A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m.

1. **Minutes of Advisory Design Panel Meeting dated May 21, 2003**

   It was regularly moved and seconded

   **THAT** the Minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held on May 21, 2003 be approved.

   Unanimously Carried

2. **Business Arising**

   None
3. **Staff Update**

**879 Marine Drive**
This proposal went to Public Hearing and received second and third reading earlier this week. Final reading will not take place until traffic issues are resolved.

**154 East 12th Street**
The applicant has addressed the revisions noted by the Panel at the May meeting.

K. McKillop declared a potential conflict of interest since he is Landscape Architect for the Lower Lonsdale Site 3a development. He left the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

M. Rahbar entered the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

4. **Lower Lonsdale Site 3a**

G. Penway, Development Planner, joined the meeting to participate in this preliminary presentation. L. Doyle - Architect, K. Foster and K. McKillop - Landscape Architects, and C. Philips - Seagate Ventures were introduced to the meeting.

Mr. Penway gave an overview of the location of Site 3a and advised that Site 2, to the south, is being developed and Site 1, to the west, will likely be the next site proceeding to development. Site 3a is pre-zoned and Design Guidelines adopted require that the Director of Community Development approve the design before it goes forward to Council for consideration. To assist in this process, the Director of Community Development has requested input from the ADP.

The Architect referred to the preliminary proposal as distributed to the Panel and noted that vehicle access for Site 3b to the east must be addressed in the development on Site 3a. As set out in the Design Guidelines, a high rise tower is located on the south of the site with a low-rise townhouse development on the north along 2nd Street. Building elevations and massing and how they address the Design Guidelines were explained. Exterior of the building will be finished in concrete with window walls to create interest detail. Vehicle access to the underground parking area off 2nd Street will be shared with the development to be built to the east on Site 3b.

The Landscape Architect reviewed the planting detail through the landscaped courtyard between the townhouses and the tower and the paving and landscape design along the vehicle access to address the future divider between Sites 3a and 3b. A green corridor down the driveway with density planting at the edges is being designed to create a ravine effect to address the bio-swale referenced in the Design Guidelines and relate to the dry stream bed at Jack Loucks Court. A low wall with trees to screen the area will separate the private park on the south side of the tower from the public park and walkway.

The Panel had questions on:

- Treatment of rooftop townhouses;
- Compliance with height guidelines;
- Compliance with adaptable design guidelines;
- Front entrance treatment;
- Building exits;
- Vehicle access to Site 3b.

There was discussion around the proposed two storey townhouses along 2nd Street when the Design Guidelines refer to a low-rise development along the street front and down the west side of the site.

K. McKillop left the meeting at 6 p.m. when the meeting went into comments and discussion of the project.

COMMENTS

- There must be a compelling architectural reasons to accept the departure from the guidelines which look for stepping at the upper floors.
- Need greater dynamics on western edge.
- Rooftops of townhouses should address guidelines for overlook.
- Trees in the courtyard area must be located to maintain sightlines.
- A scale model would assist in understanding the development of a project of this size and importance.
- Future presentation must address:
  o relationship on east and west sides of the property with details on elevation and grades;
  o pedestrian access and bio-swale intention along the driveway on the east;
  o how the site relates to the public lands and adjacent property;
  o detailed drawings and elevations are needed.
- Townhouses seem to be a token gesture and with importance of this site, needs to be an appropriate low rise element – whether apartment or townhouse. 3-storey design is desirable and it should extend down the walkway.
- Stepping at top needs to be further considered.
- Project needs detail finishes to create a signature building – too similar to Site 2.
- Needs to be a stronger gesture onto the north walk;
- Extension of street frontage for townhouses would be beneficial;
- Driveway needs to address pedestrian circulation to the south walkway.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the preliminary application for design approval for Lower Lonsdale Site 3a (Seagate Ventures / Lawrence Doyle Architects) and, although supporting the proposal, feels the following have not been adequately resolved:

- Design of the car ramp in reference to the architectural guidelines;
- Design of the top of the tower, particularly since the tower as presented does not conform to the architectural guidelines;
- Design of the townhouses and street frontage on 2nd Street and the relationship of the townhouses to the North Walk;
- Roof treatment of the townhouses;
- Further definition of the bio-swale on the west edge;
- Details on finishing materials.
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The Panel also recommends that future presentation materials include –

- a three-dimensional representation of the project; and
- more detailed information on grade levels between the east and west property lines.

The Panel supports the inclusion of a break in the building mass on the North Walk.

Unanimously Carried

The Delegation left at 6:20 p.m.
Councillor R. Clark left the meeting at 6:25 p.m.
K. McKillop returned to sit on the Panel at 6:25 p.m.

5. 257 & 265 West 5th Street – Rezoning

Development Planner outlined the proposed rezoning for 6-unit development. APC reviewed the project last week and the Chair read the resolution passed by them.

B. Harrison, Landscape Architect, and A. Saunders, Owner, entered the meeting and advised that the project Architect, C. Moorhead, is out of town at this time. The meeting was advised that the applicant is now addressing the comments made by the APC but these changes are not shown on the plans being reviewed.

A. Saunders, Developer, gave an overview of the site and neighbouring properties. The Plans as distributed to the Panel were explained. The exterior finish of the units will be natural cedar siding with duroid shingle roof. Garages for eight vehicles are located at the rear of the site with centre separation to create visual access into the site.

The Landscape Architect explained the access through the site and the private entries to the front units from the street. Planting detail was noted and paving material through the site will include detailed concrete on pathways and pavers at patio areas. Some street trees may be included. No decision has been made at this time whether to include an irrigation system.

Questions and concerns included:

- Use of permeable pavers on walkways;
- Elevation of rear yard;
- Roof over the bay needs explanation;
- APC’s concerns around permeable surfaces on walkways need to be addressed;
- Support the direction of the proposal;
- Outdoor access needs consideration in Units B and C;
- Roof plan needed;
- Support moving building forward in this instance if it solves technical issues on the site and does not impact design;
- Landscape edge at forecourt needs clear detail to ensure definition;
- Consideration needs to be given to how terrace areas work in relation to interior spaces;
- Non-standard features in this design need to be addressed in detail;
• Separation of units may improve visual access from the street;
• Material board required;
• Kitchens in Units B and C are small and may impact livability;
• Some degree of inconsistency in plans and elevations.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the preliminary rezoning application for 257 & 265 West 5th Street (C. Moorhead Architect) and recommends approval in principle and looks forward to future additional information providing:

- Greater clarification on the siding details and roofline;
- Detailed design development of plans and elevations;
- Street landscape

The ADP supports reduced front setback, specific only to this design and site.

Unanimously Carried

D. Rose, who is a member of the ADP, entered the meeting at 7:35 pm. as Landscape Architect for the project at 338 West Keith Road. Councillor R. Clark returned to the meeting at 7:45 p.m.

6. **338 West Keith Road – 3 unit Residential Rezoning**

M. Rahbar and R. Kintar – Vernacular Design, A. Cusano, D. Cusano, and M. Cusano – Developers, and D. Rose, Landscape Architect, entered the meeting at 7:35 p.m. and distributed an updated plan of the proposal.

Mr. Rahbar referred to the previous presentation and advised that this has now changed and will be a strata triplex development. The proposal complies with the Zoning Bylaw and is designed to fit the context of the neighbourhood.

Each unit has a separate entry from the street private front garden and verandah, as well as private decks and garden areas at the rear.

D Rose, Landscape Architect, reviewed the planting detail designed individually for the garden spaces at each unit. The rear yard will have fruit trees and plantings around the garage and garbage enclosure at the rear. Trees will be planted on the boulevard.

Questions from the Panel related to:

- Window style and material
- Exterior access to the basement
- Exterior finishes
- Awnings
- Building grades and service elevations
- Materials used at stairs and guard rails
- Height of flues at the roof
- Roof drainage at the valley between the peaks
The Chair read the resolution of the APC and the applicant confirmed that these items have been addressed.

M. Rahbar and D. Rose, who are both members of the ADP, left the meeting at 8:06 p.m.

Comments from the Panel included:

- Canopy needs to be addressed around code
- Maintenance of the canvass awning will be problematic
- Flues need detail
- Interesting scheme but may be overworked with so many trims, materials, colours
- Vinyl windows may not address style illustrated
- Support strong colours but three strong colours may be too much
- Landscape is minimal and needs to be softer
- Many good aspects to project and refreshing change from usual language.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 338 West Keith Road (Vernacular Design) and recommends approval subject to approval by the Development Planner of the following:

- Simplification of the building elevations to reflect the rationale and strong nature of the design;
- Further consideration of how technical aspects of the design of roof drains affect the elevation treatments;
- Reconsideration of the use of commercial style awnings, particularly with regard to code issues.

The Panel also recommends that, while supporting the use of bold colours, the colour palette be reconsidered.

Carried
1 - opposed

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 338 West Keith Road (Vernacular Design) and recommends that selection of window frame materials allow the window style as presented in the drawings to be retained.

Unanimously Carried

7. 265 East 10th Street – Rezoning

The Development Planner advised that this proposal is a one lot subdivision to two lots with a duplex on each in a heritage zone. This change would result in a higher density and requires rezoning from RT-1 to CD Zone.
M. Wick, Noort Developments, and M. Messer, Landscape Architect, entered the meeting and reviewed the existing site at 10th Street and St. Andrews Avenue and the proposal to subdivide the property to two separate lots, each with a duplex and double garage for at the rear and a third surface parking spot on east property.

The Developer referred to the plans, as distributed to the Panel, and gave an overview of the proposed developments. A variance is being sought on the porches which extend into the setback. The basement in each unit has partial habitable space and a storage/utility area.

Each unit has a private entry from the street and entries to the rear units are designed to provide visual access from the street. Exterior finishes will be wood siding, with shakes on gables, vinyl windows and asphalt shingles. Elevations were explained.

M. Messer, Landscape Architect, gave an overview of the planting detail on the site. Each unit has an outdoor private space with paved patio and grass area.

The Panel’s comments included:

- Beneficial to relocate entry path to west unit to parallel east unit path;
- Concerned with two long flat elevations. Needs further consideration to create more interest – perhaps offset the building to address this;
- Entry to rear unit treated in a secondary manner and needs to be addressed;
- Entries to rear units need covers over the entry doors;
- Window treatments need consistency;
- Architectural refinement needed;
- Treatment of the space between the buildings and circulation on both sides needs to be simplified to create greater privacy for the units;
- Delineating walkways for each unit and private space for units;
- To create a private rear yard for residents, fencing should be added;
- At the corner of East 10th – it may be desirable to create a more private front yard rather than giving it all to the street;
- Concern with space between the two buildings;
- Entrance to the south west unit needs articulation;
- East elevation on the side street is haphazard and needs better composition.
- Garages need to be addressed and should include windows to be coherent with the buildings.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 265 East 10th Street (Noort Homes) and recommends approval, subject to approval by the Development Planner, of the following:

- Refinement of the design of the access to Unit 2 on Lot A;
- Elimination of the chimney box that is blocking that access;
- Further consideration be given to circulation on the site with regard to separating walkway space from private amenity space;
- Further design consideration be given to the east elevation of Lot B Unit 1 and Unit 2;
- Relocation of the west sidewalk at the front of Unit 1 to the east side of Lot A;

AND THAT further design consideration be given to the south east garage facing St. Andrews Avenue.

Unanimously Carried

9.  **1445 Mahon Avenue - Rezoning**

The Development Planner gave an overview of the proposed project and M. Wick reviewed the site and the proposal to rezone it for duplex development with storage only in the basement and double garage and two outdoor parking spaces at the rear of the site. Exterior finishes were explained and samples were displayed.

The Landscape Architect gave a brief review of the landscape plan. A fence at the front of the site creates a separation from the street and each unit has a separate walkway the a garden area. A hedge separates the private garden spaces at the rear and creates direct access to parking at the rear.

Questions related to:

- Paving material in rear yard
- Neighbouring properties
- Privacy screen on the deck

Comments from the Panel included:

- Scale of development fits well with the neighbourhood;
- Context elevations are needed with this type of proposal;
- Strong horizontal on front elevations but side walls are large blank walls. Detail needs to be carried round the sides and perhaps to the garage and carport as well.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 1445 Mahon Avenue (Noort Homes) and recommends approval subject to the approval by the Development Planner of the following:**

- Reconsideration and treatment of side elevations, especially at the corners.

Carried
– 1 opposed

M. Wick left the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

10. **Other Business**

(a) The Low Density Guidelines were revised recently and will be distributed to the Panel for information.
11. **Adjournment**

    There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

**Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting will be held Wednesday, July 16, 2002 at 5 p.m.

__________________________________
Chair