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 13th, 2017

MINUTES

Present: J.P. Mahé
         P. Maltby
         A. Man-Bourdon
         K. Bracewell, RCMP
         B. Checkwitch
         B. Harrison

Staff: D. Johnson, Development Planner
       M. Friesen, Planner 1
       J. Braithwaite, Development Technician 2
       R. Fish, Committee Clerk

Guests: 2052 Chesterfield Ave (Rezoning Application)
         Peter Hildebrand, Iredale Architecture
         Mike Enns, Enns Gauthier Landscape Architects
         Ryan Beechinor, Developer

         311 West 1st Street (Rezoning Application)
         Paul McDonnell, Studio B Architects
         Johnny Zhang, Rod Maruyama Landscape Architecture
         Walter H. Berukoff, Client
         Stephanie Martel, Client

         645 St. Davids (Rezoning Application)
         James Stobie, Synthesis Design Inc.
         Kevin Li, Synthesis Design Inc.
         Matt Hansen, Matthew T. Hansen Architect
         David James, Insite Design Landscape Architecture
         Curtis Krahn, Principal of Synthesis Design Inc.
         Gregg and Diane Hallaway, Owners
         Mark Hallaway, Owner

Absent: K. Yushmanova
        B. Phillips
        J. Geluch

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m.
1. **Resolution for Wall Financial - Moodyville: Phase 1, 2A & 2B held November 29th**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Permit Application for Moodyville – Wall Financial, Phase 1: 509-603 East 2nd Street, Phase 2A: 548-602 East 1st Street, and Phase 2B: 502-528 East 1st Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Consider furthering the diversity of the form and character in the architectural expression;
- Ensure that while moving forward into future Phases, there is an explicit differentiation and departure in the architectural expression from these proposals in keeping with Moodyville guidelines;
- Ensure unit identification and wayfinding provided is clear for all units of the site;
- Ensure that natural surveillance and CPTED strategies in the semi-public realm are upheld with path lighting and landscape that is not overgrown and dark;
- Ensure that landscape design is further refined with staff in both semi-public and public realm spaces;
- The Panel expresses a general support for garage entries off of 1st Street and the living lane noting the potential conflict with the current bylaw;
- Explore opportunities for common amenities throughout the site that facilitate varied activities; and
- Explore the potential for including rain protection in public nodes.

The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

Carried Unanimously

2. **Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held November 29th**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held November 29th be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

3. **Business Arising**

None.

4. **Staff Update**

None.

5. **2052 Chesterfield (Rezoning Application)**

The City has received a development application to rezone 2052 Chesterfield Avenue to support a 5 residential unit, 3 storey, stratified, townhome building. The townhome units each include a basement with a lock-off suite, resulting in a total of 10 dwelling units on the site.
Parking for the development is located off of the lane, which leads to a small courtyard and a rear entrance to each of the primary dwelling units. The site is located on the south-east corner of Chesterfield Avenue and West 21st street, and is one block west of Lonsdale Avenue. The site is well connected to public transit, active transportation routes, commercial areas, park space, and public services and amenities. The base zone for the proposal is Ground-Oriented Residential 3 (RG-3). The development is being led by Peter Hildebrand of Iredale Architecture.

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

- The proposed site design including: setbacks, massing, the parking area and any potential CPTED concerns;
- Architectural style, the application of façade materials, and the proposed colour palate; and
- The proposed landscape plan, including integration with the public realm, opportunities to expand common and/or vegetated areas, and the planting plan.

Peter Hildebrand, Iredale Architecture, described the project to the Panel:

- Close to transit and amenities.
- Site has been in the Morris family for 62 years.
- Parking at grade level frees up space below the units.
- Provides an opportunity of having two street frontages.
- Schools are close by.
- Creating a collective community with the courtyard.
- Existing house spans two lots.
- The courtyard is private and an area of respite.
- Ample decks up on the third level.
- Large end units also have patios.
- Rental suites in the basement are accessed by patios at the front.
- Material palate is a warm grey-beige brick, white accent panels, charcoal window frames including warm Corten steel like panels.
- Bookended the project with brick.
- Large sun oriented patios facing the south.

Mike Enns, Enns Gauthier Landscape Architects, reviewed the landscape plan:

- Using this as a precedent project to assimilate into the community.
- Promoting rain water management; plant palate has a lot of trees on site with wider planters.
- Permeable pavers.
- Visible green infrastructure, expansive walls could have green walls.
- There are social spaces along the Chesterfield bike path. The corner has a good spot for pause, pedestrians, a bench and illuminated sign.
- A communal courtyard with feature paving and sunken in patio to promote social activities on the site.
- Materiality is stone with Corten steel accents.
- Planting is a mix of perennials, grasses and coniferous trees deciduous trees, native shrubs.
Contemporary refined details.
Upper floors have roof top patios that are oriented towards the center and intimate spaces with planters and trees.
Lighting concept is a subtle approach. We want to hide the light source and ensure safety and wayfinding.
Opportunity for illumination of key landscape features, furnishing or green walls.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Is the garbage and bike storage in one room? A: Yes.
- Is it secure? A: Yes.
- Is there gated access form parking to the courtyard? A: Not shown yet but it’s a good idea.
- What lighting treatment is being used for the parking area? A: Subtle lighting but enough light to feel safe bringing cars in. It will be soffit lighting that isn’t too obvious.
- Have you considered making the planters in the courtyard smaller so it’s more of a communal area? A: Its function is to get people together but then break off into more individual units. There is a building massing component as well. We don’t want people walking right beside someone’s window either. Want to ensure privacy where possible
- Can you describe in more detail the perennial garden? A: It will be a butterfly garden to attract insects and birds, a departure from a low maintenance foundation around the perimeter and ensures a buffer between building and sidewalk. Needs further design development.
- On the plant list there is mention of Thuja Plicata, where will this be located? A: It will be sprinkled around the site.
- Property edge has a low wall, is the brick the same on the building? A: It would be nice to tie them in. It’s a veneer brick so we can apply it to anything.
- Is the Corten steel, Corten steel like? A: No, it is Corten steel. If we go with this we need to be careful how we detail that because it stains.
- Are there any water features? A: Not in the public realm, it would be a private feature.
- Will the detailing on the frame and windows where it is sloped up at the bottom and down at the top be visible inside the building? A: On the main upper floors yes, but at the bottom no.
- What is the white product? A: Swiss pearl, it’s very smooth and stunning.
- Is there natural lighting in the garbage, recycling and bike area? A: Yes, we can put a window in or something up high and tie it in with architecture
- The lock off suites, 3 out of 5 seem to have windows in lower areas, is that the intent, not to have natural light? A: It has sliding glass. There is a possibility to get glazing on two of them by taking away some of the planting area. The other unit is against the parking structure so there’s not as much of an opportunity.
- To staff: Is there a public art contribution? A: No.
- To staff: Does the parking calculation include lock off suites? A: No, lock-off suites are exempt.
- If you get an alternate material to the Corten, what would it be? A: There is a ceramic product that we haven’t used before. It has a pattern so you have to be careful how to cut it. It’s a 10ft panel. Our first choice is Corten.
- Where is unit storage located? A: There is space within the unit itself.
- Where do personal items go, for example a Christmas tree, luggage etc.? A: We have large 3rd floor studios which could be used for storage, there is flexibility for that.
• There is a sharp contrast in visual impact and finish compared to across the street where it is a warm brown. The eastern elevation looks industrial; it’s not a warm look. Could you think of anything to warm it up a bit? A: We will consider this.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

• Ensure you have an effective lighting treatment in the parking area, this is a security issue.
• Addressing and unit identification needs to be clear for first responders.
• The form is a great way to deal with density in this neighbourhood.
• Appreciate the differentiation in the architectural form.
• South facing patios are great.
• View along 21st is elegant. The way the units step down is good.
• The Corten steel material needs to be genuine, the brick will benefit this as well.
• Thuja Plicata can get quite large. Picea gives an opportunity for a coniferous balance. It’s nice to see a mix of the two.
• Good mix of plant materials with a balance between native and non-native that will do well with maintenance.
• From the Chesterfield view, two planters on the staircase moving up to the entrance look monolithic. Consider breaking that up or using a different material that cascades over the edge.
• Pavers in the carport are a nice touch.
• Appreciate the juxtaposition between the white panels and the Greystone.
• Nice to see a fresh contemporary expression that is different.
• Pay attention to overlook and privacy issues.
• Form and character is great. There are a lot of details in the architecture and landscape. This needs to be pulled off well.
• There is a metal panel that looks like wood, recommend using real wood.
• Skilfully designed project.
• This building is an art component in itself.
• Get light into the bedrooms that are at the back instead of borrowing natural light.
• Garbage recycling and bike area need more natural light and a sorting counter to make it usable.
• Nice to see someone trying something new and not the status quo.
• The architecture is exemplary.
• The project strongly hinges on materiality; if you change the material it changes the architecture. Maintain authenticity of the materials, keep the Swiss pearl.
• Instead of aluminum wood consider using real wood.

Presenter’s comments:

• Thank you for all the comments.
• Materials chosen are incredibly durable.
• We are nervous about using real wood. It can deteriorate over time but we will look into it.
It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 2052 Chesterfield Avenue and recommends approval of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for the quality of the proposal and their presentation.

Carried Unanimously

There was a discussion regarding the amount of significant development occurring in the Moodyville area and the lack of visible public art contributions per project. It was clarified that there is an overall contribution being made and the City allocates accordingly via Council.

There are a lot of opportunities in various spots within Moodyville. A whole new subsidy is being approved with a lot of residents. The public art that would be a part of that community is very important. It defines the culture and shouldn’t become lost. The livability of it is a huge component.

6. 311 West 1st Street (Rezoning Application)

The City has received a development application to rezone 309-311 West 1st Street to support a six storey mixed-use building consisting of 50 rental units and approximately 3,600 square feet of ground floor commercial space. This is supported by a two level underground structure to support vehicle parking and secured bicycle parking.

The location of the site is on the south west corner of West 1st Street and Mahon Avenue, directly north of a forthcoming private school that the Panel reviewed and Council approved last year. The subject site has good connections for public transit and close to commercial related amenities.

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

- The architectural style of the proposal, including the application of façade materials;
- The design to the main entrance; and
- The proposed landscaping plan, including the design of the west patio areas.

Paul McDonnell, Studio B Architects, described the project to the Panel:

- Corner of Mahon Avenue and West 1st Street.
- Six-storey concrete building.
- Two-storey parkade is accessed off of the lane.
- Materials include architectural concrete, metal panels and high efficiency glazing.
- There is a large staircase in front that connects to the lobby.
- Ground floor is commercial.
- The back area has 3 garden suites.

Rod Maruyama, Maruyama Landscape Architecture, reviewed the landscape plan:

- Satisfies commercial and residential components.
- Streetscape has new planting with street trees and a grass boulevard.
• Private patio spaces are all defined with raised planters and a decorative privacy fence and pots.
• Plant materials are small deciduous trees, shrubs and perennials to provide biodiverse planting.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

• On the west side where garden patio exits, is there only one way out towards first? A: Yes.
• All gateways to the patios are set back as well as the two exits from the building? A: Yes. These are just emergency exits.
• They are hidden from view? A: Yes, there is a gate at the end where it hits 1st Street.
• Parking garage has 4 directions that are sloped, is there any opportunity to take the two east west ramps and increase the slopes and the other two sides can be flat? I’m concerned about handicap parking on the slope? A: The parkade is tight. It’s a small site and not very wide.
• What is the max slope to use? A: 10%.
• Are they wheelchair stretcher accessible? A: Yes.
• At the access at the main entrance that steps to Mahon, is there a ramp down onto 1st? A: It’s a less than 5% slope. The ground raises there. Front entrance will be accessible.
• There are lots of planters around south side and east side at the main level, can you walk in those planters, how do they get maintained? A: They will be maintained through a gardening service. It has drip irrigation as well.
• Does the residential area service the commercial? A: No.
• The layouts for bedrooms look small. Storage is an issue with dressers, have you considered how this will work? A: No, not with dressers. We’ve kept rooms at 9ft which is a standard size.
• On the front elevation, there are balconies that are side by side, how are they separated? A: We tried to stay away from side by side connection, we have a full scale divider that is glass and slightly translucent. They occur where the studio units are.
• There is a lot of concrete at the base of the building due to slopes, what kind of forms will use to build them? A: We are not sure yet.
• Metal forms might give them a cleaner finish compared to wood, have you considered this? A: It is a cost issue. Trying to address it with planting that hangs over and cascades down.
• For the public art panel, are you going internal or through an art council? A: There is no art requirement.
• What is the salmon panel art feature by the amenity space? A: There is a rock feature and salmon panel.
• The roof plan has one patio, can you explain this? A: It’s divided into lower roofs for the penthouse units. The upper roof is a patio on top of the penthouse unit which is private access.
• What is the treatment? A: It’s not an intensive roof.
• Can you describe the materiality on the building and the interface of materials and the edging? A: There are three primary materials; larger architectural concrete that frames the façade, glazing and metal panel. We stayed with a greyscale colour
scheme. The panel itself is broken into different types of texture with black and silver. The texture is designed to be corrugated.

- The metal cladding which is MT01 dies into the concrete, is there space? A: We haven’t done the real detail work on materials. There would be a slight reveal to make the materials work together.
- The commercial elevator goes to the penthouse? A: Yes, it is for the owner.
- The landscape fencing on the elevations on the lane looks like intriguing material what is it? A: It is intended to be wood or some sort of wood like, lower maintenance material. There is debate around this.
- Are you considering Hardie panel? A: Yes.
- The penthouse has a stair to the roof? A: Yes.
- Is there an opportunity to put glass walls at the roof level in the stairwell? A: Yes.
- Is there an opportunity to bring in natural light into garbage and recycling rooms? A: Yes, with an upper window.
- There is a roof patio up top above the 6th unit? A: Yes, it’s associated with the penthouse unit.
- Is the bike storage closed stalls or a wire rack? A: Would be done to city requirements. We haven’t gotten to this level of detail yet.
- What kind are you considering for the commercial space? A: Professional offices.
- What kind of storage space will you provide? A: None.
- Where will storage items go? A: Storage is tight. We discussed a hall closet and larger closets in each bedroom.
- The east elevation along Mahon and the way it relates to pedestrians seems neglected. Is there no opportunity for grade entrances? A: The grade entrance is off of 1st street.
- Is that purposeful? A: It is generated out of the parkade. We pulled it back 5ft and put a series of planters that cascade down.
- The material that appears to be wood in your rendering, is that a consistent material? A: Yes.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Ensure effective lighting treatment on west and south sides, there is a lot of shadow on the west side.
- Ensure access control off of 1st street down the walkway is secured. There are setbacks to patios that can hide people. There are also entrances to the parking lot exit and the commercial premises.
- On the lane side, there is the advantage of vehicles coming in and out, but ensure appropriate lighting usage. Make the laneway more inviting for people to walk through.
- Make sure it is appropriately lit along the side of the parking garage.
- For the commercial office entry to the street, passing the bike racks may be an issue for fire access.
- For the wood fence, don’t use a fake wood, do aluminum or steel.
- The elevation on Mahon Avenue is a big drop of solid wall. Consider looking at other opportunities to deal with the wall height.
- Step back two rows of planting to deal with the huge grade change and animate the space a bit.
- The bedroom suites are small; consider getting dressers into the rooms.
- Some living rooms are small and there isn’t much furniture shown.
- Refine the layouts a bit to improve them.
- Consider losing a suite to accommodate more square footage.
- The form and character are good and I support the rental and mixed use.
- Concerned about detailing.
- Durability of materiality is important.
- Encouraged to do the art panel. Consider something other than a salmon panel, do something a little different.
- Consider more of a roof element for extensive use without contravening the height. There will be spectacular views.
- New streetscape on West 1st and Mahon could be more artful to line the sidewalk more.
- On Mahon, there is an opportunity for more trees or public open space.
- The fence along the laneway is a residential precinct. I recommend something other than Hardie panel.
- The office component glazing will be transparent. Take the residential entry material around and into the office to make that a feature wall to make it more three dimensional.
- Using soffit materials is an opportunity to warm things up considering the palate.
- Bring natural light into garbage rooms and bike rooms to make it user friendly.
- Consider EV stalls, E-bikes and a green roof.
- There is an opportunity for solar panels or hot water panels.
- Make the treatment of the sidewalks more of a community part of Mahon, add areas of respite.
- Mahon and 1st are busy traffic wise. When council considered the school it was a major concern. It will get very busy in mornings and afternoons.
- Concerned with a rooftop garden. Once built, people put trees which makes it another storey in terms of impact for those to the north
- The project needs additional design development with landscape along Mahon Ave.

**Presenter's comments:**

- In regards to the Hardie panel, we are looking for good materials. The cost of construction has gone up and we have to balance cost. We are trying to get the best product that we can because it will be our building for a long time.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 311 West 1st Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Further design development of the architectural elevations and landscape design along Mahon Avenue;
- Encouraged to pay attention to the detailing of the architectural façade components and materiality;
- Encouraged to retain the use of wood on the fence along the lane;
- Consider the use of wood on the soffits;
• Explore the possibility of usable green space on the roof for all residents;
• Ensure effective lighting treatment on the west and south sides for public safety;
• Ensure entrances are clearly identified and that the lane sides are adequately lit;
• Ensure access control from 1st Street on the west side;
• Explore the accommodation of unit storage and the possibility of eliminating one unit to make room for storage;
• Consider ways to provide adequate space in the bedrooms and living rooms;
• Explore using the penthouse staircase as a lantern;
• Encourage natural light in the garbage room for a more social and usable space;
• Ensure adequate room for bikes and first responder access at the commercial office entrance;
• Accommodate the use of electric vehicles and bicycles; and
• Explore the use of active solar panels.

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

Carried Unanimously

7. **645 St. Davids Avenue (Rezoning Application)**

The City has received a rezoning application at the above noted address to replace the existing single detached dwelling with the proposed four-unit, three storey townhouse complex with one of the units containing a lock-off unit. The intent of this proposal is to replace an existing single detached dwelling. This application is being referred to the advisory bodies prior to the completion of a full interdepartmental staff review.

The subject site is located on the west side of the 600 block of St. Davids Avenue, at the south west corner of St. Davids Avenue and East Keith Road. The area consists of mainly two level duplexes to the south and west of St. Davids, with single detached dwellings to the east.

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

• Overall site design, in particular the internal drive aisle;
• Massing and articulation of the architecture; and
• The overall landscaping proposal.

James Stobie/Kevin Li, Synthesis Design, described the project to the Panel:

• We have received tremendous support from the community.
• All four units front St. Davies Street.
• There is a 4m courtyard in the middle.
• There is a grass paver driveway.
• The separation of the buildings reduces the massing of the architecture.
• There are solar panels on top of the building and no rooftop decks.
• Four garages are attached and there are bicycle lockers.
• There are four private courtyards for each unit.
• Main levels have open floor plans.
• On the upper floors there are 3 bedrooms for each unit.
- Roof planters create more privacy for the units.
- Using Moodyville zone guidelines for the design.
- Majority is Hardie panel because of its low maintenance.
- Rock wall at the front is a reclaimed stone rock wall.
- Each front door is individually coloured.
- Sustainability features include green planters and open areas, reclaimed materials and aiming to achieve Energuide 86.
- Units will be stratified and the owner will take 2 of the units.
- Great location with public transportation nearby.
- Units are each about 1600 sq. ft.

David James, Insite Design Landscape Architecture, reviewed the landscape plan:

- Driveway surface has grass pavers to break up the site coverage and add a softer approach rather than just asphalt.
- Outdoor patio spaces for residents.
- We are limited along East Keith and St. Davids Avenue due to sight lines. In the key corners we want to introduce some evergreen and bring in colour with perennials and grasses.
- It is important along St. Davids to create a long continuous green edge. We will provide screening from the ground floor units to the street and create a softer edge.
- We have reinforced the rhythm of the stepping of the building with the entrances.
- The planter wall is intended to use reclaimed natural stone at the key corners, at the lane and at the main signage between the two units.
- Used Japanese lilac due to overhead powerline restrictions.
- Plant palate includes ornamental grasses and perennials.
- Landscape lighting is fairly subdued to highlight the key circulation routes and entrances.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- To staff: Are there guidelines with regards to site coverage and permeability? A: No.
- With the retaining wall using reclaimed material, what is the rest of the wall? A: Cast in place concrete.
- St. Davids is a future greenway? A: Yes.
- Is that the reason for the setback? A: It will be a multiuse path down the west side of St. Davids which will front this property. The final design hasn't been completed.
- Will there be a widening of the sidewalk? A: Yes.
- Are there four courtyards? A: Yes.
- Patio spaces too? A: There will be sundecks on different levels as well.
- Will there be EV plug-ins included? A: Unit A will have the charge station.
- How wide is the driveway for unit a? A: 9 ft.
- There are a lot of window boxes, are they all reachable to look after them? A: Yes. They are designed to be low maintenance. They are at reachable height.
- What product are you thinking for the grass pavers, will it stay green? A: We want to use something like the expo creek grass pavers, 50% concrete 50% open cell. The more important thing is the permeability versus the green. As you drive over there may be some discolouration. We will pack with soil and seed it. There is no guarantee how green it will be.
The courtyard in the middle between two units, will it work? **A:** Yes, there will be a fence between them. It acts as an access between front and back of the building. It is 6m wide. We want to maximize the outdoor space as best we can.

You justified the units to the side of St. Davids, why did you choose this? **A:** St. Davids will be the frontage because it's the longer side of the two adjacent streets. All main floors are slightly higher than St. Davids. We want to open up to the adjacent neighbours so they don't feel so closed into the building.

Can you explain how these units access their courtyards? **A:** Unit A has a south facing sundeck where the access is. Unit B is off the dining room, unit C has a west facing sundeck with access from the living room.

Physical connection to the courtyard seems difficult; can you have visual connection to it? Does that have to be a clear storey window? **A:** We are trying not to create opportunities for neighbours to look at each other.

Is there a way to make the garages closer together? Unit A access to the garage is quite pinched. They would have a long way to back out. **A:** We don't want to make unit B too narrow. Everything is tight and needs to fit.

To staff: What is the front lot line? **A:** We consider St. Davids to be the front yard; the access is off of St. Davids. In a way this is a double frontage lot.

The rear lot line is the lane? **A:** Yes.

What is the soffit material? **A:** Natural wood.

How does this proposal differ from the zoning setbacks and where it's going past the setback? You seem to be reaching for more land. Where are the setbacks for this site? **A:** The biggest difference is at the lane setback where we are asking for the most relaxation. At the front we are asking for relaxation but it's not that much.

What is the roof construction? **A:** Fly roof, I-joist.

The public meeting went well? How many attended? **A:** About 20 people.

Why do you believe they responded so well? **A:** They liked the design, concept, and there was positive discussion with the people walking in.

What did they like about the design? **A:** They spoke to form and character, layering, individuality along St. Davids and that it is neighbour friendly. No massive garage in the back, that it was tucked away. It was set back enough. There were positive comments about the modern design.

There is a bevelled corner at the top, is that to allow a change in the angle coming onto St. Davids? **A:** We need to have 5m from the intersection to the road. It is a corner of visibility triangle.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- With the subdued and ambient light, consider an introduction of motion sensors for when it's dark in the garage areas.
- The view from the laneway is a large open space, consider the view from people walking up the street looking in, frame that and make the courtyard seem smaller. Consider larger trees or planters, or a trellis structure over the entrance.
- The grass pavers need to be realistic with how those will work and what it will look like in the future. Look at permeable pavers.
- Reclaimed stone is a good use.
- Concern about courtyard B and C and the light it will get.
- Garage A is probably impossible to drive out of, it could be fixed with more planning.
- A possible solution could be with eliminating the court yard so the units could be moved out.
• The roof edges and planters and varieties are unwieldy and busy. They could be refined and improved.
• Consider electrical stations for all the cars and bikes to be charged.
• Units D and C are livable and work great.
• The eastern part of courtyard could be dedicated to B and western dedicated to C.
• Redesign the garage A, push it further north and decrease the size of the northern terrace.
• More work needs to be done on units A and B in terms of usability and livability.
• The units are well proportioned.
• Consider evening things out a bit more. Each individual part is a little too much.
• Get a traffic analysis for access in and out of the garages.
• The elevations could use a punch more colour than just the doors. It would help to break up the units.
• There’s too much crowding on the site.
• The corner lots are important sites in our neighbourhood. You are asking quite a bit of this rezoning to overlook a lot in order to get the building on the site. The project needs to add more to the community somehow. Suggest reducing the size of the project, or more design development in the project to simplify or refine.

**Presenter’s comments:**

• It’s a tough balance between asking for too much or too little. For people buying the units, we want to ensure good quality homes with generous layouts and outdoor space. The reason we are asking for this much is because we are using Moodyville guidelines, we didn’t max out the site.
• Not sure we could have a secondary suite.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 645 St. Davids Avenue and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the issues listed below:

• Explore simplification of the articulation;
• Refine or simplify the massing;
• Explore design opportunities to make the parking area appear smaller or screened from view;
• Encouraged to explore alternatives to the grass pavers for some other type of permeable paving that will accommodate storm water management;
• Further investigate the vehicular access entry into Unit A to ensure usability;
• Encouraged to complete a traffic study to ensure maneuverability of vehicles within the site;
• Explore the introduction of motion sensors in the pedestrian areas to avoid pedestrian and vehicle conflict in the parking area;
• Consider moving Unit A northward or redesigning it to make it more functional;
• Suggest the courtyard for Units B and C be redesigned to address the lack of natural light and increase functionality;
• Explore the use of other roofing structural systems other than cantilevered roof I-joists;
• Explore more colour in the material palate rather than just at the doors; and
• Address the monotone colour palate.

AND THAT the Panel looks forward to reviewing the applicant's response at a future meeting.

Carried Unanimously

8. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, January 17th, 2018.

Chair