

MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON January 8th, 2026 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER

- ATTENDING:** Sgt Kevin Bracewell, RCMP Crime Prevention
 Mr. Jay Boyce, Architect
 Mr. Rasool Ghodoosi, Landscape Architect
 Mr. John Gilmour, Development Industry Representative
 Mr. Robert Greene, Visual Art Specialist
 Mr. Koosha Kheradmandnia, Professional Engineer
 Ms. Vanessa Konn, Architect
 Mr. Tieg Martin, Building Industry
 Mr. David Parke, Accessibility Representative
- STAFF:** Ms. Tash Cheong (Staff Liaison), Development Planner
 Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner
 Mr. Kevin Zhang, Development Planner
 Ms. Afrooz Fallah, Planning Assistant
- APPLICANT:** Mr. Michael Patterson, Landscape Architect, (Perry + Associates
 Landscape Architecture / Site Planning)
 Mr. Shamus Sachs, Applicant (Integra Architecture)
 Mr. Bryce Gauthier, Landscape Architect (Gauthier + Associates
 Landscape Architects Inc)
 Mr. Collin Truong, Applicant (Integra Architecture)

1. PANEL WELCOME AND DINNER

Ms. Tash Cheong (Staff Liaison) advised that the former Chair, Mr. Stuart Rodney, is no longer on the Panel. Vice Chair John Gilmour served as Acting Chair, and elections for Chair and Vice Chair would take place during staff announcements.

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Mr. Gilmour, and attendance was taken. Panel members and staff introduced themselves. New panel members Mr. Jay Boyce (Architect), Mr. Rasool Ghodoosi (Landscape Architect), and Ms. Vanessa Konn (Architect) were welcomed.

2. ADMINISTRATION

The minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting held on September 11, 2025, were reviewed and amended. A motion to adopt the amended minutes was moved by Mr. Tieg Martin, seconded by Mr. Robert Greene, and carried unanimously.

3. STAFF ANNOUNCEMENT

Staff outlined the election process in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order, noting that nominations could be made by any panel member, including self-nominations, and that a majority vote would be required if more than one nomination was received.

Election of Chair

- Nomination: Mr. John Gilmour
- No further nominations were received.
- John Gilmour was elected Chair by acclamation and assumed the role.

Election of Vice Chair

- Staff explained the role and responsibilities of the Vice Chair.
- Nomination: Mr. Tieg Martin
- No further nominations were received.
- Mr. Tieg Martin was elected Vice Chair by acclamation.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) Riverside Affordable Housing Project (District-Owned Land) – Development Permit Application for an 81-Unit Affordable Rental Housing Development within a Six-Storey Building

Ms. Cheong provided an overview of the application for the proposed six-storey social housing project on District-owned land in the Maplewood Village Centre, submitted by Integra Architecture on behalf of Metro Vancouver Housing Corporation. The proposal includes an 81-unit rental building above one level of underground parking, with an in-suite daycare for residents' children, extensive bicycle storage, and new lane connections to Riverside Drive and Old Dollarton Road.

Ms. Cheong requested the Panel's feedback on the following key aspects:

- How could the building's materiality and colour be approached to enhance coherence, particularly at the eastern entrance, and how might alternative treatments, like differentiating upper-level materials instead of stepping back, be applied effectively?
- What considerations arise from the proposed location of the childcare facility near the garbage staging area?
- How might the Riverside entry be made more identifiable as a visual reference without suggesting it is the primary access, considering that fire response is from the lane?
- Is there any feedback on the placement of the mechanical and electrical rooms near the outdoor amenity space, as well as the location and materiality of the exterior bike shed?

The Chair thanked Ms. Cheong for the presentation and invited the Panel to ask any clarification questions.

- **Q:** Is there a public art requirement for this application?
A: No. Public art is not required for this proposal.
- **Q:** Does the project currently have a civic address?
A: No. The site is currently vacant and will be assigned a civic address later in the approval process.

- **Q:** What is the status of the laneways adjacent to the site?
A: The laneways are currently closed. Surrounding properties are developed, but the lanes are not open for public use at this time.
- **Q:** Are the proposed lockers intended for general storage or limited to bicycle storage?
A: This item was noted and will be addressed by the applicant team during their presentation.
- **Q:** Do the Form and Character guidelines allow flexibility on step-back requirements for affordable housing projects?
A: Yes. Affordable housing projects are typically afforded greater flexibility, particularly where design decisions support building durability and resilience.
- **Q:** Has the closure and use of the east–west laneway been considered in the broader neighbourhood and transportation context?
A: Yes. The east–west lane will remain functional but will be capped at Riverside Drive due to its classification as a busy arterial. The configuration has been reviewed for servicing, fire access, and future development of adjacent District-owned lands.
- **Q:** Is future road widening or improvement planned along Riverside Drive?
A: Yes. A road dedication is being provided to accommodate potential future improvements.
- **Q:** Can staff comment on unit layouts, laundry configurations, mailboxes, and daycare interior layouts?
A: These questions were deferred to the applicant team for response.

No further clarification questions were raised, and the Chair invited the applicant team to proceed with their presentation.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team. Mr. Shamus Sachs of *Integra Architecture*, and Mr. Michael Patterson of *Perry + Associates Landscape Architecture / Site Planning* who introduced the project.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for their presentation and invited questions for clarification from the Panel.

The Chair thanked all presenters and asked the Panel whether they have any questions.

- **Q:** What mechanical systems are proposed for the building?
A: The mechanical systems are still being finalized. They are anticipated to include domestic hot water and make-up air units, with intake and exhaust likely located on the roof. Given greenhouse gas reduction targets, the design is expected to rely more heavily on electric systems. Elevators are proposed as machine-room-less (MRL).
- **Q:** Are any renewable energy systems, such as solar panels, proposed?
A: No renewable energy systems are currently proposed.

- **Q:** Was an alternative layout considered for the relationship between the amenity space and adjacent interior spaces?
A: Yes. Multiple configurations were explored, including relocating the mechanical room. The current layout was selected to strengthen the visual connection between the lobby and courtyard, though the applicant acknowledged the merit of alternative configurations.
- **Q:** Was relocating the pad-mounted transformer station (PMTS) closer to the lane considered?
A: Yes. Alternate locations were reviewed; however, constraints related to road impacts and Hydro requirements resulted in the current proposed location along Riverside Drive. Discussions with Hydro are ongoing.
- **Q:** How is bicycle parking secured, and is there flexibility to reduce its footprint?
A: Bicycle parking meets bylaw requirements and is intended for parking rather than long-term storage. Bike rooms will have fob-controlled access and an open-air design for visibility and security. Storage lockers are generally avoided due to operational challenges, though the project includes more in-unit storage than typical developments.
- **Q:** How will site access, addressing, and servicing function?
A: Vehicular and fire access will be from the lane to the east, while the primary pedestrian entrance and civic address will be on Riverside Drive. This configuration reflects District direction. Canada Post has confirmed it can service the site from either location.
- **Q:** What is the status of the proposed in-home childcare space?
A: The childcare space is currently identified as a footprint only and is designed to accommodate up to eight children, subject to future funding and licensing. If funding is not secured, the space may be converted to residential use. Any future operator would be responsible for meeting all applicable childcare regulations.
- **Q:** How does the project address accessibility requirements?
A: The building is designed to exceed adaptability requirements; however, due to funding and affordability constraints, the project currently commits to the minimum required number of enhanced accessible units, while maintaining flexibility for future upgrades.
- **Q:** Are stairwells accessible for everyday resident use as an alternative to elevators?
A: Stairwells are primarily intended for fire egress and are not designed as continuous circulation routes between all levels for daily resident use.
- **Q:** What is the grade relationship between ground-floor patios and adjacent landscaped areas?
A: Ground-floor patios are separated by low walls or planters, approximately two feet in height, to provide privacy. Slabs are sloped to manage grade changes between patios and landscaped areas.

- **Q:** What are the anticipated hard construction costs?
A: At this early design stage, estimated hard construction costs are approximately \$650–\$700 per square foot, generally consistent with comparable wood-frame construction.
- **Q:** Why are some laundry units side-by-side rather than stacked, and can additional storage be incorporated?
A: Side-by-side laundry is required in accessible units, while stacked units may be used elsewhere. Opportunities to integrate additional storage within larger adaptable bathrooms are still being explored.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner, provided a detailed design review and offered the following observations and comments for the Panel’s consideration:

- Mr. Tejada noted that his comments focused primarily on built form, character, and materiality, and were intended as questions and discussion points for the Panel.
- He raised concerns regarding the treatment of the east and west elevations, particularly the west elevation, which functions as a secondary entrance. He questioned whether the character of this entrance adequately presents a positive and welcoming frontage to the streetscape, despite not being the main entry.
- Concerns were expressed about the proximity of the loading area to the children’s play area. While acknowledging that changes in grade shown in the cross-sections help mitigate some impacts, Mr. Tejada noted that truck access and traffic circulation near the lane and adjacent areas remain potentially problematic.
- A key concern related to the location of mechanical rooms along the south side of the site, occupying a prime courtyard-facing area, while residential units are located on the north side with limited sunlight exposure. Mr. Tejada encouraged the applicant to explore alternative locations for mechanical spaces to improve residential livability and maximize usable courtyard-facing unit space.
- He emphasized the importance of the courtyard concept, noting that the building configuration aims to create a semi-rectangular courtyard and, in the future, a larger green open space when paired with potential development on the south side of the street.
- Mr. Tejada commented on the bicycle storage structure, noting that its current design appears visually disconnected from the main building and reads as an accessory structure. He suggested strengthening its architectural integration with the overall building character and streetscape.
- With respect to massing, Mr. Tejada referenced design guidelines encouraging buildings over six storeys to step down at upper levels to reduce perceived scale. He acknowledged the project’s use of contrasting materials and colours to visually break the building into two components, which helps reduce massing impacts.
- He suggested further consideration of roofline articulation, including setbacks or recesses, to enhance visual separation between building components and avoid the appearance of a long, continuous mass, particularly given the building length exceeding 45 metres.

- Positive comments were made regarding the west elevation, where roofline movement and material differentiation successfully create the perception of two distinct building forms.
- He noted that end elevations require particular design attention and felt that some elevations were resolved more successfully than others.
- Questions were raised regarding material consistency on the east elevation, which appears more solid and less articulated compared to the Riverside frontage. Mr. Tejada encouraged further refinement of material selection and colour strategy to either better unify the building or clearly reinforce its segmented composition.
- In closing, Mr. Tejada stated that the project demonstrates strong potential and could become a successful development, provided that the Panel's comments regarding built form, materiality, massing, and functional relationships are carefully considered.

The Chair thanked staff and the applicant team for their presentations and invited comments from the Panel.

Summary of Panel Commentary and Consensus Items:

The Panel provided extensive comments and observations, generally acknowledging the complexity of the project constraints and commending the applicant team for a thoughtful and well-developed proposal.

Overall Design and Response

- Several Panel members expressed strong support for the project, noting the high quality of the design response given the constraints of affordable housing delivery.
- The Panel commended the clarity of the stacked building design and the thorough consideration of functional requirements, including ventilation, servicing, and building systems.

Entrances and Wayfinding

- The Panel discussed the west (Riverside) entrance and noted opportunities to improve its prominence and weather protection while maintaining its role as a secondary entrance.
- Suggestions included enhanced canopies, decorative architectural elements, improved glazing, lighting, and stronger material expression to clearly signal an entrance without competing with the primary access.
- Broad consensus emerged that the lane-side (east) entrance should function as the primary pedestrian entrance, with improved visibility, architectural emphasis, and safer drop-off opportunities.
- Panel members raised concerns regarding addressing clarity, first responder access, ride-share drop-offs, and potential conflicts along Riverside Drive, emphasizing the need for clear and intuitive wayfinding.

Materiality, Colour, and Massing

- Panel opinions varied regarding material palette and colour. Some members supported the lighter colour scheme for durability and reduced maintenance, while others

encouraged bolder colour use or primary colour accents to enhance identity and recognizability.

- The Panel discussed building height and massing, particularly the vertical expression of the façade. While stepping back upper storeys was discussed, some members cautioned that setbacks can introduce long-term building envelope vulnerabilities.
- Alternative strategies were suggested, including horizontal articulation, material transitions, roof plane variation, and colour differentiation to visually reduce perceived height and break down massing.
- General agreement was reached that further refinement of roofline articulation and façade composition would help soften the building's scale.

Mechanical and Electrical Rooms

- Many Panel members supported the central location of mechanical and electrical rooms from an efficiency and functionality perspective.
- Suggestions included treating blank walls with architectural detailing (e.g., dummy windows or doors) to better integrate these areas into the façade.
- Some members encouraged continued exploration with utility providers to relocate servicing where feasible, to improve courtyard function and daylight access.

Courtyard, Amenity, and Childcare Areas

- The Panel supported the generous courtyard and amenity spaces, noting their strong solar access and usability.
- Concerns were raised about the proximity of the childcare outdoor area to loading and waste functions, and some Panel members suggested that a solid visual screen could help mitigate potential impacts.
- Several members suggested opportunities to improve shared amenity use, weather-protected seating, and flexible programming of outdoor spaces.
- Accessibility considerations were noted, including ensuring sufficient maneuvering space around accessible planters and amenities.

Bicycle Storage

- The Panel expressed concern that the bicycle shed appears visually disconnected from the main building and reads as an afterthought.
- Suggestions included stronger architectural integration, alternative materials, stacked bike systems to reduce footprint, or relocating bike storage to the parkade.
- Security concerns were emphasized, with recommendations for robust construction, strong lighting, natural surveillance, and durable access controls.

Parkade and Servicing

- Panel members noted challenges with accessible parking locations relative to elevator cores and encouraged further review.
- Waste storage size, servicing logistics, and future flexibility were identified as areas requiring careful consideration.
- The Panel discussed broader site circulation and suggested that a cul-de-sac configuration for the lane could improve safety, access, and long-term site functionality, particularly given potential future development.

Consensus

- The Panel agreed that the proposal demonstrates strong potential and is well advanced.
- Key areas for further refinement include entrance hierarchy and clarity, material and colour strategy, massing articulation, bicycle storage integration, and servicing/layout efficiencies.
- Overall, the Panel was supportive of the project and encouraged the applicant to consider the comments raised to further strengthen design quality, functionality, and long-term performance.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion.

Moved by Mr. Tieg Martin, and seconded by Mr. Robert Greene:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and **recommends APPROVAL for the project SUBJECT to addressing to the satisfaction of staff** the items noted by the Panel in its review of the project.

CARRIED

The motion was carried unanimously.

b.) 328 and 332 Seymour River Place – OCP Amendment, Rezoning, and Development Permit Application for a 40-Unit Six-Storey Residential Apartment Building

Mr. Kevin Zhang, Development Planner, provided an overview of the application. The proposal, submitted by Integra Architecture, consists of a six-storey residential apartment building containing 40 dwelling units, with one level of underground parking. The site is located within the Maplewood Village Centre and is surrounded by a mix of multi-family residential, mixed-use, and single-family residential developments.

Mr. Zhang requested the Panel's feedback on the following key aspects:

- Are the proposed materiality and scale fit with the immediate context and overall Maplewood Plan area?
- Does the overall design interface well with the ground/pedestrian level on all sides?
- Does the scale, materiality, massing, and step-backs ensure that the proposed development 'reads' as a 5-storey rather than a 6-storey building?
- How might the stair shaft be better integrated into the building?

The Chair thanked Mr. Zheng for the presentation and invited the Panel to ask any clarification questions.

- **Q:** How does the proposal comply with the OCP requirement that habitable space not be located below the Flood Construction Level (FCL), given that the mechanical and electrical rooms are proposed within the parkade, with the top of the parkade approximately four feet below the Sea Construction Level (SCL)?
A: The applicant confirmed that all life-safety systems will be located on the ground floor at or above the FCL and that compliance will be confirmed through detailed design.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team Mr. Collin Truong of *Integra Architecture*, and Mr. Bryce Gauthier of *Gauthier + Associates Landscape Architects Inc.* who introduced the project.

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

- **Q:** Are any mechanical systems proposed on the roof?
A: Yes. The applicant confirmed that rooftop mechanical equipment is proposed, including a make-up air unit.
- **Q:** What type of glazing is proposed for the stairwells?
A: The applicant advised that the stairwell glazing will be translucent, with final specifications (double or triple glazing) to be confirmed through energy modelling.
- **Q:** Do the privacy screens shown in the renderings represent the final design intent?
A: Yes. The applicant confirmed that the privacy screens are intended to be opaque and consistent with the renderings.
- **Q:** How will balcony dividers be treated on the lower floors, particularly between glass guards and masonry columns?
A: The applicant explained that metal railings with opaque glazing will be used consistently between columns and guardrails.
- **Q:** Is there any intention to incorporate solar panels or renewable energy systems?
A: The applicant advised there is no current intention to install renewable energy systems. The building is designed to be largely electrified with minimal gas use to support low-carbon objectives.
- **Q:** Is public art required as part of this project?
A: The applicant stated that no discussions or requests regarding public art have occurred to date, and no requirement has been identified by staff.
- **Q:** How will exterior lighting be addressed, particularly on feature elements?
A: The applicant confirmed that exterior lighting will be provided to meet Building Code and life-safety requirements. No decorative lighting above the second level is proposed at this time.
- **Q:** Is tree planting feasible along Seymour Boulevard given overhead utility lines?
A: The applicant confirmed that tree planting is feasible and will be coordinated with BC Hydro. Low-growing tree species will be selected and finalized at the Building Permit stage.
- **Q:** Was the use of rooftop amenity space considered to increase outdoor usable area?
A: The applicant advised that rooftop amenity space was explored but is not considered viable due to code requirements, elevator and stair extensions, space limitations, and financial feasibility for a rental housing project.

- **Q:** Have soil volume and planting requirements been assessed for proposed trees?
A: The applicant confirmed that minimum soil volume requirements will be met, with further refinement to occur during detailed design.
- **Q:** What is the intent of the narrow space between the building and certain raised planters?
A: The applicant explained that this separation allows for construction, waterproofing, and maintenance, and avoids direct attachment of planters to the building façade.
- **Q:** Is the rear exit accessible, or could it be made accessible?
A: The applicant advised that due to grade differences, the rear exit cannot be made accessible.
- **Q:** Are the northeast stair exits emergency exits only?
A: Yes. The applicant confirmed that these exits are emergency-only.
- **Q:** Has secure parcel delivery space been considered in the lobby?
A: The applicant noted that while not fully developed, options such as secure parcel lockers have been observed in similar projects and could be explored.
- **Q:** Can enhanced accessible units accommodate caregivers or lock-off configurations?
A: The applicant advised that while lock-off units are not currently proposed, there is potential to explore enhanced accessibility features, including automated door rough-ins.
- **Q:** Are there concerns with door swings, transfer spaces, and accessibility within enhanced units?
A: The applicant acknowledged the concerns and confirmed that door layouts, transfer spaces, and accessibility will be reviewed and refined, including consideration of sliding or pocket doors.
- **Q:** Are accessible parking stalls located too far from elevators?
A: The applicant acknowledged the challenge due to site constraints and committed to reviewing opportunities to improve proximity and circulation.
- **Q:** How was the reduced parking count determined given the number of residential units?
A: The applicant explained that a high-water table limits parking construction and that a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) study has been submitted, citing proximity to transit, services, and proposed car-share spaces to support a parking reduction.
- **Q:** Can the applicant comment on anticipated construction costs?
A: The applicant advised that costs have not yet been finalized but noted that affordability, constructability, and design quality are being carefully balanced. Some architectural features may increase costs but are intended to enhance long-term value and livability.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner, provided a detailed design review. His comments focused primarily on built form cohesion, massing, articulation, and materiality, with particular

attention to how the building is read as a single architectural entity and offered the following comments for the Panel's consideration:

- Mr. Tejada noted that the primary concern is whether the building reads as a cohesive whole, or as two distinct buildings connected by a dominant central element. He emphasized the importance of clarity in the relationship between the podium, middle portion, and upper storeys.
- He reviewed the north-west and south-west elevations, noting that the north-west elevation presents a more cohesive and successful composition, with a clear podium, articulated middle floors with balconies, and a stepped-back top storey. He observed that the use of setbacks at the upper level is effective and not commonly achieved in many comparable developments.
- In contrast, Mr. Tejada described the south-west elevation as presenting a different architectural character, particularly at the main entrance, raising questions about consistency between elevations. He highlighted variations in character across the façade, describing them conceptually as distinct elements that appear to function as separate architectural identities.
- He explained that the building composition appears to rely on three primary elements: two contrasting façade characters on the north and south sides, unified by a central vertical element associated with circulation. While this central element helps connect the building visually, it also becomes one of the most dominant components of the massing, which challenges the overall cohesion.
- Mr. Tejada discussed the material palette, noting the use of three primary materials—brick, fibre cement siding, and corrugated metal. He observed that these materials are expressed more strongly on the north elevation than on the south and front elevations, contributing to an uneven architectural reading.
- He commented that the podium treatment is particularly challenging, as it introduces multiple architectural vocabularies that compete rather than clearly reinforce a unified base.
- Mr. Tejada acknowledged that the angular form of the central vertical element responds to the site geometry and program requirements; however, he questioned whether its scale and visual prominence overpower the adjacent building elements.
- He noted a personal preference for the north elevation, which he felt demonstrates stronger articulation, material expression, and overall architectural clarity.
- In closing, Mr. Tejada invited the Panel to consider whether the building's articulation and material strategy should be simplified to strengthen unity and asked whether the current balance between variation and cohesion successfully achieves a single, legible architectural form.

The Chair thanked staff and invited comments from the Panel members.

Summary of Panel Commentary and Consensus Items:

The Panel provided detailed comments on the project, generally acknowledging its strong architectural intent and thoughtful response to site constraints, while identifying several areas for refinement.

Overall Design and Massing

- The Panel generally agreed that the project is visually strong and attractive, with effective massing and articulation.
- Some members noted that the building can read as two distinct volumes connected by a central element. While this was not viewed as a critical issue, several Panel members encouraged further refinement to strengthen cohesion.
- The step-back at the upper storey was widely supported and described as an effective way to reduce perceived height and scale.
- Suggestions were made to further break up massing through subtle adjustments to roof planes, colour, or material transitions rather than additional articulation.

Materiality and Colour

- Panel members had mixed views on the colour palette. While the industrial/marine-inspired theme was acknowledged as appropriate, concerns were raised about long-term maintenance, particularly lighter colours susceptible to moss growth.
- Several members suggested simplifying the façade by reducing banding and limiting the number of contrasting materials to improve clarity and legibility.
- The stairwell shafts were noted as strong visual features; however, their prominence raised questions about colour choice, glazing treatment, and potential opportunities for public art or lighting.

Stairwells and Glazing

- Concerns were raised regarding translucent stair glazing, particularly nighttime visibility and neighbourhood impacts when interior lights are on.
- Panel members encouraged careful consideration of glazing opacity, lighting levels, and energy performance to balance safety, privacy, and aesthetics.

Ground-Level Experience and Entrances

- The ground-level interface was generally viewed positively, particularly along the Munster Avenue where the building engages well with the streetscape.
- Some members questioned the need for extended pedestrian walkways around the building, suggesting opportunities to reduce hardscape and improve landscape integration, especially near amenity spaces.
- The main entrance location was considered clear and legible, with opportunities to enhance weather protection, seating, and lighting.

Amenity Spaces

- The primary indoor amenity adjacent to the lobby was supported and described as generous and functional.
- Concerns were raised about the secondary outdoor amenity space at the rear of the site, which some Panel members felt may function as a leftover space and be underutilized.
- Suggestions included reconfiguring circulation, reducing the extent of wrap-around walkways, and enhancing landscaping to improve usability and comfort.

Mechanical, Electrical, and Floodplain Considerations

- Several Panel members highlighted that locating mechanical and electrical rooms within the parkade in a floodplain context may present challenges.

- Based on similar projects, it was noted that life-safety and electrical code requirements may necessitate relocating certain services to grade, which could affect amenity space and parking layout.
- The Panel encouraged continued coordination with staff and consultants to resolve floodplain, servicing, and code-related issues.

Garbage, Servicing, and Parkade Layout

- The Panel expressed concerns regarding the functionality and size of the garbage room and staging areas, including maneuverability, bin placement, and potential conflicts with parking.
- Suggestions included adding protective elements such as bollards and reconsidering spatial efficiency.
- Accessible parking stalls were noted as being located far from elevators, with potential conflicts along ramps and circulation paths. Panel members encouraged further review to improve accessibility and safety.
- Additional comments included the need for secure parcel storage within the lobby, if feasible.

Safety and Crime Prevention

- Panel members emphasized the importance of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles, particularly for exit doors, underground parking access points, and secluded walkways.
- Recommendations included robust door hardware, appropriate lighting, clear sightlines, and secure treatment of bike rooms and exit doors.

Interior Layout and Unit Functionality

- Concerns were raised about overlapping door swings within units, which could create long-term maintenance issues in a rental building.
- Suggestions included reviewing door layouts, storage provision (e.g., linen closets), and overall functionality during detailed design.

Consensus

- The Panel agreed that the project demonstrates strong potential and is generally well received.
- Key areas for further refinement include façade simplification, stairwell treatment, accessibility and parkade layout, amenity usability, servicing and floodplain compliance, and long-term durability.
- Overall, the Panel was supportive of the proposal and encouraged the applicant team to incorporate the comments raised to strengthen the project as it advances.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner, requested the Panel's feedback on the proposed building typology, which is expressed as two distinct architectural forms connected by a central element with varying podium heights, and whether this approach represents an appropriate or emerging built form strategy.

The Panel generally supported the proposed approach and agreed that the building typology is acceptable. Members noted that variation in form, massing, and podium expression can encourage architectural creativity and is best evaluated on a case-by-case basis rather than through prescriptive rules. The expression of two connected forms with distinct character was considered appropriate, particularly in response to the site's multiple frontages and varied contextual conditions.

Panel members emphasized that the success of this approach relies on overall cohesion, including materiality, colour, and the design of the podium and ground-level interfaces with the public realm. While some subjective comments were noted regarding colour and articulation, these did not constitute fundamental concerns. Overall, the Panel concluded that the proposed typology is acceptable and supported continued refinement of the design rather than a complete redesign.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion.

MOVED by Mr. Tieg Martin, and SECONDED by Mr. Koosha Kheradmandnia:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and **recommends APPROVAL for the project SUBJECT to addressing to the satisfaction of staff** the items noted by the Panel in its review of the project

CARRIED

The motion was carried unanimously.

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

5. NEXT MEETING

February 12, 2026

Signed on behalf of Chair John Gilmour

 Chair



Jon Maselli (Staff Liaison)

February 12, 2026

 Date