

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

**Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel
Held via WebEx on Wednesday, January 20th, 2021**

MINUTES

- Present:** K. Humenny
N. Petrie
R. McGill
J. Ralph
M. Messer
S. Mitchell
M. Muljani
K. Ross
Councillor A. Girard
- Staff:** D. Johnson, Planner
M. Wray, Planner
J. Braithwaite, Development Technician
L. Karlberg, Planning Assistant
H. Dang, Planning Assistant
R. Fish, Committee Clerk
- Guests:** 309 Kennard Avenue (Development Permit Application)
Larry Podhora, Larry Podhora Architecture Inc.
David Batten, Krahn Engineering Ltd.
Maral Zolghadr, Larry Podhora Architecture Inc.
Dave Krahn, Larry Podhora Architecture Inc.
Landen Sperling, Larry Podhora Architecture Inc.
Jessica Thiessen, KD Planning & Design Ltd.
David Gilbert, AAA Storage
Alex Gwilt, AAA Storage
Rudy Loewen, AAA Storage
- Lonsdale Quay Market (Renovation Project)
Taylor Mathiesen, Quay Property Management
Ben Bosiak, Hotson Architecture
Kai Hotson, Hotson Architecture
Richard White
- 273-279 East 6th Street (Rezoning Application)
Hassan Moayeri, Hassan Moayeri Architect
Cherie Hongbing Chen, Viewise Landscape Design Inc.
Jalil Astanehe, Owner
- Absent:** K. Bracewell, RCMP
-

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:34 p.m.

1. Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held December 9th, 2020

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held December 9th, 2020 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

2. Business Arising

Staff thanked Panel members whose terms are ending.

3. Staff Update

Staff reviewed the status of ongoing development projects and the frequency of meetings.

4. 309 Kennard Avenue (Development Permit Application)

The City has received a revised development application submission, for 309 Kennard Avenue. When this application was reviewed by the Panel in October 2020, key concerns included the proposed height, land use planning, and surrounding context.

Staff asked the Panel for feedback on how well the applicant responded to the October 21st motion and if the changes introduce additional comments.

Larry Podhora, Larry Podhora Architecture Inc., reviewed the response to the resolution:

- Updated project design rationale with new direction.
- Trying to accommodate the goals of the client, environmental concerns, conditions of the site and land use, employment and intensity of the use.
- Accommodating the industry in the building.
- Reduced the height of the building.
- Building design is modulated and various materials to bring the apparent scale of the project down to be more sympathetic to the general height in the neighbourhood.
- Infrastructure to the south is heavy industry and highly developed.
- The hillside to the west is heavily buffered with topography and trees.
- The size of the building is camouflaged.
- The densities and heights do not do any harm to the natural environment nor the social environment and people passing by.
- Providing a big employment opportunity.
- Shadow casting was done in several milestone dates, especially in middle of winter.
- The majority of the trees are deciduous and are not impacted by mid-winter shadows.
- Addressed planning goals in terms of sustainability and cultural aspects of the project.

Jessica Thiessen, KD Planning and Design Ltd., reviewed the landscape plan:

- Provided additional planters with shrub and planting at the main level.
- Allowed more space for trees to bring the scale up.

- Using an extensive green roof at the top of the building.
- Addressed CPTED concerns with the north side not being accessible.
- The left side will be well lit and only accessible for the units.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Was there any consideration to utilize the roof as a gathering space? **A:** The sharp edge of the building looking west was seen as a common area. There is an opportunity to make the rooftop accessible. We also have a large balcony with a jutting roof which would be publicly accessible and a place for people to gather.
- Was there consideration to lower the height slightly more so the project would tie in with gradient of the hill? **A:** We have been sensitive to balance the need to be economically accountable with the density. The project won't have a visual impact over the trees. It is not an adverse addition to the neighbourhood.
- How will the movie studio access the first storey and elevators? **A:** The intention is to provide access to the two floors as shared access from the common core. We can accommodate a separate access on the south if needed.
- The drive aisle was reduced to accommodate stairwell to the east corner and seems to still have exiting issues, how has it been resolved? **A:** It has not been integrated into the diagram. We would have to make the stair address specific dimensions for the drive aisle below. We may have to dead end the parkade if necessary but don't think it will be.
- How many lockers would be on the fifth level? There will be a mix of sizes but based on a 5ft module. The specific mix depends on the demand of the market. It could range from 120 to 250. The layout has not been determined, need to work with owner on these details.
- There will be two storeys of studio, four for storage and then four more up top in Phase 2? **A:** Yes, we have dropped the height in an area with no height restriction.
- Could you provide more information on the retention or detention of water on the green roof? **A:** We will need a detention tank and the location is fencing into the west edge of the project.
- The lower level is the water detention area? **A:** Yes, we will be working with a civil engineer to sort out how invest the water.
- What will the first two levels of studio use be for? **A:** Production spaces with offices.
- How many vehicles do the production studios have on the property? **A:** It's not significant and is mainly accommodated in the studios. Parking will be adequate.
- Are you thermally breaking the concrete stairwells? **A:** We may rely on stairwells to be a feature on the exterior. The insulation is incorporated in the concrete wall or internal to the stair.
- To Staff: has the City looked at the overshadowing of the park and trail? **A:** Park staff haven't looked at it yet.
- Is it possible to get a street level view of the building? **A:** Yes.
- Can you speak to how the phasing of construction is being balanced with the massing? **A:** Instead of making a clear demarcation of phase line, we tried to make it make sense as a stand alone building in phase one then in phase two, treat it as an extension of each elevation element rather than an extension of the entire building.
- Why not carry the curtain wall over to the south west stair core, why include the grey volume in the middle at all? **A:** We think the composition is successful in balancing the transparency with opaque surfaces. The need for the curtain wall is to showcase what the use is and what is happening inside.

- Is this a fully or semi-conditioned space? **A:** Semi.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Concerned with the height of the building.
- Consider the opportunity for a green roof and outdoor amenity.
- Concerned with the stairwells, especially the south east one. Consider programming and use for the studio to get to and from the first and second floors.
- More concerned with how the issues will be resolved.
- Appreciate the movie studio and different uses.
- Height will be an issue especially for the area and impact on neighbourhood context.
- It is hard to imagine what the remainder of the area could be developed as to match the massing of this project.
- A street level view would have been helpful.
- Elevations are being determined on where staircases end up and they are based on a parking level that no longer seems to work. Level 1 is not resolved and you can't see where the circulation is in the storage levels.
- There has been a lack of development in the whole project.

Presenter's comments:

- Thank you for the comments.
- Financial feasibility is relevant to our client.
- The remainder of the floors will be built once the market is there, years down the road.
- People in the area had no concerns with height.
- We will be happy to address the views from street level.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Permit Application for 309 Kennard Avenue and thanks the applicant for the resubmission. The Panel feels that the following concerns have not been adequately resolved or explained and looks forward to further review at a future meeting:

- Ensure the height reflects a reasonable projection on what the local area industrial property development might look like;
- Include street level views in the presentation;
- Include a height context model to provide more information; and
- Provide a higher level of resolution into the planning of the property and how that carries into the elevations.

Carried Unanimously

5. Lonsdale Quay Market (Renovation Project)

Quay Property Management Corp. has advised CNV that they will be undertaking renovations to the existing Lonsdale Quay Market at 123 Carrie Cates Court. The renovation will include a minor increase in floor area with additions at the southeast corner of the building on levels 1 and 2, as well as at the public entrance near the northeast corner of the building. The proposed addition

would allow for a new tenant (restaurant) to occupy a 10,000 sq. ft. area at the southeast corner of the building.

Staff is seeking the Panel's input regarding the following:

- Architectural presentation
- Proposed colour scheme and lighting
- Canopy design at entrances and upper deck area
- Proposed CPTED and Sustainability Elements

Taylor Mathiesen, Quay Property Management, reviewed the response to the resolution:

- The challenge has been to work with the character of the building and strategically work within the frame of the context and character of the building with the goal of modernizing it and improving on the existing spaces.
- We are focusing on north entry area, south restaurant area and Q stair extension.
- We want to open up the entrance to create more public engagement with the street.
- We have removed the diagonal bracing and are proposing structural steel.
- With new tenants and the insertion of new canopy designs, we can augment exterior lighting.
- Covered spaces will be expanded on and brought out further from the building.
- Bringing the animation of interior uses out to the front of the building.
- We have mimicked the existing glazing system and improved upon it with operable portions, especially on the second floor.
- Bringing entrance doors out to the face of the building to help with wayfinding and improving on the entrance.
- Hoping to reinvent the public plaza space in the future.
- Operable garage style doors builds on this language of a flexible façade.
- Looking at exploring to modernize the building with a dark grey palette which will work with the existing structure of white painted concrete.
- To address CPTED, we have improved on the entry space of the building in terms of visibility, daylight and evening lighting. Expanding the second floor and ground floor covered spaces will improve on that as well.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Could you provide an explanation for the reduction of the nostalgic red? **A:** There was a lot of discussion, we were hoping to maintain subtle elements of red. There will be red site furniture and umbrellas.
- Can you connect the vertical steel with steel element across the top on the south side? **A:** Those vertical elements are already existing. Will have a look at this.
- Are you doing anything with concrete frontage to thermally break that from the elements? **A:** There is existing insulation in that space on the roof area. The interior design in that space is not in our scope currently but we will consider this.
- How do you plan to clean all glass canopies? **A:** This still needs to be considered.
- Will there be any landscape added to north entrance? **A:** There's a portion that needs to remain clear for fire vehicle access and there are existing trees on the east side of far lane but there could be an opportunity for something in planters. The client can engage a landscape architect.

- Have you considered extending the north canopy to cover more of the open area near the coffee shop? **A:** What we've proposed is to the same extent of what's already there but moving it up. The fire lane access is a restricting factor as well.
- The foot of the Q sign is a dense circulation area, are you confident it works to take the stairs down to the corner area? **A:** The plan is not to extend the boardwalk, there is enough clearance to walk through and is high enough to walk underneath.
- You are losing the overhangs on the south elevation, there is both direct sun and reflected south sun. How will you mitigate solar heat gain there? **A:** Shading could be great there to come down as needed and also solve introducing the horizontal element at the top. We will study this in greater detail.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Nice update to the building.
- Consider the iconic red and what it means to lose that aspect. Adding an accent of red in the building with a thin neon line around the circumference could add a modern yet retro touch.
- This will incorporate a lot more community and is conducive to the shipyards update.
- There should be more red included in the structure outside of accessory pieces.
- This is an important renovation and centerpiece for our community.
- Look at the horizontal element on the south façade.
- Thermally break the concrete.
- Object to the greys, people will miss the colour. Play with the colours and try to get some in that makes sense. Bring back a festive feeling to the building in a more modern way.
- The wayfinding is still confusing and not clear where the entrance is and the canopies leading to it.
- Signage is key and there isn't any.
- This seems like cautious architecture that is reductionist and has lost a level of the details the building formally had.
- There is an opportunity to be bolder and do something out of the box.
- The canopy over south entrance is less than it could have been.
- Like the addition of the glass canopies but they will require maintenance.
- Grey colour allows for more of the program to shine.
- There is an opportunity for the fabrics and sunshades to pick up the red.
- Ensure the building envelope is as good as it can be.

Presenter's comments:

- Thank you for the comments.

The Panel provided the following comments to go to building permit:

- The Panel is divided on the removal of the space frames and nostalgic red colour within the architecture;
- The project storefront system and envelope systems should be as energy efficient as possible;
- Ensure the canopies will be accessible for proper maintenance and cleaning;
- Important to ensure wayfinding around the project remains comfortable to use;

- Find ways to ensure the carnival spirit and red accent colours are preserved in some way;
- The outdoor seating at the south of the building is popular because it is covered, explore opportunities to extend another canopy here to replace the coverage;
- Add exterior shading on the south face to mitigate double solar exposure; and
- Consider utilizing the old Lonsdale Quay Market signs as markers for the main entrances.

6. 273-279 East 6th Street (Rezoning Application)

The City has received a rezoning application for a ten unit townhouse with nine accessory lock-off units on two lots at the south west corner of East 6th Street and St. Andrews Avenue two blocks east of Lonsdale Avenue. The proposal includes one level of underground parking below the residential units. The applicant is proposing to use the RG-3 Zone to accommodate the proposed design.

Staff is seeking the Panel's input regarding the following:

- The access to the proposed lock-off units along the north row of units, specifically the stairwell location along the street front;
- The street front design along St. Andrews Avenue;
- The location of the PMT at the corner of the site;
- The inclusion of CPTED principles in the design;
- Distinctiveness of the design and the buildings' contribution to the urban realm;
- Quality of the material choice as well as the application;
- Weather protection and solar shading and how that protection integrates with the overall design;
- Effectiveness and location of the buffer between the street and the property;
- Attractiveness of proposed vegetation, planting plan, ground materials; and
- Accessibility.

Hassan Moayeri, Hassan Moayeri Architect, described the project to the Panel:

- Project consists of 10 townhomes, each three levels.
- Each unit has its own courtyard.
- The second level has rooftop balconies and patios.
- Materials are simple yet modern including cedar siding with warm and dark brown colours.
- The windows are black and mesh into the design.
- Tried to make this project as green as possible and give life to the building.

Cherie Hongbing Chen, Viewwise Landscape Design Inc., reviewed the landscape plan:

- There are two trees on the site with a larger one in the middle which need to be removed.
- The Red Maple will be retained.
- There is not a lot of room to play around with landscaping.
- Creating private screens to separate the view from different units.
- Most of the planters are only two feet wide.
- At the first level, the landscaping in the middle is on top of the garage.

- Looking at how to translate different grading from Building F to Building G.
- We want to create an attractive amenity area and keep the soil depths.
- Created two nodes, one in front of the entrance with furniture and combined tree design, with a small space at the other end.
- There will be planters and vegetable gardens on the roof deck.
- The front patio between the sidewalk and building has a bridge connecting to the main entrance. The planting area is under the bridge and is very shady. We will be using native plants in this area.
- This will give the space more vibrancy.
- There is a four foot hedge along the property.
- Planted small plants in front of the hedge to provide more layers.
- The buildings north patio is lower and shady so we used two native trees and a flowering dogwood.
- The basement level lighting focuses on the function.
- The first floor level emphasizes the tree and entrances with highlighting and landscape lighting to create an atmosphere for gathering.
- Planters are 3x3x3 for the trees and the roof vegetable garden planters are 2ft tall.
- Interlocking pavers.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- How big are the units and lock-off suites? **A:** 500 sq. ft. for townhomes that are one bedroom, the other units are about 2000 sq. ft.
- Are the lock-off units slightly below grade? **A:** About 7-8ft below grade.
- Can you explain the stairwell that comes off of St. Andrews? **A:** One stairwell goes to the central patio, there's another exit from the parking on the right side of the central courtyard which is an emergency exit.
- Is there a reason why you weren't able to incorporate more greenery along St. Andrews? **A:** We can plant more around it, we just didn't want to hide the building behind the trees. Each side is considered a frontage, we want to show it off.
- The gate for the garage is recessed far back, has anyone reviewed CPTED? **A:** It is pretty wide in the parking, both sides of the ramp are open. It is possible to move the door closer.
- At the north-west corner of the property there is a set of stairs that lead to a mechanical room, how are you going to secure that so you don't have unwanted visitors? **A:** We have designed this building to be as open as possible. We didn't want to build a fortress. We will come up with a design to lock some of the corners which might give access to strangers and prevent them from hiding there.
- How will you be addressing and providing wayfinding? **A:** This has not been considered yet.
- Is this the best location for the PMT? **A:** It is not the best from a design point of view but this is the location which was recommended by BC Hydro.
- Is the roof overtop of the stairwell going to the parkade? **A:** Yes.
- Has the root system for the Maple tree been reviewed by arborist on whether the PMT will work there? **A:** There will be a cement path underneath the PMT so it won't impact the Maple tree.
- The roof deck planters are only 2ft high, where is the railing in relation to the planter? **A:** The planters are behind the railing and are 18 inches higher than the planters. There will be plenty of room for maintenance.

- Will there be issues reaching the planters? **A:** There shouldn't be an issue reaching them.
- Are you allowed to plant a hedge on City property on St. Andrews and East 6th? **A:** This has not been discussed with the City yet.
- Staff: the Engineering Department will review the proposal for the hedge on the property and will advise if it's acceptable or not.
- Are you confident that parking Bylaws wouldn't fine for a 2000 sq. ft. unit needing more than one parking stall? **A:** The requirement is one parking stall per unit.
- Are the courtyard planting and pavers over the wood structure? **A:** It is over the concrete structure.
- There are not a lot of overhangs on the project, is it panelized? **A:** Yes.
- Are you using any anti mildew agent? **A:** Yes, it will be highly resistant.
- Are you looking at 2m plus 42 inches of wall screening for the PMT unit? **A:** Yes. What do you intend to do to get light and air into the lower unit? **A:** We have used the entrance from St. Andrews instead of East 6th, have made a small patio at the St. Andrews side which brings additional light in and a small patio on the East 6th side.
- What is the guardrail detail? **A:** Glass.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- The landscaping has nice touches, the key will be in how well it's maintained in its integrity.
- The buffer to the sidewalk and sunken patios might not work well. It is severe in terms of liveability.
- There will be issues with the PMT and the protection and retention of the tree.
- Have an arborist consult on saving the Maple tree and providing space for the PMT.
- The rooftop deck planters should be designed as a finished, workable and safe planting area.
- If there are vegetable gardens, they should be accessible and should be resolved. Make sure the patio and deck space accommodates a safe handrail.
- The livability of the units on the north is questionable and are buried into the ground.
- Material is really nice, strong merits about this project.
- The wall thicknesses aren't sufficient and when you add inches, they suddenly don't quite work.
- The PMT is the projects biggest problem and will be in the root zone of the tree.
- The lock off unit is extremely compromised by it.
- There is room for a gate where the mechanical room is.
- Parking should be a little bit more generous.
- There are wayfinding and overlook issues.
- The project doesn't fit the neighbourhood, no other buildings look like it.
- Too much is being crammed into the project.
- Would like to see more in terms of the detailing of the project.

Presenter's comments:

- Thank you for the comments.
- We are not certain we will need the PMT.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 273-279 East 6th Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Improve the livability of the lock-off units;
- Further design development of the accessibility of the lock-off units and their interface with St. Andrews Avenue;
- Ensure the feasibility of the location of the PMT and the guard condition in relation to the Maple tree;
- Improve on the detail and design safety of the roof level deck and planter concept;
- Include more detail within the documents to address what is concrete and what is wood, in terms of the assemblies that make up the roof deck and general building assembly; and
- Further design development of the garage gate's depth and location to address CPTED concerns.

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

Carried Unanimously

7. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:08 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, February 17th, 2021.

Chair