

Date: February 11, 2016 Page: 2
To: Design Review Committee
From: Chris Bishop, Manager of Development Planning and Lisa Berg, Senior Community Planner
Re: **RE-SUBMISSION - Sewell's Marina Redevelopment**

9. Enlarged building entries.
10. Vehicle turn-around reconfigured.
11. Further development of the colour and material palette.
12. Discussion on architectural vocabulary.
13. Full review of vehicle movement (Bunt Engineering).
14. Landscape drawings examine pedestrian and vehicles in the urban realm.
15. Discussion on diversity of residential units proposed.

The applicant has provided a broader discussion on each of these points in the revised proposal booklet (pages 144 to 148) including responses to comments by the North Shore Advisory Committee on Disability Issues (ACDI).

Since the last DRC meeting where the proposal was considered, the applicant has worked with staff and agreed to increase the Flood Construction Level from 3.8 metres to 4.5 metres, and the revised proposal reflects this change.

Specific Items to Address:

1. How well has the applicant responded to the recommendations of the DRC?
2. Has the proposal sufficiently addressed the staff-suggested items to be considered as set out in the memo to the Committee dated September 9, 2015?

Appendices:

- A. Suggested items for consideration from the September 9, 2015 meeting.
- B. Revised Development Proposal Booklet, February 18, 2016 edition.

APPENDIX A

Items for DRC Consideration, September 2015

1. General appropriateness and fit – is the concept potentially compatible with the attitude, spirit, and established character of Horseshoe Bay?
2. Site planning, the arrangement of building masses, the amount of proposed floor area, responsiveness to natural and urban context, site grading, and the extent to which the proposal works with the land.
3. The pedestrian experience on the site including circulation and shared spaces with vehicular traffic, landscape design, preliminary information on materials and plant species, and the quality and purpose of the public realm.
4. Adjacencies, impacts on neighbouring residents and property owners (such as BC Housing's Libby Lodge and the neighbouring undeveloped single residential lot), and potential for improvements to the park interface and waterfront path, etc.
5. General architectural design, style, and use of materials (recognizing that the submission is at the conceptual level and does not yet include full architectural expression or details).
6. The residential experience on site – privacy, views, access, etc.
7. The commercial experience on site – location, size, activity, types of uses, etc.
8. Potential for public art in and around the site and what form that could take (integrated into architecture, standalone sculptural pieces, lighting installations?).
9. What the members would like to see for the next, detailed appearance before the Design Review Committee in order to be able to provide a fulsome review of the proposal – detailed elevations for each building, etc? Please discuss.

1083880v1