changes.
- I appreciate the public access through to the park; you are really connecting the park to the future. Work with the City to create a language that clearly identifies it as a public access to the park.
- There has been a lot of change over the last four years. I struggle with the Hardie Panel; it is becoming familiar.
- Colour can change different buildings e.g. colour changes on balconies. Maybe each building can be differentiated through the use of different colours. The wood soffits complement the brick.
- Historical analysis would help. The massing is a result of the guidelines and density required for the area.

Presenter's comments:

I think we have done a good job of designing the building and have responded very carefully to your comments. There are objectives that have been set out which the design follows. What is Moodyville and how are these four storey 1.7 FSR buildings going to be Moodyville.? There is not a lot to work with; we are building a new community. I am not sure there is a distinctive Moodyville identity we are going to find to apply to it.

Thank you for your comments. We welcome your comments and think it is a much better building than before. Moving the amenity room cost us density but it was the right thing to do. In terms of innovation, Qualex has won awards for being innovative. We try to recognize our markets and create a robust product that tells a story. Glass brings light into all the corridors. The pitched roof will break up the roofline. We do not know what the Moodyville character is; it is hard to know how to meet the guidelines in an affordable way.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 703 – 819 East 3rd Street and 746-758 East 2nd Street and thanks the applicant for the resubmission. The Panel feels that the following concerns have not been adequately resolved or explained and looks forward to further review at a future meeting:

- More can be done with the architecture to bring down the massing and break it up;
- Design should grow out of the site analysis to create a narrative which can be used so the design does not look as ubiquitous, helping to create a new authenticity of the place;
- A clearer demonstration of how the project is innovative;
- A review of materiality as it relates to the context and history of Moodyville;
- A review of the fire lane in terms of reducing the hard landscape in coordination with the City requirements;
- Ensure coordination between the Moodyville Park Design team and the project for consistency in the public path materials to assist with wayfinding; and
- Explore the opportunity to reuse/include existing trees, which will be removed as part of the road widening, into the project.

The Panel requests a staff review of the guidelines to help identify guidelines for creating a sense of place.

**Carried
4 in favour
2 opposed**

B. Harrison left the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

4. 603-639 East 3rd Street (Development Permit)

This application was previously reviewed at the July 20th Design Panel meeting.

Staff asked for the Panel's input on the effectiveness of the material revision to address repetition along the street and lane, and the balance of diversity and harmony for the material palette with paired buildings.

Robert Ciccozzi, Ciccozzi Architecture, outlined the response to the Panel resolution:

- The units on the upper floors have been revised to be more affordable.
- A passageway through the site connecting to the lane has been added for public access.
- There is more variation in the architectural form along East 3rd Street while trying to create a more unified design with the two buildings relating to each other.

- There is a rhythmic variation along the street with pedestrians walking past seven vignettes.
- Decks have been added at the corner to soften it. Four bays of brick have been introduced to create a textual variation.
- The staircase is externalized through a window wall system.
- Subtle changes in brick colours have been made to both buildings; it is important the project feels unified.
- Ground floor units have a strong sense of identity with individual entrances.
- The innovation comes through the product being situated in a neighbourhood in transition. The architecture will redefine the area.
- The design tries to introduce little details which will make the difference.

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

- The linkage through the site is a pathway system using stairs.
- The courtyard space at the back of the building has more linkages to the lane with benches at each connection.
- The storm water management plan includes a rain garden.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Do you have a 3D image of the building? **A:** We have cleaned up the roof to make it simpler with subtle variations along the streetscape. We do not feel the buildings are imposing on the street. We think the little things make the difference.
- What is the material on the inside of the arches? **A:** Cementitious Hardie Board with a clip system which will be painted the same colour as the Hardie Board.
- What is the beige? **A:** A cementitious product to look like natural cedar.
- How does this support the appearance of incremental development? **A:** The different elements and the entryway, subtle variations in the materials and the colour changing as you walk along East 3rd Street.
- How does it foster a distinct sense of place, of Moodyville? **A:** Moodyville is single family homes; we are changing that. How it impacts the street, interacts with the street. Each of the ground floor units has an individual address. There are a lot of programming elements on the lane side which are all things that would have happened in someone's back yard, and which all the residents can use.
- Is there an option of accessible access through the public pathway? **A:** It is difficult because of the grade change; we would need a 200 foot ramp.
- Is the walkway private or public and how wide is it? **A:** It is public and five feet wide.
- Will the access have a public right of way on it? **A:** We have not thought about it. It would need to be controlled at night. It is separate from the private patios.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Thank you for the presentation. If there is a way of celebrating the access between the two buildings, it would help break up the repetitiveness of the design along East 3rd Street. It is still a bit of an issue. The repetition of the arches almost works against breaking down the building into something smaller. It makes the building feel almost mass produced. The landscape has a sense of repetitiveness with the same thing happening all down the block.
- We are presenting the same challenges to all applicants and struggling to enforce the Moodyville Guidelines.
- The idea of such a large site as being presented as unified is problematic.

- The idea about innovation in Moodyville; there is an opportunity at the lanes – you are moving in the direction of creating something interesting in the lane. There is more in the landscape than is in the rendering. Innovate at the back of the building on the lane and create a stronger relationship of things happening in the lane. I recognise you are trying to do it.
- I appreciate the new access and stronger interface at the lane, the day-lit staircase, the work on the façade to change it. Changing the façade has not done enough to address the guiding principle to support the appearance of incremental development.
- I am not sure that using Hardie Board that looks like real wood. More could be done to address the guiding principles.
- The challenge of this project is to create a place that fosters a distinct sense of place and reflects Moodyville. I think you have to approach it differently, not looking at what it will be in the future but looking at the history and heritage of the place and try to address it. The Guidelines are asking us to propose an architecture that addresses it.
- The buildings could be from anywhere.
- What is missing is connecting it to the North Shore and to the place in a meaningful way. It could be in any neighbourhood and anywhere and is missing the point of the principles.
- I do not find the innovative explanation to be convincing.
- I am challenged by the architectural expression; there are a lot of colours and materials. I think the use of the brick in an arch is odd; it is a unitized material but is being used in an applique way. You could tone down the materials and colours. It is very busy with a lot of repetition which is drawing more attention to the length of the project.
- The gap is an opportunity; could you exploit it? Make it more generous with water features; maybe through block connections will be one of the defining aspects of Moodyville. It could be more generous as opposed to just a staircase.
- I appreciate the presentation and the quality of the project. I like the treatment of the lane which is quite innovative. I would love to walk by it. I am in support of it.
- Re the sense of place, there is more history than a single family neighbourhood. Moodyville had one of the first pulp mills, the oldest in Vancouver. There should be a bit of story in terms of how the material is used.
- A site analysis would help the project; e.g. what was Moodyville from history, changing from single family to denser buildings, how is it going to be told by the major projects such as you.
- Hardie Board is a very common material being used in many projects.
- The use of brick softens the material.
- The challenge for me is there is no story to how this design is being achieved.
- You need to articulate a break-up of the massing.
- It is a challenge for you being one of the first projects to be reviewed.
- This is a new context for four storey buildings, but it is being done everywhere. You have the opportunity to say “This is Moodyville”. Create something that is unique and defines the place.
- There are unique elements on the North Shore that could be brought out.

Presenter’s comments:

Thank you for your comments. I think every project is having the same difficulty as we are having. I think the guidelines are expecting too much and asking too much. I do not think we have too many colours, patterns and layers. I think we have broken the massing with the arches; we are going to articulate it. There is an honesty in the massing and what it is: a condominium building with balconies. I respect the history of Moodyville. How do I recreate

it in this form? We worked hard on the entryways to create a human scale. There are only four bays defining one part of the building. We could open up the entryway at the sidewalk. We have received compliments from the public on the architecture. It is a unified project that has subtle changes; we want the buildings to work together. It is not a big project, but in the context of Moodyville it is a big change. It is going to be difficult; there are the economics to juggle. We are working hard on it. I do not think any project will get through.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Permit for 603 – 639 East 3rd Street and thanks the applicant for the resubmission. The Panel feels that the following concerns have not been adequately resolved or explained and looks forward to further review at a future meeting:

- Celebrating the public pathway access between the buildings;
- A review of the vertical elements to help reduce the massing;
- A review of the repetitiveness of the landscape along East 3rd Street;
- A review of the lane to create a stronger active experience on top of what has been presented;
- A review of the façade revisions and materials in relation to creating a sense of place; and
- Future submissions to respond clearly to previous comments about innovation.

The Panel requests a staff review of the guidelines to help identify guidelines for creating a sense of place.

**Carried
Four in favour
One Opposed**

5. Other Business

None

6. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, October 19th, 2016.

Chair



