

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, May 30th, 2017

MINUTES

- Present:** K. Bracewell, RCMP
B. Checkwitch
P. Maltby
A. Man-Bourdon
B. Phillips
K. Yushmanova
- Staff:** D. Johnson, Development Planner
B. Hurley, Planner 1
R. Fish, Committee Clerk
C. Perry, Supervisor, Development Servicing
M. Friesen, Development Planner
- Guests:** 245 Moody and 645 – 659 E 3rd (Development Permit Application)
Harald Sinow, CREO Development Ltd.
Roger Hughes, CREO Development Ltd.
Andrea Sinow, CREO Development Ltd.
Alec Smith, Shape Architecture Inc.
Kate Busby, Shape Architecture Inc.
Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Ltd.
Kyle Labow, Durante Kreuk Lt.
- 312 Moody and 710 – 732 E 3rd (Development Permit Application)
Yashpal Parmar, Guildford Brook Estates Developments
Simon Richards, Cornerstone Architecture
Scott Kennedy, Cornerstone Architecture
Luke Han, Cornerstone Architecture
Caelan Griffiths, PMG Landscape
Alicia Parmar, Guilford Brook Estates
- 417 E 2nd Street (Development Permit Application)
Raajkumar Bagga, RKB Developments Inc.
Herbert S. Chase, H.S. Chase Architect Inc.
Karl Wein, Karl Wein & Associates Design Consultants
Harry Lee Haggard, Landscape Architect
- Absent:** J. Geluch
J-P. Mahé
B. Harrison

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

1. Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held May 17th, 2017

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held May 17th, 2017 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

B. Hurley gave an overview and brief description of the Moodyville Development Permit area and subareas.

2. 245 Moody and 645 – 659 E 3rd (Development Permit Application)

The project seeks to create a diverse range of unit types fathered around an intimate courtyard mews running through the middle of the site. Townhouses, stacked townhouses, two room maisonettes and lock-off units create a 40 unit pedestrian friendly development with 8 lock-off units providing further unit diversity. All units are accessed from either the courtyard mews or directly from 3rd Street or Moody Avenue. Five row house style buildings are proposed with an underground parking garage connecting the site below grade. Access to parking is at the southwest corner of the site via the lane to the south of 3rd Street. The proposed site planning strategy allows for multiple mid-block connections through the site.

Staff asked for ADP's input on the following:

- The design, façade, and architectural variety of the buildings as they respond to and potentially impact the East 3rd Street, Moody Avenue, and the rear lane;
- The overall massing of the building as it relates to both the street edge and the internal spaces of the proposed development;
- Quality and overall cohesiveness of the landscape plan, pedestrian circulation, as well as transitions between common and private outdoor spaces;
- The interface with the neighbouring apartment project to the west;
- Suggestions for grading, landscaping, and building design along East 3rd St and Moody Ave to enhance the quality of the street and the transition from private space into the public realm; and
- Quality of livability and CPTED responses for the stacked townhouses and associated accessory lock-off units in this proposal.

Alec Smith, Shape Architecture Inc., described the project to the Panel:

- There are 40 units, 8 lock off units with a stacked townhouse model
- It's rare to work in zone area with a clear vision of urban reality
- Interested in idea of Moodyville and how it might become the inspiration for the project
- Located on the South West corner of E 3rd and Moody Ave
- The road type terrace and mews housing is inspired by London
- Clean, clear materiality and brightness despite tight corners
- Semi-public spaces are created
- People can walk into the mews, there are no gates but there is a sense of ownership from people in the area
- London mews was a concept precedent

- White wash brick with concrete planters, metal cladding, stucco
- Wood accents add a West Coast feel
- The main mews down the middle of the project creates an engaging space for neighbours, a vibrant main living space
- The terrace housing model was very important
- This brings a passive surveillance and semi-public quality to it
- There is a cross access through the middle of the site connecting street to lane side
- A key component in terms of the urban design concept was creating a meaningful and engaging community space down the middle, the mews space.
- Creating usable outdoor space would create an atmosphere of public space
- There are access stairs to the townhouses going upward
- The stoops and steps at the front doors can be significant for engagement between the private and public realm
- There are 6 unit types: A/C - 3 bedroom townhouse, B - ground oriented 2 bedroom unit, 1200 sq ft and D/E – 2 storey stacked maisonettes, two levels, one with living space and one with bedrooms. Unit F is a one bedroom, or one bedroom plus den.
- Consists of 46 parking spaces and 70 bike spaces.
- Glazing exceeds min thermal performance by over 30%.
- Continuous ventilation in each unit with a dedicated heat recovery ventilator for 70% heat recovery of exhaust air.
- Percentage of openings is in the 30-40% range.

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

- Vision for residents to engage with their neighbours in patio spaces.
- Trees will be used for shade on the sunny north side of the units.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Does the site qualify for a 2006 square meter site area that will require certain landscape features? **A:** A 34,000 sq ft apartment site does qualify.
- Where is the plant list? **A:** It was not included in the package. We can provide a list.
- Can you speak to the relationship of the adjacent site to the west? **A:** The connection through them is a slight level change at the retaining wall along the edge. It has hard surface paving and plating. The buildings are different and we are using a denser townhouse model. There is a level change through of 6ft. We are in discussions with the developer because there are advantages with excavation to find some synergies there.
- Do the interior patios have gates? **A:** No.
- How tall are walls? **A:** 30 inches.
- Is each townhouse one unit or are there two? **A:** The lane side ones are single units. The 3 storey units have a lock off underneath, stacked on street side and not stacked on lane side then there are the 2 storey units on the end.
- On drawing 27, in regards to the entry stairs, how are they separated from suite to suite? **A:** There is a railing that separates them, on page 65 there is a drawing on the top left that shows the hedge condition and planter.
- How high are the walls on the 3rd floor decks? **A:** The separation between them is at guard height which is 3.5ft and the walls on either side are full height.
- What is the material E2? **A:** Whitewash brick, a concrete brick that is painted.
- How do you get from your unit to your car? **A:** There is a continuous garage underneath. Unit B has direct access. In unit F, there are stairs on the edge of each building where

residents can come up and go around and in. In the town houses there are two additional stairs that bring you up from the garage and circulate into the units.

- Drawing 39, do the washrooms have 2 free standing sinks? **A:** That's a drawing issue – there are 2 sinks on the counter.
- Drawing 41, how do you get to unit D? **A:** They are upper level, street units and are accessed from the street into a small sectioned area, up two sets of stairs. They have access from parking garage as well.
- Can you describe how the glazing works with the material the white panels on the face of the building; they appear appears less than 40%? **A:** Moodyville guidelines require for a 60% be set back, an additional 2ft. The main entrance has a glazed corner and glazed side light. On the top level there is an additional 3ft setback at top level. For the 3rd floor there is significant glazing.
- Can you describe the step down for the lower basement units? **A:** On page 65, the top left drawing shows there is a planter down at patio level and terraced green elements that characterize the edge.
- In terms of the paving textures in the courtyard, is there a way of introducing that into the patio area with another finish or colour? It looks monotonous. **A:** We would like to have lighter pavers but they build up dirt over time, charcoal is more forgiving. Ground plane doesn't have to be as light with the brighter white on front facing areas.
- Can you confirm the dimensions of the main mews? **A:** 7.4m at ground level, 9m at the upper level. What about the walkways versus the patios? **A:** The walkway is 860 meters wide and then the patios are 2 meters which leaves 5.4 which is divided between the two patio spaces.
- Is there a laneway treatment to identify the crossway in the mews that run North-South and exit out into the lane? Can that be marked for pedestrians to recognise it's a laneway? **A:** Using colour or texture to do that would be good. We are trying to create an edge condition there. The setback from the property line is 1.6; there is some capacity to have street marking. This is a new form of street as opposed to a laneway.
- The Moodyville guidelines encourage you to look at the treatment of the lane and allow you to do something to make the lane be more compatible for pedestrians and cars.
- Is there river rock in the laneway? **A:** Yes, there will be storm water management, catching surface water
- Along Moody Ave on page 62/63, can you explain the grey tone and larger boulder? **A:** They are down under stairs, nothing is going to grow under the stairs, they will be precast concrete and bring a zen garden feel to it.
- Can you explain the railing? **A:** It is steel on the street side, the roof level has glazed handrails
- For the units on 3rd street, is the exit also on 3rd? **A:** Yes.
- Do the units on the back exit to the mews? **A:** Yes.
- And the South dwellers on the lane? **A:** Yes.
- How will you identify all the entrances to first responders? **A:** There will be a single located annunciator panel at the main entrance that will announce the different units. There will be a strobe to identify which unit.
- What are you considering for lighting on the patios? **A:** See page 62: There are step lights in the planters and building faces. The ground plane will be significantly illuminated and soffit lights above entrances.
- People living on lane that exit out is this a single lighting unit? **A:** Yes, an LED step light is built into the stair area and a soffit light.
- Will there be lights out on the lane? We don't want people walking out into darkness. **A:** There should be significant light from the soffit and step lights.

- Moodyville guidelines suggest varying architecture expressions across assemblies. How will your project respond if some variety is introduced into the façade? **A:** Our approach was to provide significant variation materially and in terms of depth for each unit. All units step slightly up; there is a good precedent for this kind of housing. It has individualized units with consistency; the terrace house model is a good precedent to create really lively streets. It's about the integrity of the single unit, assemblage of the pieces with individual heights give them character.
- Is the PMT fixed? **A:** No, there has been a slight change in the scope of the project. There was an orphan lot that has been added in. PMT locations have gone back and forth. It will be on the North West corner of 3rd and Moody where PMT is shown on the landscape plan. Exploring to have it on lane side. Getting sizing information from hydro.
- Hydro access confirmed to be off E 3rd and LEC connection.
- Any comments about native plant count? **A:** Plant selection had a lot to do with sustainability, the concept of bringing in seasonal colours, plants that are pollinators and heavy foliage. Didn't pick them because they were native but we have some. For example if we have 15 plants on the list, 5 are native and adaptable. There are native plants in the lane and some areas along E 3rd.
- Is the landscaping actively reflected in the renderings? **A:** No.
- Is the roof patio one half of the deck? **A:** 2/3rds, they are set back. We are aiming to have a green area in the part that's not accessible.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Appreciate the crispness of the architecture and enjoy the outdoor space, roof terrace and usability of the plan.
- It would be helpful if some pedestrian connections could be stronger with potentially seating and other expressions to be perceived as more public. It should feel open and inviting.
- Suggest that the architect and landscape architect look more at north east corner to avoid blank walls in corners. It seems like an opportunity to provide some sort of public realm enhancement; a gathering, seating area.
- The mews running north-south on the east side are more successful with patios spilling out onto them. The more central one seems more isolated. Having eyes on the walkway would be a challenge there.
- Request for shared outdoor spaces, playground or garden areas. It's challenging to gather in the center. Landscaping can create a slightly bigger courtyard area, flexible space with seating and softness in landscape.
- Opportunity to have more activity and relationship with the neighbouring building instead of a blank wall facing the site
- Patios in building 5 are a challenging and narrow section. This needs a bit more looking into in terms of landscape, they are buried below ground.
- Access to units below ground might consider having gates for security reasons.
- Suggest looking into softening the central mews with bigger planters in some areas, not breaking things so evenly with taller trees mixed in.
- More planting variety would be beneficial and introduce more pollinator plants.
- Street trees could use more variety on both sides, at the property line and boulevard.
- It would be beneficial to think about the patio spaces, introducing and reflecting the wood element into these spaces.
- For the parkade it would be beneficial to introduce sustainability like e-car charging and bike wash stations.

- The materiality is reflected in the rendering of the white facing panels. The landscape plan shows trees that will obscure the panels, when trees lose leaves it will be nice and light.
- The publicness of the mews is great and implied privacy as well. Would like to see more in the mews and the design. Not getting the same feel of the London mews.
- There is repetition on the corners, variety of trees is needed as a way to articulate that it the beginning of the project
- Interesting and vibrant planting in the lower units is needed
- Unit identification has to be simple, clear and easily accessible for emergency personnel
- In regards to territoriality, if everyone is allowed in areas like that, it breaches confidentiality of those that are in there. People will not recognize strangers.
- Lighting treatment will have to be effective and not overtaken by the landscaping plan due to the narrow walkway with patios. If there is no clear line of sight and visibility it can attract questionable people.
- The mews is too repetitive and harsh. Without the intro of the variety architecturally, that needs to happen more in the landscape. Making larger spaces in mews would really help.

Presenter's comments:

Thank you for all the comments.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Permit Application for 245 Moody and 645 – 659 E 3rd and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Permit Application for 245 Moody and 645 – 659 E 3rd and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Consider the articulation of the corner on 3rd and Moody and the architectural response to that corner;
- Encourage further design development of landscape portion of the mews and an additional variety of spaces within the mews;
- Consider better expressions of the entries into the public laneways;
- Explore the connectivity with the adjacent development;
- Consider gates to the lower level exterior spaces and ensure territorial definition as part enhancing the pathways into the site;
- Consider softening the mews;
- Encourage more plant variety in general and specifically along the street;
- Ensure identification of units is easy and clear and not just for firefighters but for all first responders; and
- Ensure lighting on the lane and mews will be effective after development is complete and occupied, including the landscaping.

The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

Carried Unanimously

3. 312 Moody and 710 – 732 E 3rd (Development Permit Application)

The project consists of 36 non-stacked townhouses, each with an integrated single car or tandem car garage accessed from an internal driveway court. All 36 of the units have lock-off suites on the lower levels. 22 of the lock-offs are 1 bedroom. The lock-off units have independent exterior entries as well as an internal connection. To demarcate site access points, we have changed the colour and the form of the units flanking each entry point off of E 3rd Street. The material palette is consistent throughout the project but colour has been used to separately identify each building and provide additional interest to the streetscape.

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

- The design, façade, and architectural variety of the buildings as they respond to and potentially impact the East 3rd Street, Moody Avenue, and the rear lane;
- The overall massing of the building as it relates to both the street edge and the internal spaces of the proposed development;
- The quality and viability of the central auto-court as it relates to functional open space and urban design directions within a large assembly development;
- Quality and overall cohesiveness of the landscape plan, pedestrian circulation, as well as common and private outdoor spaces;
- The interface with the neighbouring heritage and infill redevelopment to the east;
- Suggestions for grading, landscaping, and building design along East 3rd St and Moody Ave to enhance the quality of the street and the transition from private space into the public realm; and
- Quality of livability and CPTED responses for townhouses and associated accessory lock-off units in this proposal.

Scott Kennedy, Cornerstone Architecture, described the project to the Panel:

- They are all vertical, 4 story units, the lower 2 floors are lock offs where the top have a major part of living space.
- Created canopy stairs and bench to hang out near the street that signifies the entry to the building.
- There are roof decks on all buildings facing 3rd street.
- For the roof deck on the building facing Moody, the last two are through the height envelopes.
- We have provided fire fighter access to the neighbour.
- It includes various story buildings and tandem garages.
- There are entrances addressing the lane.
- Using glass in garage doors to give character and trying to grow greenery overhead with lights.
- There are colour variations to decipher where the entries are.

Caelan Griffiths, PMG Landscape, reviewed the landscape plan:

- The architecture has a Dutch flavor with semi private and private entries.
- Indicated a low hedge barrier along each front units facing to 3rd.
- Continuity along the front end of the building with the repeated columnar trees.
- The plaza area is a place of gathering, where we can provide bike parking and a seating area.
- Plantings in this area are more flowering and give more of a seasonal feel, marking seasonal changes.

- There is a climbing vine system in the courtyard spaces; we can select a species that will be evergreen.
- We are able to hang light and bring the ceiling into the courtyard space creating a more friendly and safe space.
- There is an opportunity for a modest introduction of trees along the property line.
- In the central courtyards, there is a concrete unit paver that's permeable. There is an opportunity to allow for greater permeability through the site.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Is there a lighting system that is fixed to building faces? **A:** No, the lights would be hanging from the greenery hanging across.
- Is there a view looking down the main courtyard looking east? **A:** Yes.
- Toward the non-exit end, is there a retaining wall structure? **A:** Yes, it is a step structure that is quite low because of the grade change; we can make the planters wider.
- What is the grade differential on the other side? **A:** About 10ft, quite high. The walls will have to have fall protection.
- With the last two units before the wall, is there enough room for a car to back out? **A:** Yes, we created extra space to bring the rear of a car through.
- Is there anything on other end to prevent a driver from going down the stairs? **A:** We could put a wall, but there is a low hedge.
- Do all units have access to private outdoor space? **A:** Yes, the rear units have larger balcony areas giving everyone a south facing balcony.
- No one relies on the laneway as outdoor space? **A:** No, the lock off unit might but the main units' wont.
- What is the width of the break between the two buildings? **A:** 10ft.
- On page 13 and 14, can you talk about the area that's shown outside the entries, the paved area, how big of a space is it? Are they separated from each other? **A:** Yes, the stairs are designed to be separate from each other with a wall there.
- Entry areas along 3rd are fairly downplayed, how you propose to make them inviting and animated spaces? **A:** There are some benches and plantings, a canopy with character, a cascading staircase to make it inviting and planter walls by the mailbox area.
- In regards to the 3rd street elevation, what are the thoughts about the rhythm in both directions? It seems there might be an opportunity to create more variation in the front elevation vertically? Have you considered the repetitiveness of the design? **A:** Going back to the idea of a book ended piece holding an end, this was a unanimous decision and became the preferred direction.
- On drawing 11 and 12 there is a light line across the page between the garage and unit? **A:** Those are level changes.
- Do you have a larger scale view of the plans of the units? **A:** Yes but not in this package.
- Which windows open? **A:** One panel would tilt open in the bedrooms; we may have more work on this still.
- Do you have a drawing of existing trees that are being removed? **A:** No, we are being instructed to do new curb lines. I don't know that there is anything to be preserved.
- Staff: There are trees on site, the demolition permits have been requested and processed and a tree survey to be done.
- Staff: We don't have a private property tree bylaw, they are not currently protected.
- Looking through the interior mews, what units can access the mews not through the garage doors? **A:** The lock-off suites have a shared staircase that enters the two suites.

- A balance of the units would enter only through the garage doors; we felt that was preferable to allow for more landscaping in the courtyard.
- Are there garage doors on the other side? **A:** Yes.
- What are the windows above the garages? **A:** Bedrooms.
- Are there gas meters where the mailboxes are? **A:** They have just been added.
- Is BC Hydro comfortable where you put the PMT? **A:** We haven't had PMT discussion about location, just separation from powerlines. We recognize there was a lot of transformer serving units across the lane. We designed around it. Just started the process with electrical engineers regarding PMT.
- How wide is the sidewalk on 3rd? Does it have to be 2 meters? **A:** I think that is the measure, yes.
- Are you doing new sidewalk on Moody as well? **A:** Yes.
- How are you guiding first responders to the units, lock-offs and courtyards? **A:** We have proposed an alternative solution for fire access using CNV rules, normal access distance is 45m for a non-sprinkler project. With sprinklers you can lengthen to 55m and also provide a hose connect, allowing it to 65m. The Intent to make sure when you come in from 3rd, you can get access to all units.
- Have you ensured identification on the building for police and paramedics? **A:** We will be using a labeled, graphic annunciator panel.
- Is the lighting for the driveway all overhead lighting? **A:** Yes, to give a festive feel.
- The access where the mailbox is, is there lighting? **A:** Yes, lights will shine down and be well lit.
- Are the walkways for the building residents? **A:** We discussed whether public can come through. There's no reason why we couldn't permit the public through. There's nothing stopping someone from walking through.
- In regards to the heritage building adjacent to the project, what was the attitude to that building when designing yours? **A:** We are struggling with it because of the grade difference and retaining wall.
- Were the height calculations done with stepping calculations? **A:** Yes.
- Will the plants survive on the hanging greenery? **A:** The challenge is to find the correct species.
- Are you confident it will grow? **A:** Yes, it will grow.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- The elevations on 3rd are challenging and there's not a lot of variability.
- The views down the street are too repetitive.
- In the middle, it looks like dark towers on the inside and it creates a very narrow looking entrance to the court. The dark material accentuates how shady it will be in there and challenging to grow plants.
- The paving material is critical. Having concrete or asphalt makes it feel like a road way and not an active space – it may just be used as vehicle access.
- Entry canopy structures off 3rd, the scale of them is a bit too small. Consider offsetting them to set them back to open up the views in the narrow corridors.
- Strong concern about the ability to grow plants in the laneway.
- Limited access to soil volume, light, water and with vehicles turning in and out it will be hard to grow successfully.
- Pass-throughs are an opportunity for social interaction, this need more work.

- It would be great to have the building respond the corner where PMT is so it's not a termination of that block. Maybe accommodate a landscape area at that point.
- It would be great to make the roof decks on the lane buildings work. Maybe reduce available space for them so you overlook the height issue.
- Take a look at the size of the bedrooms to accommodate bedroom furniture.
- Struggling to see how the building, architecture and landscape respond to the guidelines. They speak to North Shore character, reflecting landscape over the North Shore, ensuring spaces where urban forest can regrow, and fostering a neighbourhood including shared spaces for play and gardening. All I see is a building and driveway.
- There is no meaningful landscape, no space for big trees.
- It's a strong directive in the guidelines that if trees are being taken down to replace it to some extent.
- Landscape is very decorative and little drought tolerant and no native plants.
- There are no doors connecting in to the central drive area, just windows.
- More design development needs to happen.
- Put more doors out in the area, it's not working right now.
- Read through the guidelines and respond architecturally. Give the landscape breathing room to put some trees in that will grow and create social spaces.
- Unit identification will have to be simple and easily directional.
- Lighting treatments in courtyard have to be significant too.
- Clear lines of sight and well illuminated paths.
- Livability and safety is critical.
- Concern about what the projects effect will be on the neighbourhood.
- It is too repetitive and forms a big wall in the community.
- The heritage building on the East, what happens along the sidewalk?
- Staff: There will need to be a movement of the sidewalk, the amount and level still needs to be determined. Grade change or movement or both is still being determined.
- Suggestion to pick up and create relationship from heritage building.
- Density is good but It has to be paired with diversity.
- Address the transition between visitor parking stalls and building.

Presenter's comments:

- The Moodyville guidelines are restrictive when maxing FSR and parking.
- We have to step the envelope to match.
- Unit size and affordability versus bigger units is a concern.
- We agree with the comments, they are valid and we can work with them.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Permit Application for 312 Moody and 710 – 732 E 3rd and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the issues listed below:

- Investigate the potential of widening the auto court;
- Consider addressing the repetition of the façade;
- Review the design development of the openings between buildings to make them wider or not as dark and uninviting;
- Encourage further design development of the hanging greenery feature to ensure it survives;

- Reminder to include unit plans as part of subsequent submissions;
- Consider more room for landscape and for places for social interaction to be able to occur;
- Review the design development of the area surrounding the PMT (Pad Mounted Transformer);
- Review the potential for buildings 4 and 5 to have roof decks;
- Consider how the landscaping can reflect the principles of the Moodyville guidelines;
- Consider how the architecture reflects the character of Moodyville;
- Encourage further design development of the landscape to respond specially to the guidelines for planting species, drought tolerance and amount of plants; and
- Ensure that unit identification is simple, un-ambiguous and easy to understand with clear lines of sight.

The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

Carried unanimously

4. **417 - 419 E 2nd Street (Development Permit Application)**

The proposed development is located in the Moodyville Development area. The project replaces an existing duplex with four new family residences including an option for a lock-off suite. The Moodyville Development area guidelines are structured to encourage the consolidation of multiple parcels into larger development proposals. The project site is located on the south side of East 2nd Street, centrally located in the Moodyville Development area. This portion of East 2nd Street is located in a quiet residential area between the busy arterial roads of Esplanade and East 3rd Street. The overall topography of the area falls steeply from North to South and the site itself has a secondary cross slope from East to the West. This makes the Southwest corner the lowest point on the site. Older homes and duplexes exist on both sides of East 2nd Street, with this being the first application for development along this section of the street under the new guidelines.

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

- The design and façade of the building as they respond to East 2nd St and the lane;
- The design concept of this as a singular building in its attempt to meet the intent of a courtyard separation within the Moodyville DPA Guidelines, noting both its constrained site and its impact on the potential urban fabric of Moodyville;
- Sustainability and energy performance commitments;
- The quality and effectiveness of open spaces and functional transitions between private and public realms;
- The appearance and design of the roof and rooftop decks, as they relate to the overall design of the building;
- The visibility of entrances and the sense of arrival for all units and accessory lock-off units;
- Quality of livability for Accessory Lock-Off Units and rear townhouse units; and
- Livability and CPTED responses in this proposal.

Herbert S. Chase, H.S. Chase Architect Inc., described the project to the Panel:

- This area is on the 400 block of east 2nd which is different from the rest of Moodyville, it still has single family feel.
- The street is not a true street as there is barely any traffic.

- There is a strong residential feel which played a significant role in how we approached the project.
- The lot is 120ft deep.
- This leaves very little developable area to accomplish the guidelines.
- Guidelines have the intention of concentrating masses on street front and laneway and opening space in between.
- We were concerned that to meet these guidelines and blend with the neighborhood, we couldn't separate the masses.
- A portion of the front is on the street front, the upper is east 2nd street façade. An effort has been made to keep the similar scale and massing of houses that are already on there.
- The house on west has been purchased and is coming in as a new development.
- We tried to relate to house on the east or on the left.
- The challenge is to create something which has to front on second and yet be created that if it is pedestrianized, the south facing entrances become fronted on a new street that doesn't exist yet.
- To address this we created an overhanging of the main block of the building to create protected smaller courtyards.
- To make a clear separation down the middle, the two on west side are the only units that are accessible from east access way.
- There is street frontage to create a clear wall with street numberings so front and back units are identified at street level.
- To resolve issue of safety, we created an opening between the massing at street and lane and created what would be a small court yard or terrace area which is lifted up off of the walk way.
- This creates a sense of being overlooked when someone enters the property.
- Emphasized with the selection of materials, a light brick and a panel so the main structure masses are the light bright and the projecting elements are the panels.
- The entry areas are where we've added wood panels and soffits.
- The main floor has a clear separation, there's no link from one side to the other
- Street side units have access to raised terrace units
- North unit windows are raised above southern units
- On top there is an outdoor landscaped area.
- We used plants that are intended to create a visual barrier from upper decks to lower decks

Harry Lee Haggard, Landscape Architect, reviewed the landscape plan:

- This is a challenging landscape.
- We kept seasonal, year round colour and longevity in mind.
- Little maintenance, no pruning if possible.
- Method of presentation is old school; design is modern with rain gardens, filtration, planters, communal gardens and native plants.
- Lilly of the valley bushes that are evergreen with white bells in the spring.
- In shaded areas there will be foliage.
- Good colours in the back areas as well in the summer and spring.
- All plants are chosen for the sun/shade situation
- The roof has sumac to survive dry conditions.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- In terms of rainwater harvesting, are there rain garden opportunities? **A:** Yes, off the lane, each planter becomes a rain garden due to the filtration system and gravel drainage. It is limited but it's the best we could do with the space.
- What is the paving material on the ground level walkways? **A:** Interlocking pavers. The intention in the lane is that the pavers would go all the way across.
- On the side lot? **A:** Yes, As long as it's flat, were not sure how to handle around the staircases.
- With the ratio of windows to solid wall, it looks like the solid wall is winning, any thoughts about the glazing and overlook relative to size of windows? **A:** There is an issue on the upper bedroom level. It's a matter of trying to balance the relationships of the size of the room and relationship to the neighbours.
- In terms of the walkways that lead on either side, describe the public private separation between them. **A:** In the guidelines, there's encouragement to create secondary space. The concern is that it creates ambiguity around who can be in the area. We could split the site in two with a clear demarcation at street level and with a landscape wall. We could change the pavers to indicate when you're moving out of a public domain. We are trying not to add gates but it would be an option.
- On the raised terraces, is there vision between the two suites? **A:** No, the north suites are connected to the terrace and are half a level above the other side.
- Courtyard separation guidelines, don't require an internal courtyard? **A:** A specific one is based on the length of building face and there's the separation of the height that's defined in the RG3 zoning.
- Is there a standard for building site cover? **A:** There are in the RG3 zoning. Most recent version has not gone through planning review.
- There are vertical elements that come up the middle of the structure? **A:** Yes.
- Is there a requirement for side setbacks? **A:** Yes, 8ft
- In regards to the rear laneways between the 4 stalls, are there small cheek walls that come out and meet the laneway? **A:** No, this is a difference in level.
- What's the rationale behind the guardrail being set so far behind? **A:** A need to relate to the neighbours so that there's not an overview of the neighbours backyards.
- Are the planters a requirement to block the views? **A:** They have the sumac trees to create a visual barrier of protection at that level.
- Is there a few feet of difference from the south? **A:** 4ft.
- Do the walkways on either side have a clear line of sight? **A:** Yes.
- They are not obstructed by garbage receptacles? **A:** No.
- Is the little courtyard visible from the lane? **A:** Yes.
- What lighting treatment is being used on the walkway to the side lane? **A:** A bollard light 2.5 feet high, non-breakable.
- Is there a developer information session coming? **A:** Yes.
- Is there a requirement for rear units to be visible from the street? **A:** No, they won't be.
- Are there roof ends at the front? **A:** Yes, they are a bit tall.
- Is there a 3d model? **A:** Yes.
- What is the construction of the 3rd storey upper deck? What is the overhang in front of the brick? **A:** Fairly minimal, 6 inches.
- What's the design process with this? **A:** The facia are all the same colour, the material is hardy panel. Cement fibre board.
- Originally we had both living rooms projecting forward to create a feeling of depth within the living rooms to have windows on more than one side.

- Because this project is between an existing residence and a proposed project, we moved back the main floor wall on the east side so that there is an open deck.
- Can you introduce more windows and glazing? **A:** Agree the front ones could be bigger.
- What are the windows on the cement fibre board up top? **A:** Those are bathrooms on both ends.
- Can you tell me more about the brick? **A:** It introduces design elements that are simpler in massing and in form and to the existing neighbourhood. The intent is to bring something which references the waterfront, industrial nature in the forms and simplified materials. The use of light brick was to give a cleaner look and residential element with an impression towards an industrial look.
- The cement fibre panel, are joints between them? **A:** Yes, with a channel.
- Will it overlap the face of the panel? **A:** We haven't gotten that far but probably not.
- The two decks separating buildings, do they have a hand rail? **A:** They will need one but the separation is the planter.
- Where does the garbage go? **A:** Up to the lane. Each unit has own recycling areas. The residential owner would take the garbage out to the lane.
- Can the roofdeck for the lane two units be widened to 8ft instead of 6? **A:** Yes, that wouldn't be a problem. Could come closer to the edge of the roof area.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- It seems the façade needs more development. Seems solid and massive. Partially due to the ratio of openings to wall spaces. Need to address that in manner to not interfere with privacy.
- There is opportunity to increase window spaces that look out into the interior decks.
- More large windows as much as possible.
- The façade looks monotonous, further design development needs to happen.
- The vents above on the front are very obvious.
- It would be good to know what paving material will be used on the ground floor. Unit pavers would feel appropriate.
- There's not much site left for landscape expression.
- Consider gardening on rooftop decks, planters residents can engage with.
- Further development of plant list to include pollinator plants.
- Remove Vinca Minor off planting list as it is an invasive plant.
- The character should fit well into the community.
- A change of scale is good.
- There needs to be more about the roof design, it seems to be designed to avoid overlook issues.
- The visibility of the entrance is complicated but works well from a planning viewpoint.
- A roof covering at each entrance will help with a sense of arrival.
- Sense of privacy could be improved.
- In regards to the two walkways that connect, the lane could be more of a straight shot through.
- The planters on the property line don't allow a straight shot through. Introduce better planters close to the building.
- Concerned about the sunken patios and the amount of light in the lower suites.
- At the stairwells there is an opportunity to create skylights to bring light into the center of the stairwell and balcony areas.
- Garbage storage locations are problematic.

- Side entrances to lock off units are too hidden with no sense of arrival. Advise to have a stoop or structural element like columns to see from the sidewalk.
- Concern about large areas of brick or hardy panel not being broken up much.
- Seems kind of imposing on the site, one large block
- Consider shared space. It's hard to consider any courtyard that's meaningful, consolidating might gain outdoor space.
- The entry retaining wall planter needs to be lower or stepped, it looks quite tall.
- Consider the visibility of the vents.
- Territoriality wise, there doesn't have to be a gateway, it can be a marked entrance.
- In regards to the two long walkways at the side, be careful that landscaping features don't overpower the clear lines of sight.
- This project could benefit from more design development with regards to the treatment of facades and the bulkiness in a way that will add to the character of the street.

Presenter's comments:

Thank you for all the comments.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Permit Application for 417 - 419 E 2nd Street and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the issues listed below:

- Consider the façade, elevation and massing of the project to address the imposing and enclosed appearance;
- Consider more opportunities to let light into the building, specifically along the front elevation and skylights into the stairwells;
- Identify options to improve observable massing to reduce the impact as singular building;
- Ensure the plumbing vents are moved and or consolidated and masked;
- Review the paving material on the lane side and on walkways;
- Further investigate any potential imposition on clear line of sight on the sides of the building, specifically noting the planters and garbage enclosures;
- Consider a refinement of the roof deck design to make them more usable;
- Encourage more pollinating and native plants;
- Consider the exclusion of Vinca Minor plant and other invasive species;
- Further investigation of the landings on the upper floor;
- Ensure clear directional unit identification on paths to access from the street;
- Encouraged to investigate better opportunities to make rear and side unit entrances visible from the street and more significant to reduce observable massing;
- Reviewing design of patios for lock off suites to make them more usable;
- Consider a planning review of light penetration for the sunken patios; and
- Ensure potential for light penetration from the top to increase the amount of natural light into the units.


The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

Carried unanimously

5. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, June 21st, 2017.



Chair