

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, December 15, 2010

MINUTES

- Present:** T. Cailes
K. Hanvey (Chair)
K. Kristensen
B. Spencer
S. Standfield
C. Taylor
Councillor Trentadue
- Staff:** Frank Ducote, Assistant City Planner
C. Perry, Supervisor, Development Servicing, Engineering Services
S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk
- Guests:** Bob Heaslip, Planning Consultant
Farzin Yadegari, Architect, Arc Homes Inc.
Kayvan Meariyeh, Architect, Arc Homes Inc.
Senga Lindsay, Senga Landscape Architecture
Lindsay Miles, Imperial Sign
Don Nunn, FineLines Building Design and Construction Management
Walter Francl (Architect)
Carla Guerrero, Development Manager, Wesgroup Properties
Chuck Brook, Brook + Associates
John Conicella, Managing Director of Development,
Wesgroup Properties
Amanda McDougall, Wesgroup Properties
Brian Shigetomi, Director, Atelier Pacific Architecture Inc.
Hugh Cochlin, Architect, Proscenium Architecture + Interiors Inc.
Randy Sharp, Landscape Architect, Sharp & Diamond Landscape
Architecture Inc.
Corin Flood, Green Building Consulting + Design
Observer: Cyrus Kabeer, Stantec
- Absent:** J. Bitar
Y. Khalighi
K. Terriss
-

A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. The Chair introduced Frank Ducote acting as staff representative on ADP.

1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held October 20th, 2010

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held October 20th, 2010 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

2. 1860 Lonsdale Avenue (Density Transfer)

The Chair read the resolution from the October 20th APD meeting.

Bob Heaslip, spoke on the project:

- The property owners wish to bring Class A office space to the area which is acceptable under the OCP.
- The project will be a bold statement on a corner that will be a critical one in the future. There are a number of recent buildings which show the way Lonsdale is evolving.
- Three variances are being requested under the zoning bylaw: the density transfer, the height 55 ft. instead of 40 ft., and an increase in site coverage from 70% to 76%.
- The design approach is to be simple and clear with the use of long lasting materials; it is a unique design respecting tenant flexibility.
- The store fronts will be in increments to match the present store fronts on Lonsdale Avenue.
- Public art will be integrated into the corner canopy.
- The density transfer allows for the expansion of affordable housing close to the site.
- Sustainable environmental initiatives include green house solar shading floor by floor, heat and energy choices, a connection to the LEC grid, an ASHRAE 90.1 target, grey water recycling for all toilets and landscaping.

Farzin Yadegari, Arc Homes, continued the presentation:

- Each commercial unit has its own seating area to add interest.
- The sunken patio at 19th and the lane could be an extension of an outdoor café area.
- The office space design allows for as much natural light as possible except from the south side which will help keep the space cool. The interior office space is simple in design so that it can be divided into offices according to clients' needs.
- There are terraces on the lane to respect the neighbours' privacy and beautify the lane
- The mesh on the southern wall is not strong or low enough for someone to climb up.
- The cladding will be glass curtain walls that continue under the soffits.

Senga Lindsay presented the landscape plan:

- The design protects the current street tree on Lonsdale Avenue.
- Three new trees and drought tolerant plants will be planted on 19th Street.
- To maximize the seating area on the common rooftop terrace, prefabricated pots of different heights and widths, automatically irrigated by a drip system, will be used.
- The green solution for the southern wall was suggested by planners as there is only 2" between the property line and neighbouring building. An aggressive-growth deciduous vine will be used to drape down the wall on a tested mesh system. The vine will be in a planter hidden behind the façade of the roof. The wall will be coated to prevent the plant rooting into the building.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Does the glazing system have mullions? A: The mullions will be every 4 ½ feet and covered with glass and caulking.
- The vertical mullions are four feet apart. The colour of the glazing will provide articulation. Are there joints in the spandrel glazing? There will be very visible mullions and visible mullion joints, are all the joints aligned? A: It is one piece of glass from floor to ceiling with ¼ in support.
- What is the construction of the aluminum frames at the base? A: They are very large pieces of brushed aluminum which are bent and connected at the back.
- The building looks very hot; will there be glare from the building affecting pedestrians? A: The south side of the building is concrete. The north side will not get any sun. The heat gain is low E. The stepping back of the building provides some shadow for the levels below; because of the tilt of the floors the reflection of the sun from each floor will be different.
- Can the irrigation be recycled storm water? A: It is not practical for this application; we will be using a drip system to minimize the amount of water used.
- What about the public amenity? A: There will be seating at the streetscape level.
- Are there guidelines about this type of building and character? Staff: There are Marine/Lonsdale streetscape character guidelines.
- What about the view impacts and the elevator penthouse which seems shallow? A: Regarding the view impact for the neighbours on 19th and across the lane; only one apartment will be affected. With reference to the elevator, we have checked with Richmond Elevator.

Comments of the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Thank you for unique shape of the building.
- The design feels cool and a bit flat; it needs some humanizing elements particularly on the ground plane. It does not do much of substance to address the important corner. I am not seeing the architectural merit which would make me want to see the extra height. I am not sure it is a great fit for North Vancouver City. I would like more warmth.
- It is a challenge architecturally. I do not want to stand in the way of a more creative geometric approach. An iconic sort of building would not be a bad thing on this corner. There is nothing nearby to which you can relate and establish an identity.
- Articulation and location of joints in this building is critical as well as how they are treated at the frame at the base and how it relates at a people level. The building can be slick and modern if the joints are treated well and the relationship with other joints is carefully thought about.
- You have worked extremely hard to address concerns expressed in the previous resolution. I have some confidence that the project can be successfully realized. It lacks a sense of materiality. Taut prismatic architecture should be developed at a much larger scale. A small building like this has too many elements in play for it to be successful. The design could go through a process of simplification and be more successful.

Applicant's comments:

- I appreciate the comments and will pay attention to the detailing during the construction process.
- Re the public realm, we are trying to make the base level pedestrian-friendly with seating areas and plantings.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the density transfer application for 1860 Lonsdale Avenue and recommends approval subject to the approval, by the Development Planner, of the detailing of the public realm and facade elements, particularly the glass cladding.

Carried
4 – In Favour
2 – Opposed

There was a short break.

The meeting was called back to order at 7:30 pm.

3. Party Bazaar – Park and Tilford (Sign DVP)

F. Ducote gave the staff input: a sign bylaw variance is requested.

Lindsay Miles, Imperial Sign, apologized on behalf of the Party Bazaar representative who was unable to attend the meeting due to illness, and reviewed the proposed signage:

- The existing display was approved by permit and the landlord in 2006, based on planned renovations at Park & Tilford.
- Bentall carried out renovations in 2008. The difference between the 2006 design and 2008 design was that a canopy was added to the façade, which meant the display could not be readapted. The projection of the canopy brought the sign forward.
- Party Bazaar are requesting they be allowed to keep the displays in place as they were built and approved in 2006, but have been in place illegally since 2008. They are requesting to keep them until the end of the lease in May 2011.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Is it guaranteed that Party Bazaar will be leaving? A: There is no intention to renew the lease.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- The sign should be left as it is due to the lease ending soon.

Presenter's comments:

- None.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Variance Permit application for the Party Bazaar sign at Park and Tilford and recommends approval of the project.

Carried unanimously

The agenda was amended to review Business Arising and the Staff Update.

4. Business Arising

None.

5. Staff Update

F. Ducote gave the staff update:

212 Brooksbank: There will be a Town Hall Meeting in January for Mountain Equipment Coop's Development Proposal. A delegation went to Council on December 6th opposing rezoning of industrial land. MEC will be presenting at tonight's meeting.

788 Copping: First Reading at Council on October 25th, carried unanimously. Public Hearing on November 15th. Second and Third Readings carried unanimously on November 15th.

415 West 16th: First Reading passed on December 13th; referred to Public Hearing.

420 W. Keith: First Reading passed at October 25th Council. Public Hearing on November 22nd. Did not pass Second and Third Reading. First Reading rescinded. Revised plans will go to First Reading on January 10th.

Anavets: Second and Third Readings of the Bylaws were carried unanimously. A grant from the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund will be given to ANAVETS to help with their legal costs. Working with BC Housing and waiting for covenants. Final adoption should be at January 10th Council meeting.

Harry Jerome Redevelopment: Many delegations to Council on December 6th. Council supported staff identifying additional capital and operational costs of including a 50 metre pool, gym space for Flicka, full programming for Silver Harbour, and allowing the Lawn Bowling Club to remain at the current location.

Density Provisions for Higher Energy Performance – Residential Four Storeys and Under: Motion to hold a Public Hearing on November 15th and First Reading were carried unanimously. Final adoption on December 6th.

Encouraging Energy Retrofits in Existing Buildings: carried unanimously at December 13th Council Mtg.

Bylaw to waive City Development Cost Charges: this recommendation to Council on December 6th was to waive DCC's for non-profit housing and 50% for rental housing. (DCC's are collected for parks and some roadwork). Final adoption – December 13th.

OCP 2021 & Beyond Workplan and Revised Budget: Recommendation to decline Federation of Canadian Municipalities grant was carried unanimously at December 6th Council.

Partners for Climate Protection Program Milestone 5 submission: recommendation to participate in the ICLEI Canada's new five milestone climate change adaption initiative and incorporate the process into the OCP 2021 & Beyond Process – carried unanimously at December 6th Council.

222-238 Lonsdale: First reading at Council on December 13th. Public Hearing on January 17th. Concern expressed by neighbours re height of the building. Have asked for detailed view impact analysis.

1250 Lonsdale: Report to November 15th Council.

Sustainability Checklists:Went to Council November 22nd and while the concept was supported by Council was referred back to staff for more consultation about the scaling and layout.

Action Item: the Design Panel would like to know why 788 Copping did not return for review when ADP requested that it come back.

6. 303 East 11th Street (Rezoning)

F. Ducote gave the staff update: there is a need for technical rezoning

Don Nunn, FineLines Building Design and Construction Management, apologized on behalf of Karl Wein, the designer, who was unable to be present, and reviewed the proposed project briefly.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Is the project creating two lots or a duplex? A: Two strata lots not sub-divided.
- Is there a requirement for a new sidewalk on St. Andrews? A: Yes, and it will include the street trees.
- A question re colours as the package was in black and white.
- What colour is the guard rail? A: Cream.
- What are the small mullions on the windows? A: They are simulated not true-divided.
- Are there stairs adjacent to the carport? A: Yes, and stairs from St. Andrews.
- Staff: the elevation shows the lane as level? A: The grade drops 2 ft.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- The architectural quality of the project would be improved if the windows were simplified; there is a great variety of sizes and proportions.
- The eaves are too shallow for the BC climate.
- Sequoias are not an appropriate tree species for a family-sized lot; they should be replaced with a much smaller-growing tree species.
- A simpler path configuration should be developed at the entrance.
- The landscape architect should work with the Engineering Department to coordinate the public realm with his landscape plan.
- Care should be taken not to create tripping hazards or narrowness in the walkway around the building; there should be a ramp rather than stairs to provide better access. There is a pinch point next to the stairs coming off St. Andrews. It should be easy to move around the building.
- The columns supporting the porches appear out of scale and should be smaller.
- The roofline looks jarring.
- I find the interior planning strange. More interior planning would lead to a better resolution on the outside. This is prominent lot; the elevation facing St. Andrews is really quite peculiar.
-

Presenter's comments:

- I agree that sequoias are not right for this design.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 303 East 11th Street and thanks the applicant for the submission. The Panel feels that the following concerns have not been adequately resolved or explained:

- that the applicant considers a more simplified and consistent arrangement and configuration of windows;
- that more generous eaves are provided;
- that the selection of sequoias is not appropriate for the project and that alternative species be considered;
- that the scale of the columns to the entrances and carports be reconsidered to be more consistent with the scale of the development;
- that ramps rather than steps be considered for the pathways to facilitate internal access throughout the site, and that rearrangement of the pathways to entries be considered to reduce localized constriction to assist in access;
- that the roofline and arrangement of roof forms be reconsidered to provide a simplified and more cohesive and coherent and orderly resolution.

Carried unanimously

*There was a short break
The meeting reconvened at 7:40 p.m.*

7. 1250 Lonsdale Avenue (OCP Amendment and Rezoning Application)

F. Ducote gave the staff update: the project will extend the idea of Central Lonsdale south of 13th. The Advisory Planning Commission wanted to know how the extra density would be earned. There is an ongoing issue with lane access; should it be incorporated or not? The City would like to see the three metre pedestrian path maintained. Staff would like a discussion on the general character, height and massing, as well as the building to sidewalk relationship and general nature of the public realm. Sense of place has implications for the other corner and further down the street. The City expects a high level of sustainability. Staff would like comments on how the massing is handled. The height is consistent with heights to the north. Staff would strongly recommend building elevations.

The Chair read the resolution from the December 8th, 2010 Advisory Planning Commission meeting.

Walter Franci, architect, reviewed the proposed project:

- They are working on the planning issues but are quite comfortable on the basic massing of the building, the planning of the atrium and the materials selected.
- The project is on one of four corners of a very important intersection; the corner is the first one being developed so we hope to set a precedent worthy of the location
- We recognise that the project is in the Lonsdale view corridor and so have stepped the residential tower back to help preserve the views. It is slender in mass and on a south-north axis to maximize views down Lonsdale.
- The atrium at the corner allows open space to illuminate and dominate the corner of the intersection.

- A drop of 9 feet from one corner to the other has an impact on the building design.
- The landscaping will be consistent with that further north on Lonsdale Avenue.
- Materials used will consist of a basalt base, zinc panel features for the facades of the building, a wooden soffit for the under storey of the commercial component.
- The residential building rises 10 floors above the podium and is designed to minimize its impact on the neighbours. We have tried to optimize frontages looking west, north and south and minimize conflicts with the building to the east.
- The fenestration is broken into strips and placed along the commercial façade it will be used as a sunscreen on the west side. The louvers will be metal.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Is there a green roof? A: The bank is considering a landscaped terrace on the southern portion of the building.
- The atrium space and connectivity to the corner. A: We want the corner to be enlivened and to participate in the activity of the building; it will be a three-storey atrium open to the plaza with the possibility of different uses e.g. displays of public art.
- What floors will NSCU occupy? A: All three floors. There may be a café. There will be space which will be available for interim commercial use until the NSCU needs it.
- What about the grade difference? A: It will be made up internally.
- What about sustainability? A: The atrium will allow air to be moved through the building and effective distribution of ventilating all three floors of the commercial building, there will be minimum mechanical ventilation. The roof overhangs on the west and south elevations will minimise the intrusion of the sun from the west and south. The envelope and overhangs of balconies will be designed to minimise heat loss.
- Is there a third party form of certification? A: We have not made a commitment: LEED silver equivalent is our starting point. It is an environmental remediation site and we have made a big investment in rehabilitating the site.
- How will you deal with daylight and the quality of the internal floor space of the commercial podium as it is about 160 ft east to west and 120 ft north to south? A: We recognize that it is a very deep space; IT programs will be using large rooms with no windows. There will probably be additional light from the south.
- Is there any outdoor space in the commercial podium? A: There are terraces off the second and third floors; there will also be an opportunity to go to the roof.
- What about pedestrian access off the lane? A: We were told the City did not want pedestrian access through the lane as people would cut across 13th Street. The neighbouring building has a podium 7 ft high; we will be landscaping the lane.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- It is a strong proposal which will contribute positively to the intersection and Central Lonsdale. The overall massing is appropriate for creating view corridors. Strong architectural expression with appropriate materiality.
- How the ground plane resolves itself down Lonsdale should be direct and include positive access to the site.
- Try to bring strong transparency and permeability into the lobby. Program the space to be energetic and active. Bring permeability down low. Atrium space is good.
- Activities in the atrium should spill out into the forecourt.
- The progression of the design is positive. I like the articulation of the balconies; the curve does not sit as comfortably as in the previous designs.
- I like the introduction to the corner, bringing light into the dark corner. It is dangerous for pedestrians; a lighter space will help.

- There should be an amenity space on the roof. It is a large slab, not attractive coming from 13th Street heading west. I am concerned about elongating the shopping street; a shopping area on a long street is difficult to sustain.
- There are not many doors and entries going down Lonsdale; it should be as interesting as possible for pedestrians. I do not see outdoor green space for the tower; an outdoor shared amenity space is important.
- What will the residents see when they look down on the roof of the commercial podium? It needs patterning or green space.
- We see the same view in all the images; I would like to see the view from 13th coming west. How does tower sit on the podium?
- I hope the eastern wall is not a blank concrete wall.
- I am looking forward to the public art component. I would like a more thorough contextual plan and see elevations as they relate to the neighbouring buildings.
- We need an analysis of pedestrian movement from the area to the south; do they use the laneway to get to Safeway?
- I appreciate that it is a commercial building, but it is important that the building area facing Lonsdale/13th does not detract from the sidewalk with pedestrians walking by long areas of glass and not being able to see through.
- We need a lot more information to be able to appreciate the project from a contextual perspective. The tower has not been successfully integrated with the podium.
- I have concerns about some of the approaches to sustainability, especially the residential tower which will have a big west-facing wall; the solar gain on the facade will be difficult to manage. You need to consider some kind of vertical screening or planting. I would like to see a measurable and verifiable commitment to sustainability. Green roofs are lovely, assuming there will be a large mechanical plant that does not end up on the roof of the podium. You will need to take seriously the comments about the quality of the office space e.g. the amount of daylight entering it.

Presenter's comments:

- Thank you for your commentary; we are continuing to evolve the design of the building
- We are working on the issue of the solar gain.
- We are cognisant of concerns around transparency and not having the appearance of a mirrored box. NSCU do not want to look like another bank on the street.
- We look forward to bringing back a more complete presentation in the future

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the OCP Amendment and Rezoning Application for 1250 Lonsdale Avenue and, although supporting the site development concept feels the following have not been adequately resolved:

- further consideration be made to provide greater texture i.e. pedestrian interest to the facade on Lonsdale Avenue at the ground level;
- further consideration be given to the provision of shared outdoor amenities for the residents of the tower;
- consideration be given to providing access to the podium roof for the residential tower;
- that the submission provide additional contextual views to illustrate the treatment of the east and south faces of the development;
- that there be further development and illustration of the connection between the tower and the podium;

- that there be further development and illustration of public art proposals;
- a more thorough and contextual assessment of how the proposed development addresses the surrounding buildings and environs;
- an analysis of pedestrian movement;
- further development of the façade at the ground plane to promote transparency and permeability, both visual and physical;
- address western solar exposure to the residences and office spaces;
- identify measurable and verifiable sustainability initiatives;
- identify and provide resolution of how mechanical plants are dealt with acoustically and visually;
- provide a thorough landscape presentation;
- consider the podium roof top view of the commercial podium for residents;
- Illustrate how the very “deep” commercial floor plates can provide a reasonable level of accommodation (daylight and views) to the occupants.

Carried unanimously

There was a short break.

The meeting reconvened at 8:50 pm

8. 212 Brooksbank Avenue – Mountain Equipment Co-op (Rezoning Application)

F. Ducote gave the staff update: it is an application to rezone from industrial to commercial. Staff is looking for an understanding of the relationship of the building to the corner as a gateway to the City, the impact of the natural elements, the bulk and scale of the building, and the quality and consistency of the finishes.

Corin Flood, Green Building Consulting + Design, began the presentation.

- Mountain Equipment Co-op (MEC) has an existing building in the District of North Vancouver which they have outgrown so needs to find a new location.
- MEC has acquired the site knowing that it requires rezoning.

Hugh Cochlin, Architect, Proscenium Architecture + Interiors Inc. continued the presentation:

- The relationship to Cotton Road, Park and Tilford and Lynnmouth Park is critical.
- The site could act as a filtration point for the Spirit Trail.
- The majority of the site is covered by building and asphalt at present; MEC is looking at turning the loading bays back to the park.

Randy Sharp, Landscape Architect, Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architecture Inc. described the proposed landscaping:

- The proposal is to blur the edges of the site and park. There would be three bicycle connections through the site into the park. The North Shore Spirit Trail would cross the south side of the site through a gateway of public art.
- Sustainable site strategies include permeable pavers and high canopy trees, rainwater off the roof flowing into the rain garden, bioswales.
- The loading bay will be moved out of the site as MEC only uses fixed axel vans.
- The sawtooth roof allows the retail floor to be lit with natural light and assists with convective ventilation strategies.
- The heating system would be tied to a weatherlogic system.
- There will be a green screen on the western elevation.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- A little café on the corner would be good for visitors and walkers. Would the use of a café be permitted? Staff: Commercial rezoning could have a café run by the store.
- How much of the existing building is being reused? A: We need to do significant work on the foundation to raise it to earthquake standards. The sawtooth roof gives a 30% saving in energy costs but has an impact on the alteration of the structure. We will reuse all the foundations and increase the mass. We will be preserving a large percentage of the slab.
- How many parking spots? A: 80
- Is the bike locker inside or outside? A: Both; the inside one is for the staff.
- Staff: Are you set up for solar panels? A: No, because the building faces north; it will be a net gain for light and heat. There will be free-standing hot water.
- How do you manage the sunlight? A: We have to ensure no undue glare in the site; we are looking at thicker glass panel to diffuse the light, or baffles.
- Are there planted walls? A: It will be a green façade using underground planters with plants growing up from the base of the building which may require supplemental watering from stored rainwater. The planting will be low maintenance with blossoms from late April to November, and winter colour.
- There are no views out to the river? A: The windows wrap the corner. Blank walls are best for retail.
- How will public meeting room be used? A: MEC makes their rooms available to the public. It will be on the exterior to make it more available.
- What about the sidewalk along Cotton Road? Staff: The existing sidewalk is four feet wide and substandard. MEC have been asked to widen it to buffer pedestrians from the traffic.
- The south west corner has an interesting landscaping but no accommodation for anyone to take a short cut. A: It is a major crossing intersection, people could cut through. We have not formalized a walkway. We will be meeting with the Parks and Environmental Advisory Committee in January. People usually walk through landscaping so we put in stepping stones.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Crossing from the south west corner is the preferred route for pedestrians; there are parking spots immediately adjacent which could lead to drivers backing out into pedestrians. The parking lot is tight for safe pedestrian circulation.
- A lot of people are used to the sidewalk; I am concerned that people with visual impairment may get lost in the circle. There need to be indicators so that they can continue to navigate down Cotton Road
- There should be a more generous connection between the store and park.
- I am pleased to see the sustainable elements.
- It is a very nice project with a visual balance of form and function.
- While I applaud reuse of the existing building, it results in a massive car park to the south of the building.
- I like the interface with the park.
- I am pleased to see a significant initiative on public art.
- The technology used in the building is good. It will be a busy parking lot with people walking where they are not supposed to; it is going to be a challenge dealing with motor vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. Raised crosswalks help to calm traffic.
- The two last parking spots make the Spirit Trail pitch down at the corner of Cotton and Brooksbank.

- The package is very thoughtfully put together and gives confidence that the building will be successful. I am anxious about hanging the building and site circulation on the existing building, but generally buy into the logic. It is nice that the structure has some legacy in the project. I would like to see some effort to reduce the parking from 3 ½ parking spots per 1,000 feet of retail. I like the architecture, but am concerned about the glass wall on the south side of the building and whether it needs solar control.
- Concerning the south facing glazing in roof; the glare issue has not been addressed in the proposal. Perhaps parking on south could be replaced with deciduous trees to help with solar gain.

Presenter's comments:

- From a green building point of view there are lots of better uses for the parking area than cars. The reality is that people drive to the store; we have less parking in more urban areas but North Vancouver is spread out.
- If we were to alter the parking and move it back, we would have to address the location of the entrance.
- The front end of store is self-programming with activity e.g. Spirit trail; if the building was flipped, it would isolate the back.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 212 Brooksbank Avenue and recommends approval subject to the approval, by the Development Planner, of the following:

- reconsideration of the balance between the parking provision and enhanced pedestrian access from Cotton Road and Lynnmouth Park;
- reconsideration of the provision of the parking spots adjacent to the pedestrian connection from the Brooksbank Avenue/Cotton Street intersection to the store front;
- consideration of visual cues and wayfinding along Cotton Road and the Spirit Trail;
- consideration for widening the path connection between the store entrance and the Spirit Trail;
- encouraging the proponents to extend the views and uses into the park and to create a greater activity and animation though the introduction of an ancillary use e.g. by including a cafe;
- further developing the south facing glazing and the roof monitors with a view to solar control and energy conservation.

Carried unanimously

9. Other Business

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, January 19th, 2011.



 Chair