

**Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel
Held via WebEx on Wednesday, July 7th, 2021**

MINUTES

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Present: | N. Petrie S. Mitchell K. Ross M. Rahbar M. Messer M. Tashakor |
| Staff: | D. Johnson, Planner R. Fish, Committee Clerk M. Friesen, Planner Y. Zeng, Manager, Planning & Development |
| Guests: | None |
| Absent: | K. Bracewell, RCMP Councillor A. Girard D. Burns K. Blomkamp M. Muljiani |

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:33 p.m.

1. Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held June 16th, 2021

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held June 16th, 2021 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

2. North Shore Neighbourhood House

The Manager, Planning & Development presented on the North Shore Neighbourhood House. The main points included:

- Surrounding neighbourhood offers abundance of amenities, local businesses, parks and access to Lonsdale Avenue.
- Adult day and overnight respite program.
- Up to 260 below market residential units.

- Community park
- Child, youth and senior programs
- Four non-profit organizations: Catalyst, Health & Home Care Society of BC, North Shore Neighbourhood House and Hollyburn Family Services Society
- Project Statistics
 - Southwest Building – 18 storeys, community services, 180 below market rental units
 - Northwest building – 6 storeys, Care BC, 89 below market rental units
 - Derek Inman Park – no net loss of dedicated park space, community engagement to support design of new park
- Site requires OCP amendment from ‘School and Institutional and ‘Park, Recreation’ to ‘Mixed Use Level 4A’
- Site Development Principals
 - Contributing to the neighbourhood
 - A distinct identity for the emerging community hub
 - Equitable, inclusive and sustainable design
- Project Phasing Details
 - Phase 1 – respite care and rentals (northwest building)
 - Phase 2 – new NSNH facility and rentals (southwest building)
 - Phase 3 – programming of Derek Inman Park and decommissioning of existing NSNH facility
- Spring 2021 completed engagement
- Fall 2021 - present rezoning to Council in September
- Public hearing in October
- Construction could begin in 2022 for first phase

Questions and Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- What has been discussed so far in terms of passive design? **A:** It is unlikely we would require Passive House for the residential components. We are looking at Step 3 of the Step Code. For NSNH it could go to Passive House or to zero carbon design.
- How will you integrate the park and public realm into the rest of the space to make it feel like one site? **A:** It is a challenging site due to the grade. We have taken a significant right-of-way on the eastern portion of the site to create a pathway and platforms to address the grades and integrate the green elements of the building design with the park space. Design conditions have been provided.
- Consider more animation of the building faces on St. Georges at the ground level with more active design features, functions or uses.
- It seems like a flat street when in reality it’s a steep slope, not sure what kind of uses will occur on that street. **A:** The ground floor at 2nd Street is the senior respite care which occupies the whole floor. Because of the grade changes along St. Georges north to south, this is where you encounter the residential entrance to the housing above. We can look at animation along the street.
- Consider something that is functional or an activity where people can interact with the building.
- Is there an interior connection to the park, would that mean going through the building to get there and is it public? **A:** Yes, it would be accessible during the hours that NSNH is operational.
- Consider more public art and interactive public art.

- Include the Squamish nation in the program for the community to interact with them in the public buildings.
- Is there a plan for the existing items on the site? **A:** The tennis court is not impacted. The City and public would explore what uses would be fitting for the park. We haven't been to HAC yet to discuss the heritage building. It can't be retained in its current location, so are exploring relocation. We are working with community gardens to find new approximate locations. The 16 trees on site have been taken into account in the design. The edge trees may be able to be retained.
- What is the design concept to achieve the relationship between the respite program and daycare? **A:** We don't have that at the time but want to explore ways to create outdoor spaces for both groups and find connections that way on the rooftop.
- What activities will take place in the buffer between the building and the park? **A:** The platform podium on the south building is the requirement for child care, the north outdoor space for the care facility provides accessible but secured garden plots. Between the buildings is an opportunity for a residential amenity space. We will find ways to integrate those forms with the park and soften the edge of the building.
- Does the tower have to be there? **A:** No, it could be on the north side but it may have some impact on the partner's ability to deliver. It's located on south side due to a timing element and to mitigate the height. The shadow study showed a low impact.
- A lot of the area will be in the darkness in the winter. Could you orient the outdoor spaces to get more light? **A:** The park would be free from shade most of the day.
- Was there any thought to develop the north portion of both sites on 2nd Street and leave the park for the south? **A:** It's a matter of project delivery and timing. We would need to deliver NSNH in first phase and there are restraints with that. Care BC has funding that is ready to go.
- It seems like the park component is getting less important and not really being set up as something that would make a better park than we have now. If tennis is being considered, it should be included.
- The public realm and open space component is weak and unplanned, the building doesn't integrate with the park well.
- There should be more of an explanation on how decisions were arrived to.
- Don't see the environmental sustainability components coming through in the project.
- It would be good to have a relationship with indoor and outdoor interaction in the center of the buildings with the ability to be extended outside specifically on the corner of NSNH.
- The buffer between the building and the park is a good opportunity to connect the rooftop patios with the park, a connection people can access.
- More exploration with the massing or if the buildings could be similar in height so there's not such a distinct corner element on the south side.
- The park needs to be designed in the earlier stages rather than later.
- Include landscaping on the ground floor and developmental space on the upper outdoor areas.
- Documentation does not show existing conditions. It seems like a real loss for what is existing, the nodes from the communities past have meaning.
- The tower on the lower corner from a planning perspective marks the location well.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the initial project information for the North Shore Neighbourhood House redevelopment project and is satisfied with moving the project forward to rezoning.

The Panel looks forward to seeing the progress of the project through the design stages.

Carried Unanimously

3. August Meeting

- There will be a meeting scheduled for Wednesday, August 11th.

4. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:04 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, July 21st, 2021.

Chair