

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
DECEMBER 11TH, 2014 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. James Paul (Chair)
Ms. Annerieke van Hoek
Mr. Greg Travers
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
Mr. Kevin Hanvey
Mr. Tieg Martin
Ms. Liane McKenna

REGRETS: Ms. Amy Tsang
Mr. Robert Heikkila

STAFF: Mr. Frank Ducote
Mr. Michael Hartford
Ms. Alex Anderson

The meeting came to order at 6:05 pm.

1. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

The Panel reviewed the minutes of the meeting of November 13, 2014.

Mr. Tieg Martin noted one point of clarification necessary and one correction necessary to the seconder of a motion.

Staff advised that the corrections would be made prior to the adopted minutes being published.

It was moved and seconded and carried to adopt the minutes as amended.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a. Panel Membership Update: Mr. Michael Hartford noted that the Council re-appointed Mr. Greg Travers to the Panel as the representative on accessibility issues, and that appointments have been made for two new Panel members: Mr. Dan Parke, Architect, and Mr. Samir Eidnani, Professional Engineer
- b. Notice regarding Video Recording: Michael Hartford noted to the Panel that the meeting would be video-recorded as a resource for District staff unable to attend. Mr. Hartford noted that the recording of the meeting would be for internal use only and would be deleted once the meeting minutes were produced.

A Panel member asked whether the recording would be available to the public upon request. Mr. Hartford responded that the video would theoretically be eligible for release to the public upon request, but that the District's policy allows for members of the public to attend and audio or video record any advisory committee meeting, so the recording is not in contravention to this policy.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a. 115 and 123 West Queens Road - Detailed Rezoning and Development Permit application for 18 townhouse units (08.3060.20-027.14)

Michael Hartford, District Planner, introduced the design team and gave a brief overview of the site. Mr. Hartford noted that the site is located on the south side of West Queens Road in the Queensdale Village Centre. The development site and properties to the west are designated as "Residential Level 5: Low Density Apartment" which allows for a maximum FSR of up to 1.75. Mr. Hartford noted that the larger property to the west is market rental housing for seniors and the property to the east is occupied by the Queens Cross Pub.

The site area is approximately 15,400 square feet and the proposed density of the project at just under 1.7 FSR is in compliance with the OCP provisions. The site would require rezoning and a development permit to accommodate the proposed 18 unit townhouse project. The proposal includes purchase and consolidation of a portion of the existing municipal lane at the rear of the site. The OCP development permit guidelines for ground-oriented housing, as well as for multi-family residential development are applicable to this application.

As background, Mr. Hartford noted that this application was seen by the Panel at the preliminary application stage on November 14, 2013 and at the detailed stage at the Panel's meeting of November 13, 2014. At the previous meeting the Panel passed a motion that the concept was generally supportable, but required revisions to address particular issues and a further presentation to the Panel.

The Chair thanked Mr. Hartford for his presentation, welcomed the applicant team to the meeting and outlined the procedure to be followed in reviewing the proposal.

Mr. Taizo Yamamoto, project architect, gave an overview of the amendments made to the project in response to the Panel's previous comments. Mr. Yamamoto reviewed detailed site context photos and specific adjacencies to the property, in particular, the south and west property line hedge that is a part of the neighbouring site. Mr. Yamamoto noted that the adjacent portion of the lane will be closed, but the hedge will remain.

Mr. Yamamoto reviewed the improved accessibility to the courtyard, noting that all unit entrances are proposed to be level entries with the ramp and grades being adjusted to remove the need for stairs in the courtyard. Mr. Yamamoto noted that 14 of the 18 units can accommodate a "stair-glide" system as a retrofit to improve internal accessibility. Entry features in the form of a mailbox and number signage have been provided to clearly mark the entries to individual units.

It was noted that the parking garage has been re-designed to allow a more functional bike storage space, and a more accessible garbage area.

Mr. Yamamoto noted that at the Public Information Meeting for the project, comments from the public referenced the desire for a heritage-style aesthetic, which is reflected in the current design. Detailing however has been simplified in response to the Panel's comments at the November meeting, including cleaner rooflines and smaller, less complex window designs. Stone cladding has been added to the bottom level and now wraps around the building to the courtyard. A continuous porch has been added to break-up the three storey massing on the front elevation and a darker colour band has been added to the base of the building, with wood

shake elements in the gables. Mr. Yamamoto noted that the previous glass canopy feature has been altered to provide larger scale wood gables with open trusses. Mr. Yamamoto reviewed the entrances and how the design team has worked to provide a clearer differentiation of entries through signage and colour.

It was noted that the outcomes of the shadow study remains essentially the same, with some shadowing improved as a result of the reduced size of the roof gables. Mr. Yamamoto concluded with a review of the revised material palette, which includes stone, wood shake, asphalt shingle roofing, wood trim and some limited use of "Hardi" materials.

Ms. Marlene Messer of PMG, the project Landscape Architect, reviewed the changes to the landscape plan. Ms. Messer noted that the fencing is, for the most part, six feet high where lot lines are shared, but there is no fencing proposed on the street frontage – instead, two foot high planters will be located along the frontage. Ms. Messer noted that the design calls for the use of concrete pavers in the interior courtyard, and concluded by indicating that the format of the landscape plan is intended to assist in highlighting the individual unit entries.

The Chair thanked the design team for their presentation and asked if there were any questions of clarification from the Panel members.

Questions of clarification were asked of the design team on the following topics:

Staff was asked for clarity regarding the guideline for multi-family housing to include recessed balconies when these balconies are facing a street, with particular reference to the balconies on the south side of this building. Mr. Hartford noted that as the existing rear lane is proposed to be closed, any compliance with this guideline would no longer be applicable.

Are the Queens Road balcony rails only partially glass? Answer: The balcony rails on the West Queens elevation are only partially glass - all other balcony rails are full glass.

How does the planter edge and guardrail work at the rear elevation? Answer: The solid element is the edge of the planter and the guardrail is on top of the planter. The drawing does not show the guardrail.

What are the finish materials for the rear elevation? Answer: Primarily "Hardi" lap siding, with some small areas of "Hardi-Panel." Wood shake feature areas and cultured stone are also proposed.

Would the waste bin be visible from the rear lane? Answer: Yes, the rear of the bin would be visible as currently formatted.

How high is the planter over the garage entry and what is the clearance from the siding material? Answer: The intent is to minimize the depth of the planter, while still allowing for a minimum two foot planting depth. The clearance from the siding is approximately 12 inches.

Are there stairs at the west end of the front elevation to access the courtyard? Answer: Yes, but not at the east end of this elevation. This may change as civil work is explored further.

Could separate entrances be provided to the rear garden for the south units? Answer: No, the gates are only for maintenance, not for resident access and there is insufficient room to provide pathways.

Could the main courtyard entry be shifted to the east end of the building? Answer: Possibly, but the setbacks are tighter at the east end, and until the results of the grading and civil work are complete, it is difficult to confirm the feasibility of this approach.

The Chair thanked the applicant team and staff for their clarifications and asked for comments from the District Urban Design Planner, Mr. Frank Ducote.

Mr. Ducote noted that this project appears to have improved greatly since the previous presentation. Mr. Ducote commented that the material palette is more logical and successful, and that the overall project is quieter and simpler. He also noted that accessibility for the project appears much improved.

The Chair thanked Mr. Ducote for his comments and invited comments from Panel members.

In general, Panel members noted an appreciation for the project team's responses to the Panel's previous input and suggested that the project has become much clearer and better resolved. It was further noted that the presentation was comprehensive in addressing the questions raised by the Panel at the previous meeting.

There was general agreement that the failure to wrap stone cladding around the south elevation appeared awkward, and that the project would look more complete if the stone were to be carried through to the rear of the building. Related to this, it was suggested that the detailing of the cultured stone appeared somewhat awkward, particularly above the windows, and could benefit from some revisions.

Some concern was expressed regarding the exposed waste bin and it was suggested that some sort of screening be provided.

A comment was made regarding the tight clearance between planters and siding and the issue of maintenance challenges that might be created from this relationship.

The stairwell on the west elevation was noted as appearing quite massive and could benefit from some attention to reduce the impression of mass.

A Panel member commended the applicant team on aging in place features, specifically accessibility features and stair lifts but it was suggested that the courtyard entrance, while likely in the correct location, would benefit from a level access without stairs.

It was noted that the proposed shed roof on the Queens Road coverage appeared to be a clever solution for the 'porch element', but could be raised slightly to reduce the exposure of framing and metal flashing.

It was noted that some roof line complications are visible on the model provided, and that it will be challenging to construct the proposed roofs in a way to avoid water traps.

The Chair thanked the Panel and asked if the applicant team had any comments in response.

The applicant team thanked the Panel for the constructive comments and noted that the input is appreciated and has helped to better the project.

The Chair thanked the applicant team and invited the Panel to compose a motion.

MOVED by Annerieke van Hoek and **SECONDED** by Kevin Harvey:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and recommends **APPROVAL** of the project **SUBJECT** to addressing the following items to the satisfaction of staff:

- Subject to finalization of grades, an attempt should be made to attain universal access for the main courtyard entrance
- Review of the south building elevation for use of cultured stone in a consistent manner across all elevations
- Review of the proposed shed roof element on the north elevation to improve relationship to balconies above
- Review of waste disposal facilities for function and appearance
- Consideration of detailing of cultured stone above windows
- Consideration of alternate material or treatment for east and west parkade stairs above courtyard level to be more complimentary with other finishes within the courtyard

MOTION CARRIED

b. 1241 – 1289 E. 27th Street – Rezoning, OCP Amendment and Development Permit for four 5 storey Multi Family buildings with 75 rental units and 246 Multi-Family units

Mr. Michael Hartford of the District Planning Department gave a brief overview of the application and site context. Mr. Hartford noted that this project requires a rezoning and development permit, and that the application before the Panel tonight is to address the rezoning of the entire site and the development permit for Phase One of the project - the two easterly buildings. The site is approximately 4.1 acres and is within the Lynn Valley Town Centre. To the north is the Lynn Valley Shopping Centre property, recently rezoned for re-development. To the east of the site is the Canyon Springs Development (also a Polygon project), to the south and west are existing garden apartment rental buildings, all designated for future development.

After the Official Community Plan was adopted the District engaged in a public consultation process to refine the massing provisions for the Town Centre. Out of this process, Council adopted a flexible planning framework, which defined the building height expectations for each of the town centre properties. The subject property was defined for up to 5 storeys. As well, the District commissioned a transportation study to inform how roads and pedestrian connections should work in the Lynn Valley Town Centre. A new road has been designated as Library Lane, and will run south from 27th street, through the development site. Mr. Hartford noted that there will also be a greenway element through the site on an east-west alignment. The ADP reviewed this application earlier this year at the preliminary application stage, and was generally supportive of the project. Mr. Hartford requested that attention be particularly paid to the differentiation between the four buildings proposed.

Mr. Hartford introduced the design team, Mr. Hugh Ker, Mr. Greg Voute, Mr. Kim Perry and Mr. Ray Letkeman, and noted that Mr. Letkeman would present on behalf of the team.

Mr. Letkeman reviewed the site context for all four buildings, and noted their relationship to the Bosa application to the north and the Canyon Springs development to the east. Mr. Letkeman identified Canyon Springs as having 2 building components, with a walkway leading from the centre of the development that will connect to the subject site.

Mr. Letkeman noted that the application is for a 75 unit rental building and 246 strata units in three other buildings. Mr. Letkeman noted that Library Lane will be designed to District standards and engineered with sidewalks and on-street parking. Cross-sections of the buildings were reviewed, with an outline of the grade changes on the site and the relationship to Canyon Springs. From west to east there is a 6 metre grade change, and the design team has worked through the building heights to achieve the most beneficial massing by stepping the buildings. The site plan was reviewed, noting two levels of underground parking, garden apartments fronting the garage structures and a large open green area which could be used as space for an amenity. The pedestrian walkway connecting to Canyon Springs from east to west includes a significant grade change, and it was necessary to use stairs in this one area of the project circulation.

Mr. Rob Barnes, landscape architect, reviewed the site plan and landscape approach including the design for streetscapes on Library Lane, with parking pockets, rain gardens, street trees and ample green space where possible. Mr. Barnes also noted improvements to E. 27th street with a generous boulevard and street trees.

Mr. Barnes reviewed a few special spaces on the site, including a courtyard space that features play and seating opportunities, and a courtyard referred to as the 'Outdoor Living Room' which is designed to be a quieter and more passive open space. Mr. Barnes identified the major public space at the corner of Library Lane and E. 27th Street to include two water features, native planting and seating opportunities.

Mr. Barnes noted that the residents of ground floor units will have private yards, which will be slightly elevated in order to have clear site lines to the open spaces adjacent. Each unit's yard area will have a private gate and steps. Roofs of the garden level units provide opportunities for ample patio space to the units above. Lobby accesses for these units are mid-building and provide for direct access in with no stairs.

Mr. Letkeman reviewed the building materials for all four buildings:

- Building A introduces a darker Hardi-Panel, as well as sloped and glazed areas. Mr. Letkeman noted that because of the height (5 storeys) the applicant is permitted to use wood soffits, and the decision was to use cedar beams to support the balconies and timber in the entry areas. Building A also introduces finer-scaled wood elements to emphasize the entry in a unique way. Mr. Letkeman noted that the private entries would feature similar wood elements.
- For Building B the roof profile changes to a flat roof with vaulted ceilings with a different timbering element in the balconies. Mr. Letkeman noted the introduction of brick which is incorporated up to the 4th storey of the building and the "frame" feature which is lighter in colour compared to the darker frame of Building A.
- Building C includes a steeper roof pitch, vaulted ceilings and increased glazing. Mr. Letkeman noted the use of stone at the base of this building rather than brick. As well, the design team has incorporated shingle form siding rather than panel.

- Building D includes brick for all five storeys of the building, and features at the ground level entry points. The amenity room in the building is expressed to 27th street and Library Lane with glazed corners and a window wall.

The Chair thanked the design team for their presentation and asked if there were any questions of clarification from the Panel members.

Questions of clarification were asked of the design team on the following topics:

On the east elevation of Building C, what is the feature at Level 5? Answer: Part of the balcony will have a guard rail and it will be between the two walls. There is a corner post on the right hand side and a guard rail extends to that.

On the south elevation of Building A and Building B, there appears to be an unprotected ledge with a drop - how is that resolved? Answer: The edge of the parkade is exposed and a guard-rail will be required with a berm from the street.

Rain water leaders are not shown, are they proposed? Answer: Yes, they will be external and painted the same colour as the siding.

What is the treatment of the setback area at the top of the fourth floor? Answer: Cap flashing with no need for external gutters.

A question was asked of Mr. Michael Hartford, District Planner: It is indicated that there will be a park to the south of the property - is there a time frame for this completion? Answer: The park development will correspond with development to the south and west of this site, so the timeline for the park will be linked to the timing of future development south of Mountain Gate.

At the east property line there appears to be a drop-off of about 1m. Will there be a railing or retaining wall there? Answer: There will be bermed plantings and a fence in this location.

Does the path from Mountain Gate at the east property line offer universal accessibility? Answer: Yes.

Can you explain the importance of the mid-block connection, and does the Canyon Springs lobby allow for public access? Answer: In early discussions around the Lynn Valley Town Center, the intent was to create an east-west connection to Whitley Court. The Canyon Springs site was very constrained and it was not an option to break the development into two portions. In this current project, the question was raised as to the continuation of the walkway. The conclusion was that pedestrian access to the walkway would be provided for Canyon Springs residents. The walkway will not allow for public access to the east of the Canyon Springs property line – a secured gate will be located at this location.

Will the pathways and public spaces be illuminated through to Library Lane? Answer: Yes.

Is the visitor parking separately gated? Answer: Yes.

Is the east-west pathway intended to be public? Answer: Yes.

The east-west pathway appears to dead-end at the Canyon Springs property line – is this correct? Answer: Yes, there is a gate at this location, accessible only by Canyon Springs residents.

Which units have grade level access? Answer: All units facing the street will have grade level access.

Are the courtyards secured? Answer: There are no gates but there will be edge definition and transition planting to create a visual barrier – the intention is that the design will create territoriality and natural surveillance.

Is the walkway between Buildings A and B and between Buildings C and D public? Answer: Yes.

Is public access along the east property line possible and do garden level units along this property line have access to the north and south? Answer: There is a walkway in this location to fulfil exiting provisions, but it is not intended for public use.

What tree plantings are proposed along the east property line? Answer: Smaller tree species such as Serviceberry will be used in this location.

How will the trees on slab over parking garages work? Answer: They will be over the slab with approximately two feet of soil depth, and smaller species such as vine maples, dogwoods and magnolias will be specified.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for their clarifications and asked for comments from the District Urban Design Planner, Mr. Frank Ducote.

Mr. Ducote noted that the previous direction from the Panel was to create variety, and that the applicant appears to have achieved this through their use of colour, material choice and roof forms. It was suggested that access from E. 27th Street could be improved to ground level units in Building A and was noted that perhaps the driveway of Building D could be improved in order to create a better relationship to Mountain Gate. Mr. Ducote also noted that there could be more colour variation between Building A and B.

The Chair thanked Mr. Ducote for his comments and asked the Panel members for their comments on the proposal.

The Panel thanked the applicant team for a thorough and detailed presentation. It was noted that the use of a model was quite helpful in appreciating the layout and complexity of the development.

A question was asked of Mr. Hartford, District Planner regarding the motions to be considered by the Panel – should one motion for the rezoning and one motion for the development permit be considered? Mr. Hartford responded that the item will be considered by Council as a package and that for the purposes of the Design Panel, the motion could be broken into separate items, but there was no specific need to do so.

It was noted that while the massing and density on the site appears generally supportable and the architecture in Buildings A and B appears generally successful, Building A measures approximately 160 feet long, which could contribute to a relentless appearance. It was suggested that using colour and material variety could help break-up the massing of the

building. Further, it was suggested that greater variation in colour and material palettes could be used to provide greater identity for each of the buildings.

A comment was made regarding the building composition, and it was recommended that the clear expression of a “base”, “middle” and “top” could help to relieve the massing as well as to create more unit identity.

It was noted that locating the parking entrance for Building D to the highest west point of the site may create a harsh edge condition and that consideration should be given to moving this parking access further east.

It was noted that greater effort needs to be taken with the ground floor unit entries to provide a sense of unit identity - the entrance doors of unit should be visible, and identifiable as a true unit entry.

The system of pathways around the site was noted as positive, but the proposed east-west pedestrian corridor was identified as needing additional work as in its current form it lacked purpose in either a public or private sense - using this path to provide unit access or as an alternative children’s play space could each be ways to create an improved role for this path. Further the east termination of this pathway was noted as a problem in terms of how the public might be advised that this is ultimately a dead end. A suggestion was made to possibly provide a map or way-finding cues at the entry from Library Lane.

It was suggested that the sense of relentlessness in the project is accentuated by the rigidity of the walkways and that a less structured and more informal approach to the landscaping could assist in softening the experience around the site.

It was noted that there could be a benefit in the project better reflecting the future park element to be created to the south of the site.

It was suggested that retaining some sense of privacy between Canyon Springs and the proposed Buildings A and B could be a challenge and that some larger tree canopies could help address this.

It was noted that while the project layout provides for natural surveillance and there is a strong territorial definition for the transition between public and private space, it was suggested that the grades may inhibit the “three / seven” rule for landscaping – to allow for sightlines from three feet above the ground to seven feet above the ground. Dead-end elements in the walkway system were also noted as something that could provide a gathering point for inappropriate activities and be a challenge in the project.

The Chair thanked the Panel for their comments and invited the applicant team to respond to the comments made by the Panel.

Mr. Letkeman thanked the Panel for their comments and responded to some of the points raised. Mr. Letkeman noted that the elevation drawings do not show the separation between the public sidewalk and the building, and there will be gates that are not shown in the drawings. Mr. Letkeman agreed with the Panel’s comments regarding the need for a true “base”, “middle” and “top” to the buildings, and that the applicant team can work on adding more variation in colour and material choices.

Mr. Kerr speaking on behalf of Polygon Developments noted that there are some challenges to altering the grade and parking entrance for proposed Building D. Mr. Kerr noted that the front entries for the ground level units are more articulated than what is reflected in the drawings and the design of the entry features and exterior entrances is intended to help to create unit identity, which has been successfully achieved in nearby developments such as the "Branches" project on Whiteley Court.

The Chair thanked the applicant team and invited the Panel to compose a motion.

MOVED by James Paul and **SECONDED** by Liane McKenna

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and recommends **APPROVAL** of the project **SUBJECT** to addressing the following items to the satisfaction of staff:

- A review of the design and function of on-site circulation including CPTED issues of territorial definitions between public and private spaces, pathways and courtyards, with particular attention to the dead-end east/west pathway at the east side of the site
- A review of opportunities for enhancing identities for entries to ground floor units including landscaping, signage and entry sequence
- Exploration of greater variation in colours and materials between buildings with specific attention to Building A and achieving greater variations in colour for this building to assist in breaking-down the mass of the building
- Ensuring that the streetscape approach for Library Lane is consistent with Lynn Valley Town Centre objectives in creating a connection from north to south.

MOTION CARRIED

c) Workshop Item – Review of the need for models and 3-D Representations in development applications

Mr. Michael Hartford, District Planner, gave a brief overview of the past discussions regarding requirements for three-dimensional models in project reviews. Mr. Hartford noted that at the November meeting of the Panel, the question was raised as to what other north shore municipalities require with regard to models. In response, it was noted that:

- the City of North Vancouver prefers that all application packages include a physical model, and particularly those developments with three or more dwelling units as well as all non-residential developments. Historically, the City of North Vancouver has attempted to build a model of the central development area with the ability to add models from new developments into the larger city model.
- the District of West Vancouver does not have specific requirements for models. It was noted that for complex projects, applicants typically recognize the benefits of providing a detailed model and that when one is used, the scale of the model is discussed with the Planning Department to ensure it is appropriate. It was noted that West Vancouver rarely requires a physical massing model, as sketch up renderings printed in booklets have generally replaced the physical massing model approach and ADP members have found that this approach provides the information they need.

Mr. Hartford noted to the Panel that in 2012 there was discussion around a need for terms of reference relating to the District requirements that could be provided to applicants and that this document is made available to all applicants scheduled for Design Panel review.

Mr. Frank Ducote commented that the benefit of seeing a project in scale and context was made apparent by one of the items seen at this evening's meeting. Mr. Ducote suggested that a good point of reference might be the Panel's ability to understand the scope of the project, and in that case a basic massing model might be a suitable reference.

The Panel discussed potential criteria and terminology for models. Members of the Panel suggested that the Preliminary Application process might be provide an opportunity to flag the need for a model.

A point was raised regarding the cost of a model, and there was concern expressed that there could be a determination made later in the application process of the need for an additional model, with expenditure incurred at that point rather than earlier in the process.

A Panel member suggested that there could be a minimum dwelling unit count determined that might trigger the need for a physical model. At that point, the applicant could work with the Planning Department and Urban Design Planner to determine the scope and scale needed. It was also suggested that examples of successful models from other applications could be used as "samples" in order to help set out clear expectations for the applicant.

A member noted that it is typically applications of approximately twelve units and over that are better understood with a model.

Another member commented that, if the Panel's needs are clear to the applicant, it should be up to the applicant to meet the defined objectives in relating the project. It was noted that review for some sites, for example a flat site in Edgemont Village, might be satisfied by renderings and drawings rather than a model.

A Panel member asked if the District provides clear direction to applicants regarding what is necessary for the Design Panel's review. Mr. Hartford responded that the criteria for submission packages to the Design Panel are listed for each applicant, but the need for a model is identified as an "as needed" item. Mr. Hartford noted that there could be value in providing applicants more information regarding the objectives of the Design Panel as background to why a model might, or might not, be required for a specific application.

Some discussion took place on the typical types of issues that arise during a project review for which additional information is requested. Panel members noted that the key issues have typically been context, the site itself before and after development, and the level of detail in relation to building proposed.

It was noted by a Panel member that the preliminary application stage is an early stage in the design development process, and given the purpose of the preliminary application to examine feasibility, this might not be the appropriate time to require a model.

A member commented that the use of a model at the Preliminary stage could be left up to the applicant, as a model, even at an early stage of design development, can serve as a useful tool for discussion.

It was suggested that the District could lay out expectations with images of models that would be appropriate and that the District Urban Designers and Planners should be able to provide some input on this approach and the types of models expected.

Regarding the surrounding context of the development, it was asked how broad the context should be, and the level of detail desired in the context representation. Members responded that this could vary depending on the size of the project, noting that smaller projects might not need as much context. In general, it was suggested that a great deal of detail was not required for the context representation.

It was recommended that developing a glossary of terms and images would be helpful for future applicants, particularly in terms of encouraging complete and useful packages for the Panel's review.

It was noted by a member that there are times when information presented by applicant teams appears to have errors or misrepresentations. It was questioned whether it is appropriate for the Panel to point out to applicants when these situations occur. Mr. Hartford commented that the Panel would be encouraged to raise these issues and that if a design team's presentation or the model displayed include errors, the Panel is encouraged to point this out in the interest of improving the information available to staff, the public, and ultimately to Council.

It was concluded that District staff will continue to refine the information package provided to applicant's, including additional information on the need and purpose for a model, and will provide at a future meeting, an updated list for the information and comment of the Panel.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

As this was the last meeting of 2014, and the expiry of Mr. James Paul's second appointment to the Panel, Mr. Hartford thanked Mr. Paul for his service to the Advisory Design Panel over the past four years, and expressed appreciation to all the Panel members for their contributions over the past year.

5. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was moved, seconded, and carried to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

6. NEXT MEETING

January 15th, 2015


Chair


Date