

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, September 6th, 2017**

M I N U T E S

Present: B. Checkwitch
J.P. Mahé
K. Yushmanova
J. Geluch
B. Phillips
B. Harrison
Councillor Don Bell

Staff: D. Johnson, Development Planner
B. Hurley, Planner 1
R. Fish, Committee Clerk
C. Perry, Supervisor, Development Servicing

Guests: 549-557 E 3rd Street (Rezoning Application)
Bri Pigeau, Formwerks Boutique Properties Ltd.
Lyle Richards, Formwerks Boutique Properties Ltd.
Michael Scantland, Formwerks Architectural Inc.
Julie Schultz, Formwerks Architectural Inc.
Alyssa Semczyszyn, Jonathan Losee Ltd.

312 Moody & 710 – 732 E 3rd Street (Development Permit Application)
Yashpal Parmar, Guildford Brook Estates Developments
Scott Kennedy, Cornerstone Architecture
Luke Han, Cornerstone Architecture
Caelan Griffiths, PMG Landscape
Alicia Parmar, Guilford Brook Estates

417 – 419 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

Member of the Public
Padraig McMorrow, IBI Group

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

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:36 p.m.

1. Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held July 19th, 2017

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held July 19th, 2017 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

2. Business Arising

D. Johnson gave details on the upcoming Wall Financial proposal.

3. Staff Update

D. Johnson reviewed the status of ongoing development projects.

4. 549 – 557 E 3rd Street (Rezoning Application)

This application is for a development permit under the East 3rd Street Area (Moodyville) DPA Guidelines. The proposed design is for a 4 storey set of 24 stacked townhouse units across 4 buildings, including 8 required live-work frontages facing E 3rd St and 2 accessory lock-off units facing the lane. The buildings have peaked roofs with no rooftop deck and a shared access courtyard. The building will have 36 parking stalls (including 5 visitor stalls) located in an underground garage accessed from the lane. The proposal intends to fully pursue LEED® Gold Certification, as well as, 15% better than ASHRAE 90.1-2010.

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

- The design, façade, and architectural vernacular of the buildings as they respond to and potentially impact the East 3rd Street, Ridgeway 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 function, frontage, and access of the Live-Work units as they relate to E 3rd Street and act as part of a future Moodyville Neighbourhood Centre;
- 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 house and apartment project to the West as well as the apartment project to the East; and
- Quality of livability and CPTED responses for the stacked townhouses and associated accessory lock-off units in this proposal.

Michael Scantland, Formwerks Architectural Inc., described the project to the Panel:

- Walkable neighborhood close to Ridgeway Elementary and Sutherland Secondary.
- Intent was to develop 24 stacked townhouse units.
- Ground floor will consist of single storey ground oriented units.
- Remaining 6 units on ground floor are soon to be adaptable units.
- 8 units on 3rd Street are live/work units, fitting in with Moodyville plan.
- The intent of site plan is that all buildings will be following natural grade.
- The rear units will be at grade.

- The design was generated based on a family oriented design offering alternative options to housing in the local neighborhood.
- Addressed the live work status by having large display windows.
- Drawing from marine industrial look for the design.
- Specifically like the old canneries in BC with a simple utilitarian design.
- Along 3rd street we have identified each unit by pushing and pulling the massing.
- Introduced metal suspended canopies along the entries.
- Defining the units off of 3rd by giving them individual entries by pushing them back.
- On 4th floor we have set back an additional amount which reflects back in the courtyard.

Alyssa Semczyszyn, Jonathan Losee Ltd., reviewed the landscape plan:

- Low maintenance, diverse lush but native plant response.
- Looking at the opportunity to use coniferous trees.
- The open plazas are a response to Moodyville guidelines for nice wide open areas.
- The main entrance has a mailbox and some seating.
- Each patio in the courtyard have a raised hedge separation from the walk way.
- Wanted to create a feeling of community where people can eat and engage with others.
- Creating the idea of a stoop to bring out chairs and sit and enjoy.
- There is a seating area and play area using natural materials.
- In the back entry we make a pedestrian focused insert to allow for the feeling of where cars can drive but people can also walk. We want people to feel safe using the lanes.
- We will change the paving material to bring this into play.
- Creating warm lighting so it's visibly accessible to create feeling of safety and being comfortable.
- Sustainability elements will have permeable pavers to become a water conservation element and a potential cistern for reuse.
- Presenting a rain garden to capture water off of Ridgeway.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Changing the curb throws a wrench into plan, would the setback to the building change as well? **A:** They have a road dedication already taken of 15ft. There is a shorter setback because it's a live work frontage and allows for a much more reduced setback; around 4ft. It goes 15ft back for a new road dedication and a curb out into the street – but we did not have a geometric design for those streets until recently. It's likely that it will not get a road dedication without some form of negotiation. It's also likely new curb will follow down to make a turning lane.
- Staff: When it does develop we will have them fix the transition. The road needs to widen because of a transit corridor.
- From the curb, do we still get a boulevard or sidewalk? **A:** There will be a regular sidewalk and boulevard (5ft) and 2m sidewalk.
- Can we talk more about relationship between the play area and central courtyard? **A:** The play area is stepped up 2ft.
- What happens to the sidewalk? **A:** From where old property line is, that's where the curb line will go, a 5ft boulevard and 2m side walk, whatever is left is the distance of the boulevard to the property line. It looks like the paved areas are their front line but it's not, it is a public realm.

- Have you modelled the relationship of the front pads on east 3rd with the entrances and the bedroom windows being 8ft below? **A:** I believe that it has been addressed in design through the window wells. We don't have physical model yet. The intent was to have exterior walls with windows at either end to allow for cross ventilation and natural lighting.
- How liveable will those bedrooms be with the window well and sidewalk right at it? **A:** We will be expanding the window well out closer to property line. We will have to look at the requirements with the zoning to see if we can actually push that out further.
- Will the 6 adaptable suites have a handicap symbol? **A:** Yes.
- Do you need that many accessible units? **A:** Yes, six are required.
- With the max building envelope on east 3rd Street, could they be raised and allow for more natural light and ventilation? **A:** That would put them out of the zoning guidelines for the work units above.
- There are two handicap stalls in the parkade, is there an elevator coming up to grade? **A:** No.
- How do they come up? **A:** The zoning bylaw requires two accessible parking stalls. There are several precedents across mainland that do not have an elevator but have accessible stalls. We have done several developments that have not had an elevator in place.
- The suites are tight; do you find the living room liveable? How would you furnish the two bedrooms on this level? **A:** A queen sized bed, the room is 11x10ft with a walk in closet. People are finding solutions to the now common smaller master suites. The cost of living in Vancouver is increasing; people need to utilize space better.
- With the curb coming in do you see any redesign of the corner units facing north? **A:** If necessary, then yes.
- How big are the patios on the south side of building 1 and 2, are they at grade with walkway in from Ridgeway? **A:** 6ft with the planter.
- Is that the same on the rear? **A:** Yes, they are wide but shallow.
- Do you think the patio space on the north side of building 3 and 4 will be used with the slope? **A:** Yes, we have precedent information of these being used. It provides an opportunity to sit at grade with people going by. It's good to have that connection to the community. We want to do things that would promote people meeting and connecting.
- To staff: Is the corner sidewalk configuration on Ridgeway realistic? **A:** It will move down but yes it should be okay.
- Is there a clear space away from transformer? **A:** Yes.
- Staff: It is a pole mounted transformer. There is a circle in the drawings to show it has to be set back that far.
- How does this project relate to the orphan house? **A:** We tried to address it with window placement and our setback.
- Is your LEED Gold Certification voluntary? **A:** It is required in order to get density bonus.
- Why did you choose LEED Gold Certification over others? **A:** We are more familiar with it. It came from our E3 Eco groups, they recommended we go that route.
- To staff: Can you explain how the pedestrian traffic will work with the sidewalk coming down and the PMT in the way of the envisioned 3ft sidewalk? **A:** The details of that would have to be worked out.
- Was the PMT moved because of Hydro? **A:** Yes.
- Would they be okay to move it 5ft? **A:** We have to work that out.

- What's the treatment of the envisioned 3ft sidewalk? **A:** Will like it to be pavers but we need to work it out with engineering.
- Staff: It can't be pavers in the public realm.
- What are other possible materials? **A:** We can discuss this later.
- Staff: The move of the PMT was based on comments during distribution.
- Staff: Are you aware because we are moving the curb it will change the building grades? **A:** Yes.
- To staff: Are the live/work units on the corner part of a commercial zone? **A:** No. It's a frontage identified in the plan. In the guidelines there are a series of frontages that are identified as live/work.
- Was the intent to create a more commercial feeling? **A:** Yes.
- Do the live/work units on the corner have to be so residential? Can there be something in the architecture that identifies them as commercial and not residential spaces? **A:** Yes, we could improve upon it. We made a decision on the way we wanted to treat this. There were some decisions made based on other precedents. In Mackenzie Heights, they have almost identical treatment of the frontage on the building. We are trying to identify it as an owner occupied commercial unit.
- Have you consciously fronted the building? The east and west sides have a very different nature than north and side. **A:** Yes, our decision was driven by a cannery style design. We are trying to replicate and pay homage to some industrial buildings in the neighbourhood. As for the west elevation, it's a simple format. Want to stand out from everyone else.
- On the north elevation between the two main masses, there's a fence or gate, what is the material? **A:** Corrugated metal although with visibility in mind, we might change to picket for safety issues.
- Where are the parking stalls for the accessible units? **A:** We have adaptable units. Is there no place for someone who has adapted the units to make them accessible? **A:** No.
- They can't use them then right? **A:** They could be escorted up a ramp.
- How big is the storage? **A:** 40 sq. ft., 10x4. How tall? **A:** 8ft.
- Is there parking in the lane or will all parking be underground? **A:** No permanent parking is intended off the curb.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- This is an interesting project. The design development can be bolder with contrasting treatments of the façade. Bring together the vernacular to make sure it's not another grey building.
- The landscape is thoughtful and I appreciate the explanations for things. There is a lot of attention into the overall presentation and design.
- It's hard to understand how the new curb will impact the liveability and interface between the public and private realm so it's hard to comment on this.
- It's a challenge to work out the interface and perhaps there's an opportunity to provide a different treatment to the corner units to have a more commercial feel.
- There's a potential to develop the central courtyard to be more of a flexible gathering space and the play area might feel separated for supervision.
- Patios connected to the central walk way without a barrier is attractive.
- The plant section is lovely with the edible and pollinating plants - bring the numbers up.

- Look at the overall expression with the cannery look a little further, not everywhere, but there's an opportunity on 3rd street as it's a different type of unit.
- The two flanking streets on the lane are well addressed.
- Address the liveability of the adaptable suites. You have to develop those cavernous bedrooms. They are a place of refuge for kids and families. Look at this further.
- In regards to furnishing the room, you owe it to occupants to provide something liveable. Set the precedent, there could be one too many units with too much small space.
- The north and south facades are nice but you forgot about the east and west facades on all four. Look at that. It needs more design development.
- Ensure liveability, you need storage and plug-in for e-bikes.
- There is a good overview from courtyard, no major CPTED issues.
- Get PMT off the corner.
- The architecture and simplicity of the plan is good.
- The openness of the spaces between the buildings is great.
- The biggest concern is the lighting of the units off of E 3rd street. A step back planter concept might help to bring more light into the lower spaces.
- The ability to put in a small elevator to bring people up to the courtyard would solve the problem with the ability to use the accessible suites.
- The materiality and the form of the building and architecture are good.
- In terms of liveability with high performance buildings, you will likely require a heat pump. Design this now so it doesn't become an issue later.
- Mechanical rooms are way too small, consider where the will HRV go. The attic is not a place for this. You need more planning and space for this.
- With an air tightness of 1.5 you need to ensure the air barrier is intact. It is a challenge to get to 1.5 on a multilevel building.
- Great spot for live work units.
- The traditional architecture is quite refreshing, this style will stand out and be unique
- You have a well put together and detailed package.
- The main concern is a lost opportunity at the corner. The problem with most residential neighbourhoods in that they lack a commercial component that can liven the streets.
- It's problematic the way the facades have been treated on Ridgeway. You've done what you can with the landscaping; it's a problem with the architecture. You could do modulation on the corner to do something unique with this interesting component.
- The black vinyl soffit could change to something else more natural which reflects the North Shore.
- The design reference of the 'cannery' needs a stronger presentation of its industrial materiality to contrast and connect with Moodyville.

Presenter's comments:

Thank you for all the comments.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 549 – 557 E 3rd Street and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the issues listed below:

- Consider a bolder contrast and treatment of facades as well as a bolder contrast between the industrial and residential character;
- Examine the potential to develop the design for the central courtyard to be a more flexible gathering space;
- Consider the liveability of the suites, specifically with the depth of the light wells and general accessibility of adaptable units, including examining the potential for step planters at the light wells, shifts to unit levels, and possible introduction of an elevator so the parking can be accessed;
- Consider the overall liveability and programmability of spaces within the development in regards to the number of units on site;
- Encouraged to reduce division between spaces as part of strategies to ensure usability of the courtyard; Further modulation and design development for the east and west facades;
- Review the slightly commercial nature of the intersection on Ridgeway and 3rd;
- Address the number of storage units in the garage relative to the number of units;
- Consider that the depth of the patios should be greater than 6ft to make them usable;
- Ensure adequate room both inside and outside of the building for the mechanical equipment necessary to achieve LEED Gold Certification;
- Consider the potential addition of electrical for e-bike storage; and
- Encouraged to consider better alternatives to the black vinyl soffit.

The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

Carried Unanimously

5. 312 Moody & 710 – 732 E 3rd Street (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.

This is the second appearance of this application for the panels review. The first was back on May 30, 2017 where the panel made the following resolution:

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 312 Moody and 710 – 732 E 3rd Street 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 (Pod 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, unambiguous and easy to understand with clear lines of sight.

The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

Carried Unanimously

Staff asked Panel for feedback on how well the applicant responded to the May 30th motion and if the changes introduce additional comments.

Scott Kennedy, Cornerstone Architecture, reviewed the response to the resolution:

- The biggest change we did was we took one unit out of middle and opened up the center.
- We made the center court wider with more greenery and a hangout space.
- There was some concern around the repetition on the façade. We've grouped it differently, made units into pairs and changed scale from the ends to the middle.
- There was a request to widen the courtyard. We pulled the garage doors in on the laneway towards the east end of site

Caelan Griffiths, PMG Landscape, reviewed the landscape plan:

- With the extra room through the middle of the site we were able to put in a substantial tree to break up the courtyard space and a green canopy. This allowed for a more productive landscape around the play area with some edible plantings
- There is now more nature play and a more North Shore feeling of canopy above and rock below.
- We have changed some of the species of trees in laneways to be more reflective of where we are.
- We addressed the request to meet a low water demand and low maintenance planting scheme. We've identified plants that correspond to that and reflect more of where we are.
- There was a request to screen towards the heritage house. We managed to step a planter up against it and screen the prominence of it.
- We can't make the rooftop decks work.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Can you speak to the mid lane connection that's been upgraded? A: It doubles as our disability parking space as well. There's a steep grade there with a wandering staircase that provides access to one unit. We've maintained the walkway down the side and made seating areas, planters and a center piece designed for play.

- Is there any public art contribution? **A:** It's not stated in the Moodyville guidelines.
- Can you demonstrate visually this repetition of the facades? **A:** We've grouped them into pairs and created different aesthetic on the end. We still like idea of a fairly uniform aesthetic between the two pieces.
- Is the Passive Housing component still intact? **A:** Yes.
- In regards to the height calculations for the rear roof decks, why can't do it? **A:** It's a piece within zoning that was negotiated at the time of pre-zoning by council. Neighbouring responses were that there are no roof decks for overview.
- The Clematis going across the courtyard, are there lights hanging from them? **A:** Yes.
- Are the vines planted in the lane going up and across? **A:** On both sides of the laneway we have sufficient soil volumes. Is it sustainable? **A:** Yes.
- Have you changed the cladding? **A:** Yes, we reversed it; it's on the front now.
- Is there a possibility of going to more natural materials? **A:** Natural materials don't withstand the weather. We can use it on a soffit or on a door but we have not been very happy with the real wood soffits on exteriors of multi units.
- Can you make them look less natural? More honesty? **A:** Yes, we're using the Hardie Shingle which looks like painted wood shingle. There's a desire to have a wood grain feel in fairly muted colours.
- Is it Passive House certified? **A:** That is our intention. We can't likely certify because of the requirement for connecting LEC.
- Does it limit your interior space when you go from where your setback is inside? **A:** There is an allowance for both sighting and GFA, about 9 inches.
- Is there any thought of renewable energy? **A:** We have discussed this but have not committed. There is potential on the roofs.
- Do the parking areas have EV stalls? **A:** We intend to allow each garage to charge.
- Does each unit have a garage? Would there be some kind of shelving in the garage for storage? **A:** Yes, there is the ability to have bike storage and other storage.
- On the south side of the lot, the property line is moving and there is an extensive sod boulevard, is there a reason we can't have trees? **A:** Staff: There is road dedication here; the curb isn't changing a lot. There are large transformer hydro lines there that will cost a lot to move. It needs to be more adjusted on the other side.
- Are there utility lines underneath the sodded boulevard? **A:** Yes.
- Are those new trees? **A:** Yes.
- Staff: That space has potential to include multiple sets of bike and pedestrian boulevards. How the power poles work with the intended bike lines and pedestrian right of way hasn't been drawn out yet.
- Where is the 6ft cedar fence located and how does it work with guidelines? **A:** On the side yard.
- Is this consistent? **A:** There is a fence on top. The fence demands are that it be on the side of the building where the fence has impact and its 6ft from that point up to 8ft behind the building face but 6ft is appropriate for where they have it, for fall protection and privacy.
- Staff: Can you clarify that the fence it doesn't go out to the back of the lot? **A:** No, that's just planting.
- Has the owner of the heritage house been consulted? **A:** We have been communicating.
- What have they said about your development? **A:** They have had little comments, but a concern for firefighter access.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Commended for sticking with the Passive House, especially with all the rigorous challenges in this area.
- I like the changes to the façade and landscape treatment. The courtyard will be nice for communal space.
- Good response to the comments, I urge you to look at the vines over the middle lane; this will become a maintenance problem.
- Push planning on the 5 units that face Moodyville, why can't you have roof decks. Staff: the main issue is height.
- This is a good looking project. I like the materiality and the modulation, it has a European look.
- The City of North Vancouver has been promoting more laneway access; this is good to see in the project.
- It will be interesting to see how the units facing your laneway courtyard and an established laneway will be perceived by their buyers.
- See if there's any way to get roof access on Moody Street.
- Need more trees along the south façade especially in the sunshine, it will be hot.
- Robust, large sized, proper street trees are needed. It's the neighbourhood character and liveability of the street that is important

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 312 Moody and 710 – 732 E 3rd Street and recommends approval of the project. The panel commends the applicant for the quality of the proposal and their presentation.

The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

Carried Unanimously

6. 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.

This is the second appearance of this application for the Panel's review. The first was on May 30th, 2017 where the Panel made the following resolution:

"THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning 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.

Staff asked Panel for feedback on how well the applicant responded to the May 30th, 2017 motion and if the changes introduce additional comments.

- Effectiveness of design responses to the May 30th 2017 Resolutions of the ADP (see Appendix A);
- Overall design, massing, and façade of the building as they respond to East 2nd St and the lane;
- Impact and effectiveness of responses to massing and building separation;
- Sustainability and energy performance commitments;
- The quality and effectiveness of open space and functional transitions between private and public realms;
- Visibility of entrances and the sense of arrival for all units and accessory lock-off units;
- Livability and CPTED issues and responses in this proposal.

Herbert S. Chase, H.S. Chase Architect Inc., reviewed the response to the resolution:

- The overall appearance of building was a bit starker than it needed to be. The fenestration was paired down more than it needed to be.
- The question of the overall form and how it affected the light in the unit was a major element that we worked on.
- We are making increases in the windows along the front

- We are emphasizing more the overall massing of the units and the big change was to extend the windows on east 2nd and lane and to wrap around the corner to become more transparent and open.
- To define entrances we introduced pairs of trees where there are entrances.
- Exposed pipes are all reduced and moved back and not visible from the street.
- We have extended the windows on the front to around the corners and did the same thing on the lane.
- Introduced landscape elements at the entrances.
- Addressing the volume.
- On the upper floor we introduced much larger windows on the recess.
- On side of the building where there are entrances, we have marked them with trees
- The request to separate the building isn't feasible, in order to emphasize a central element, we placed trees and rearranged landscaping on the roof.
- We relocated the garbage enclosures.
- On the lane we introduced trees into the landscape element.
- Shifted a lot of the area allowance to increase the areas for lighting purposes.
- We enlarged the lower terraces and introduced an intermediate planter which gives an extension to the terrace.
- Introduced skylights into stair cases to bring light down into the interior of the building.
- Shifted terraces back and concentrated the landscaping in the link area having substantial trees on the lower level and higher level.

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

- Removed plants that weren't favoured.
- Shifted landscaping to create larger areas and trees at entry ways.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- It is hard to understand what level the mid-building trees are at? **A:** They are planted at ground level in a 3ft wide planter.
- There is entry to four distinct units, each having a lock off unit or secondary suite? **A:** Yes.
- How do you get to unit D's front door, do you have to go all the way to the back and up? **A:** The main levels on the back are at lane level, the ones at the front are at street level.
- What if I visit and park on the street? **A:** There's visitor parking at the back.
- Addresses are off of second? **A:** Yes.
- Given the lay of the land, there's no need for window wells? **A:** No. On the front terraces for the lower level, to get side windows, we have created a large well to add the corner window.
- Do all habitable spaces have a view out? **A:** Yes.
- Each unit has roof deck? **A:** Yes.
- Are they well separated visually? **A:** The stair units provide the major separations, we also have the wings. Concentrating on creating a significant landscape element with sumac trees and shrubs that will match the height.
- Any potential for sustainable features, renewable energy, EV plug-ins? **A:** Yes, we are Energuide 86.
- How do first responders know where to go? **A:** We will be given numbers for the specific addresses.

- Staff: In terms of addressing, it is assigned to each unit. The secondary suites will have their own number.
- First responders want to see the door, this could be very confusing.
- How many addresses will there be? **A:** Eight, each lock off will have designated number and main residents will also.
- At the lock off door, what is the black shading above? **A:** Canopies above the doors.
- The lower level one looks a little too high? **A:** We could drop this down and make it similar.
- What is the density bonus? **A:** From 0.5 to 1.0 FSR, double the density.
- How do you plan to get 86 Energuide? **A:** With insulation, but we're still looking at this.
- Standard 5000? **A:** Staff: I think it's more than that; it's at a percentage rate. They need to provide that at time of building permit.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Appreciate revisions to the landscape with more greenery.
- Like the move with having trees in the center, but concerned about practicality with working with the canopies and building. The platers are narrow.
- Need to be more aware of where those canopies are coming out in relation to the entries and trees.
- Suggest looking into columnar trees at the front to soften the front doors.
- Review the landscape planting plan in relation to location of windows for lower units to ensure the planting doesn't block light into the units that are below ground.
- Ensure providing sufficient soil volumes especially at ground level with access to native soil and ensure planters are wide enough.
- Materiality and massing look good.
- Concern about the back door identification; maybe have something coming out from the building, like an illuminated sign.
- Solve how to support the corner overhang from the main level above the garages by the D entrance.
- Is there an enclosure over it? **A:** No.
- Glad to see no window wells which make the rooms more habitable.
- Rooms appear to be of good size for furniture.
- Great changes made based on the comments.
- High performance construction at this stage that impacts the design, should include a preliminary report on how to get to an Energuide of 86. If they have 4 independent units in this configuration, it's not a simple building to get to 86, it could impact the design. If the applicant doesn't understand how to achieve this it could impact design at a later date.
- Overall appearance of the project has not changed that much. Changes to façade have been made and opened up with more windows, but note difficulty achieving corner window.
- North street elevation has a mean look to it. This area could have a bit more attention. It doesn't speak to a refined design. Look at other ways of achieving this look that is more finessed especially on the grey block on the north elevation.

Presenter's comments:

- We do have an Energuide analysis but did not get into the package.
- Interesting comment about the block above the entrance at the front.

- We will take all comments into hand and work with them.

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 recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Ensure sufficient soil volume for the trees and planting;
- Ensure project is identifiable and addressed properly;
- Recommend the doors toward rear are identifiable in some way from the street;
- Encouraged to find a better relationship between the canopy and door on the sides over the entrance doors;
- The preliminary sustainability report is notably absent from presentation;
- Concern over the design teams apparent lack of strategy on how the sustainability guidelines will be achieved;
- Concern that once those sustainability requirements are incorporated in the design, it might have a market effect on actual design and appearance;
- Review the tree location and species for potential conflict with the building and canopies and revise selection if necessary;
- Review the potential use of columnar trees;
- Ensure the planting at ground level does not block light to the windows of lower units;
- Review the structural support of the overhanging second storey towards the rear;
- Encourage further design development of the north elevation around the cement fiber volume on the second storey; and
- Further refine the detailing of the cladding system.

The panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

Carried Unanimously

8. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:43 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, September 20th, 2017.

Chair