

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, March 21st, 2018**

MINUTES

- Present:** W. Chong
K. Yushmanova
B. Phillips
J-P. Mahé
M. Messer
B. Jones
B. Harrison
- Staff:** D. Johnson, Development Planner
S. Galloway, Manager of Planning
K. Dixel, Development Technician
R. Fish, Committee Clerk
- Guests:** 1600 Eastern Avenue (Rezoning Application)
Riaan Debeer, Anthem Properties
Nick Kasidoulis, Anthem Properties
Ryan Vanderham, Anthem Properties
Colin Shrubb, DYS Architecture
Jia Liu, DYS Architecture
Norm Chin, DYS Architecture
David Stoyko, Connect Landscape Architecture
Eason Li, Connect Landscape Architecture
Madeline Pearson, E3 Eco Group Inc.
- 125-145 East 13th Street (Rezoning Application)
Richard Bernstein, Chris Dikeakos Architects Inc.
Soheil Khosravi Kermani, Chris Dikeakos Architects Inc.
Peter Malek, Millennium Northmount Properties Ltd.
Adam Nour, Millennium Northmount Properties Ltd.
Hazel Jambor, Millennium Northmount Properties Ltd.
Stephen Vincent, Durante Kreuk Ltd.
- Absent:** K. Bracewell, RCMP

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m.

1. Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held February 21st, 2018

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held February 21st, 2018 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

2. Business Arising

None.

3. Staff Update

D. Johnson reviewed the status of ongoing development projects.

4. 1600 Eastern Avenue (Rezoning Application)

This application involves a request for 1.0 FSR density bonus and a rezoning to permit an apartment building at 1600 Eastern Avenue with the Central Lonsdale Core. The proposal is for a 225 mixed unit building consisting of a 13 storey form.

The details of the application are:

1. Density bonus to go from 2.3 FSR to 3.3 FSR
2. Rezoning to amend the current CD-403 and RM-1 zone to permit a 13 storey apartment building with 3.3 FSR. As shown in the attached architectural drawings.
3. Creation of and open space at the southern end of the property.

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

- Contextual fit of the proposed buildings within the local area, including how this building transitions between the Lonsdale Central Core and the surrounding low to mid-rise neighbourhoods;
- The orientation and interface of the building to the public streets and laneway;
- The interface of the building with the proposed open space to the south;
- The bulk and scale of the building;
- The composition of the proposed materials.

Rainn Debeer, Anthem Properties and Colin Shrubbs, DYS Architecture, described the project to the Panel:

- Clean and contemporary lines.
- Efficient building form.
- Target market is young professionals, families, retirees and downsizers.
- Currently 5, three-storey rental buildings on the site, low-rise residential.
- Close proximity to library, hospital and future Harry Jerome Centre.
- New dedicated park on the southern side of the park covering 40% of the entire site.
- The building is a north-south orientation.
- Building entrance is located at the north end of the site.
- Parking access is from the south end of the site off of the lane.
- Two car share parking spaces and two visitor parking spaces on the lane.

- 225 units, 174 more than the existing units.
- Mix of unit types.
- Complies with the 10/10/10 policy.
- 3000 sq. ft. amenity space on levels 1, 2 and on the roof with outdoor amenity space.
- 124 residential parking stalls, 24 visitor stalls.
- 339 bike spaces.
- Amenity roof space includes a covered trellis with outdoor seating and barbecue area for socializing.
- Grade level units are the larger family units.
- 2.5 levels of underground parking and a bike wash and repair area, garbage and recycling area is centrally located.
- Ground floor includes a health and fitness room.
- Level 2 includes a small meeting space.
- Clean, simple, modern finishes.
- Close to transportation.

David Stoyko, Connect Landscape Architecture, reviewed the landscape plan:

- Fits with the building and accentuates and expresses forms of the building.
- Emphasis on the connection with the community.
- We shaped things to respond to the building.
- Importance on the connection to the park as well.
- Clear sightlines through corners.
- Great views on the roof, trying to create interesting patterns with covered and open spaces.
- Concrete terraced planters, benches, patio slab paving.
- Plant materials fit in with the natural environment, native and naturalized plant selection with a modernized look with easy maintenance.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Park space is crucial, are you beginning to discuss this with the city? **A:** Yes, we are starting to see what they want to see from the park. We have made a concept graphically. We want to see what the public wants and get options from there.
- How was the south façade going to address the south park? What is the relationship? **A:** There's no direct access to the park from the south. That was a request from the park department. They want it to be seen as a public park.
- Is there an elevation change? **A:** No.
- Can you describe the design rationale at grade? **A:** Private patios at grade with low level landscaping at the front, slight grade change from street to patios.
- Is there an elevation change from the sidewalk to the entry? **A:** Yes, a very small change. Mostly it is pretty flush with grade stepping out.
- Was there a lighting scheme proposed? **A:** A lot is based on the streetscape lighting done by the city, we don't want to overwhelm with lighting.
- To staff: what is the treatment tree planting along 17th? **A:** It ties into the Lonsdale corridor design guidelines, for Eastern Ave and 17th we are taking the patterns from that, continuing from Lonsdale through to the lane. There's a slightly raised curve around the trees.
- Any rain gardens? **A:** It will be tight on this project.
- Any concerns with the lower parking count? **A:** Staff: there have been neighbourhood concerns. The proposed parking count is valid given the close proximity to the city centre. We have a good rationale to justify it.

- Are you doing anything to deal with the thermal performance? **A:** We're about 45%. The middle of the building doesn't have balconies, so we have insulated slabs for about 50% of the building. No thermal bridging at this point.
- How is storm water dealt with? **A:** There's a high percentage of planted areas, so no lawn. There is a tank that will let water out slowly.
- Can you consider getting natural light into the building by having the staircase on the outer edge? **A:** We had issues getting shear walls so they had to be moved in.
- Any programs for e-bike or e-car facilities? **A:** 25% of stalls should be pre-wired. This allows for future load sharing. As for e-bikes, we will provide outlets for that.
- To staff: Is there a public art component? **A:** It's voluntary but encouraged.
- Is there a budget or component for public art? **A:** Yes, but we haven't landed on what it is. The park is an opportunity for this.
- What percentage of units have storage? **A:** First come first serve basis. 135 storage units, 65% provision.
- Is there laundry in the units? **A:** Yes.
- What percent of units get balconies? **A:** Probably 45-50%.
- How big is the outdoor space on the roof? **A:** Not quite half.
- That's not a very big space for all the units, can it be enlarged? **A:** We spoke to some of our property managers to get a program based on this project and based on that, this size was developed.
- Did they see any need for any child areas outdoors? **A:** No, since there's a park next door.
- To staff: who owns the park land? **A:** Parks has resources allocated for other parks in the area. The program piece is being worked out between anthem and our parks department on a conceptual basis. There will be a public process to deal with the overall design.
- Is the density based on the entire site? **A:** Yes, we pushed all the density to one side.
- Can you describe the setbacks east and west? Are you right at the setback? **A:** No.
- Is there an opportunity to break the 'slab' feel of the building, widen the building to setbacks, something to break up the mass? **A:** We would have less of the outdoor open space that we have for the family units. Our goal was to create generous patios. We would lose quality of the interior space by doing that.
- Is there an opportunity for how the building addresses the future park, with having the amenity room on the other side so it could look out onto and possibly access the park? **A:** That's a great idea. The issue of access is the problem. Overlooking visual connection is great.
- In your sustainability strategy, how will the HRV work? **A:** In each individual unit. Makes it healthier and more livable unit for residents.
- Explain how your precedent images informed your design? **A:** In the center of the building with the charcoal and the green was taken from the artist painting.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Extend south east corner units balcony, consider a family unit with a bigger balcony.
- Push the amenities on level 2 up top and make them bigger.
- Explore the south east corner and wrapping the balcony around.
- If the park is not done when the project is done, hydra seed the land so there's grass.
- I like the precedent images but don't see that colour and don't see it coming into the building design. Would like to see more colours.
- Roof deck could have more green as well.
- Missed opportunity to have more units facing the park with balconies facing the park.
- Have some visual storm water management somewhere that reads to the public.
- Look at integration of the public park to the building.

- Have amenity space at the end with the park.
- Look at the multi-programmable space there, outdoor play, urban agriculture and engage the community in that public open space and include public art.
- Have one stairwell get natural light into the building. That will encourage people to use it.
- Not enough storage units or lockers, reduce the carpark and increase storage.
- Increase the e-car and e-bike plugs, have them so people can actually use them.
- Expression of storm water someway into the park.
- Brad – public art, integrate it into the actual façade or building itself. Tree theme and colours could be expanded and involve an artist to accentuate this.
- There's a lot of bike storage parking spots. Some of that could be switched for unit storage.
- Do more to insulate the building, maybe at the balconies.
- Visual interface with the park and more balconies.
- Great treatment of the corner at the entry.
- Rooftop could be greener, don't have to be heavy concrete planters, soften the landscape with planting.
- Opportunity to provide small space for kids to go would be beneficial.
- Suggest incorporating more pollinative plants and work harder on vents, not square vents on the landscape.
- It would be helpful to give some idea of what the public park could be to provide synergy. The stair could face the park to create that synergy.
- Architect brought the building right down to grade, this could be articulated a lot better. The panels come straight down and seems a bit harsh. Building could be lifted or approached a bit differently at grade.
- Public art can be incorporated through the entire building.
- Lighting could be more thoughtful and strategic and incorporated with the park.
- Stronger stance on minimizing the charcoal and dark. Glazing could have the lime green elements. Seems kind of busy, keep it pure. Would give the mass some presence to the street.
- Use of precedents are a bit timid.
- The south façade can be expressed more.

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 1600 Eastern Avenue and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Further expression of the south façade while exploring the possibility of wrapping the south east corner balconies around to face the park;
- Consider the integration of the public park to the building;
- Proponent is encouraged to conceptualize the park design;
- Explore opportunities for the public park as a multi-programmable space for outdoor play, urban agriculture and community engagement as well as public art;
- Consider the inclusion of a public art component to be incorporated throughout the building façade;
- Expression of storm water management facilities to be visible to the public from the park;

- Examine the opportunity to move a stairwell to the exterior wall of the building and ensure the stairwell has glass walls to bring natural light in;
- Consider the addition of urban agriculture on the rooftop and at grade;
- Further design development and articulation of the building at grade;
- Consider the opportunity to provide a small space on the rooftop deck as a children's play area;
- Further design development of the rooftop deck to soften the landscaping with planting and greenery;
- Consider incorporating more pollinator plants to the plant list;
- Consider the shape of the parkade vents on the landscape;
- Further incorporation of colours and expressions from the precedent images presented;
- Ensure additional e-car and e-bike charging stations are provided;
- Consider the addition of more unit storage in place of bike storage and parking stalls; and
- Further development of a more thoughtful lighting scheme that can be incorporated with the landscaping.

AND THAT the Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

Carried Unanimously

5. 125-145 East 13th Street (OCP Amendment and Rezoning Application)

This application involves an Official Community Plan (OCP) and zoning amendment application and proposed density transfer for 125 and 145 East 13th Street. This proposal would result in a 162 unit mixed-use development in an 18 storey form.

The details of the application are:

1. OCP amendment to increase the height (increase from 46m to 57m);
2. Zoning By-law amendment to permit an FSR of 4.95;
3. Zoning Amendment for the donor site of the potential density transfer.

The application proposes an 18 storey residential tower towards the eastern extent of the site, and a 7 storey mid-rise component extending westward. Two storeys of the podium would contain commercial uses.

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

- Contextual fit of the proposed buildings within the local area, including how this building transitions between the Lonsdale Central Core and the surrounding low to mid-rise neighbourhoods;
- The orientation and interface of the building to the public streets and laneway;
- The bulk and scale of the building, including views from surrounding sites;
- The composition of the proposed materials.

Richard Bernsetien, Chris Dikeakos Architects Inc., described the project to the Panel:

- 41 of 162 units are adaptable, 25%.
- Parking on 3 levels with 279 spaces.
- Stepping the form to maximize view corridors.

- Allowing maximum view cones from each tower, through and across the podium which is at 6 storeys.
- Tower and podium have large groups of amenities, large pool, community gardens, outdoor areas and children's play areas.
- Townhouses along the lane have their own parking areas that are gate controlled and separated.
- Two loading areas off of the lane to access the retail units.
- Eight townhouses that address the lane with patios.
- A breezeway through the center of the scheme with an intention for a cross walkway to the development to the north.
- Townhouses are 1500 sq. ft.
- Two main office levels connected by a bridge across the breezeway.
- Large terraces for lower level units.
- Offices will be largely medical services.
- A lot of adaptable units in the podium.
- Tower steps in to the south on both sides.
- Units range from 1 bedroom to 3 bedroom + den.
- Each step creates large terraces for the units.
- 10 ft. grade difference from west to east.
- Retail space will be from 13 ft. to 20 ft. high to the west side of the project.
- High quality materials, limestone, salt finish and simulated wood product.
- Glass canopies along 13th.

Stephen Vincent, Durante Kreuk Ltd., reviewed the landscape plan:

- Rain gardens, trees that continue from Blue Shore Financial.
- Bike racks will be included in the covered breezeway space.
- The breezeway will have high quality materials that will be brought into the landscape.
- LED strip with frosted glass in the breezeway.
- Animated space and supporting the uses of the CRUs.
- Planting is a challenge under cover so we will consider a water element.
- Evergreen, terraced planting.
- Multi-stem trees for garden character.
- Screening will be used for privacy reasons.
- Subtle lighting for wayfinding.
- Banding of landscape around the perimeter.
- Outdoor amenity space will have seating and lounge areas that are built into the landscape.
- Composting areas and tool storage, outdoor kitchen spaces and natural seating.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Will there be windows on the amenity on the east side of breezeway? **A:** Yes.
- Is there an opportunity to move the kids play area where the interior amenity is on the roof? **A:** Yes.
- How will someone access the greenspaces for maintenance? **A:** There would have to be access form the outside. We would have plants that require maximum heights of 1m that would require very limited access and anticipate using lifts.
- The planters look narrow? **A:** They would be small trees but they are connected together so we would double up on the soil volumes.

- On the lane can you enlarge planters for tree space? **A:** Yes, we could increase the outside wall to make one large planter with trailing vines to soften the edge.
- To staff: Where are the power lines in the lane going? **A:** The fire department raised that issue as well and they would like to get them underground. They service both properties which could create issues.
- Can you describe the water feature underneath? **A:** It's a raised element, 24 inches off the ground, the water source travels along a rough surface and recirculates. Not a large feature.
- Could people use the edge as a bench? **A:** Yes.
- To staff: **A:** Can you talk to the 1.0 FSR density bonus and height rationale of the extra 11m? **A:** As for the density bonus, because they are providing a community amenity, the money can be put towards a childcare park space. In terms of height, the development across is 180ft., we looked at a number of options with a number of forms. The rationale for going skinnier and taller is to open up the view corridors from adjacent buildings rather than to have a big street wall formed.
- The terraces at the podium level are large, will there be programming to break it up? **A:** It comes down to maintenance, figuring out where to put the railing maybe on the outside.
- Can you talk to the solar heat gain on the tower? **A:** We are meeting ASHRAE energy standards. Shading coefficient will be strong to control it. High performance glass. Have roller blinds to address the sun exposure. Did not want to minimize the windows due to the views.
- Any possibility to have natural light into the tower stair? **A:** Not likely, it's a scissor stair.
- Any consideration for e-car and e-bike plugin stations? **A:** Yes.
- Is there any public art component? **A:** Yes, we are looking at this. Nothing has been determined yet. The breezeway is the logical place for this to happen.
- What is the program for the level 2 amenity space? **A:** Not sure yet but it will be shared between the commercial and residential space.
- What is the materiality in the breezeway stair wall? **A:** Glazing.
- The balconies in the podium, the jagged form, can you speak to the rationale? **A:** Wanted to differentiate the podium from the tower to make it more interesting.
- How many plots of urban agriculture? **A:** 16-20 of them, they can be partitioned.
- What is the rationale for the thin tall part of the building at the top? **A:** A strong vertical element to contrast with the rest of the building.
- Will it be painted? **A:** Painted concrete.
- How deep are the south elevation fins on the office? **A:** 24 inches.
- What is the thought for the transition between the podium and tower? **A:** We want to make it seamless.
- Can there be an architectural distinction to differentiate materials between the two walls? **A:** Yes.
- Where is the darker stone? **A:** On the north side.
- Along 13th, where did the 3ft setback from building come from? **A:** This was discussed with City planning.
- Is there a concern with the streetscape and the height of the trees? **A:** They don't go very wide. The canopies could go to 6ft.
- How do the gaps between the project and BlueShore work together? **A:** It's not a lane, it's a pedestrian way. It's animated by turning the glass of the CRU closer to the BlueShore building. There's a 3ft grade change with planting.
- To staff: will that be a pedestrian way? **A:** It's currently a lane that's been transformed to a pedestrian way.
- After business hours with the breezeway, what happens in that space in relation to CPTED issues? **A:** The space is very open with a light strip that will remain on all night.

From each side, a police officer would be able to cruise by and look directly in. It will be well lit. There will be ambient lighting from the lobbies.

- Is there an opportunity to have glazing from the stairwell at the rear of the townhouse unit near the breezeway? **A:** Yes.
- On drawing A2.05 there's an opening at the 2nd level, is there an opportunity for glazing from that amenity space? Likely there will be residents in the amenity that will be able to look out? **A:** Yes, we can look at that.
- To staff: what's the future of the fire hall site? **A:** At this point there's no direction to move the fire hall. We discussed that this development does not preclude future development on the fire hall site.
- If there was a development there, there would be 80ft between the towers.
- Have you thought about noise issues for the townhouse units beside the delivery bays? **A:** It's a concern that we should address.
- Would you consider a daycare? **A:** Yes.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- South lane is great and well animated.
- Like the breezeway concept, the height is right and materials are high quality.
- Do more with the vertical fin.
- Create a subspace for owners to create their own gardens.
- Form and character, organization and development is supportable.
- A lot of interface of vertical and horizontal details that need to be thought out.
- Need more setback on 13th.
- Further design development of the expression of the breezeway on the upper part of the joint between the two buildings to give more pronounced definition to the two forms.
- Like how the tower tapers and is respectful of views.
- Some balconies on the podium are big spaces that need more thought to the treatment of the landscaping.
- Would like to see the vertical element be tall wood.
- The architecture needs another round of rigorous design, a few too many different moves that need to be polished. Tie it all together so there's not too much going on
- Pay attention to the canopy size of the trees and continuous sidewalk grid.
- Landscape still needs a lot of work.
- Architecture is bold and fresh and the landscape needs to join it.
- Move away from the approach of band of green with planters in between, circulation on the outside in the upper terraces.
- Level 2 can have a door for maintenance to come out.
- Larger islands of planting, there are big volumes for trees.
- The landscape needs to step up to respond to the architecture.
- Upper terrace needs to have less programming squeezed onto the deck. Not enough urban agriculture plots. Pool deck could become a bit more generous for lounges with space to be with planters and trees.
- Consider a nicer outdoor kitchen area with seating.
- Further develop the roof deck.
- Like to see more details of refined materials being interfaced together.
- Breezeway is a little narrow, there should be more activation, public art component could be in there and how you associate the breezeway with the art. Incorporate it as a whole.
- For the office glazing to the south, the depth of horizontal member could be deeper and could help the mechanical situation which will give depth to south elevation. It will have a translation towards the tower and hide the detail to the curtain wall.
- A daycare component would be a great addition.

- Tie in the lane at BlueShore (13th street mews) complementary to what the BlueShore has and unify it.
- The townhomes have to be extremely well done on the lane, it's a busy working lane. Not sure what will be developed in front of them. Take this into consideration when developing the townhomes.
- Consider acoustics the townhomes beside the loading bays.
- More eyes, activity and light in the breezeway, keep in mind as to how to design this space.
- Work with the City to underground the power lines in the lane.

Presenter's comments:

Thank you for all the comments.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the OCP Amendment and Rezoning Application for 125-145 East 13th Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Explore further expression and detailing of the breezeway to increase activation and incorporate CPTED strategies;
- Explore opportunities to glaze walls of the residential amenity space that will provide overlook into the breezeway;
- Further design development to the expression of the breezeway on the upper levels between the two buildings to give a more pronounced definition to the two forms (the podium and the tower);
- Consider the Blue Shore pedestrian area expression to complement this development;
- Review opportunities for treatment of the vertical fin at the top of the tower;
- Consider the relationship of the townhouses to the lane and the possibility of future developments to the south;
- Further development of the overall expression and character of the outdoor amenity deck;
- Encourage access to landscaping on roof decks for maintenance purposes;
- Further expression of the landscape design throughout the project. Architecture is bold, landscaping should be as well;
- Consider programming the roof top terraces to accommodate outdoor living and maintenance;
- Further design development of the podium balconies as it relates to the treatment of the landscaping;
- Consider the buildings' canopies and their potential impact on future street trees;
- Reconsider the approach to bands of green with planters and the circulation on the outside in the upper terraces;
- Consider more of a setback on 13th Street to accommodate street trees and to provide pedestrian circulation as the Blue Shore development has a greater setback;
- Supply and detail e-bike and e-car plug-ins;
- Explore and further develop the potential for a public art component;
- Explore the passive design elements to minimize solar gain on the south and west facades in conjunction with the mechanical systems and glass performance;
- Consider the possibility of adding a daycare use to the development;
- Consider options for noise mitigation with respect to the two townhomes located beside the loading bays;

- Reconsider the amount of programmable areas on the amenity deck;
- Consider the inclusion of a green roof over the amenity/fitness facility;
- Careful attention to the interfaces of uses and materials is required, e.g. curtain wall to window wall;
- Investigate options to place the power lines underground in the laneway; and
- Flip the kids play area on the amenity level so that it has more exposure to the enclosed residential fitness facility.

AND THAT the Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

**Carried
2 opposed
5 in favour**

8. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:34 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, April 18th, 2018.

Chair

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "J. P. Mahé", is written over a horizontal line. The signature is written in black ink and is positioned to the right of the word "Chair".