

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

**Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel  
Held via WebEx on Wednesday, January 19<sup>th</sup>, 2022**

---

**MINUTES**

---

- Present:** M. Muljiani (Acting Chair)  
K. Bracewell, RCMP  
D. Burns  
M. Messer  
N. Petrie  
M. Rahbar  
K. Ross  
M. Tashakor  
Councillor A. Girard
- Staff:** M. Menzel, Planner 2, Planning and Development  
E. Chow, Planner 2, Planning and Development  
M. Friesen, Manager, Strategic Initiatives  
A. Garcha, Planning Assistant, Planning and Development  
T. Huckell, Committee Clerk
- Guests:** North Shore Neighbourhood House – Phase 1  
225 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street (Building Permit Review)  
Collin Truong, Integra Architecture  
Robin Petri, Catalyst Community Developments  
Inge Schamborzki, Care BC  
Xiahui (Molly) Liu, Durante Kreuk Ltd., Landscape Architecture  
Dylan Chernoff, Durante Kreuk Ltd., Landscape Architecture
- Regrets:** K. Blomkamp  
S. Mitchell
- 

Due to technical difficulties, S. Mitchell was unable to join and M. Muljiani presided as Acting Chair. A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:43pm.

**1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held November 17<sup>th</sup>, 2021**

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held November 17<sup>th</sup>, 2021 be adopted.

**Carried Unanimously**

## 2. Staff Update

No staff updates at this point in time.

## 3. North Shore Neighbourhood House – Phase 1 – 225 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street (Building Permit Review)

The City has received detailed design plans for Phase 1 of the North Shore Neighbourhood House (NSNH) Site. The NSNH Site has been recently rezoned to CD-737 Zone to accommodate three phases of development, with detailed design of each phase subject to specific Development Guidelines, including review by the Advisory Design Panel.

The proposed development is a six-storey mixed-use building with:

- Respite care centre on the ground floor, including:
  - 1767 m<sup>2</sup> GFA;
  - 18 overnight care rooms;
  - 482 m<sup>2</sup> indoor amenity space;
  - 393 m<sup>2</sup> outdoor amenity space; and
  - Pedestrian access and pick-up/drop-off from north off East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street;
- Five storeys of below market rental housing above:
  - 89 units total;
  - 70% MMR units;
  - 30% Housing Income Limits (HILs) units;
  - 23 adaptable units (25.8%);
  - 75 m<sup>2</sup> indoor amenity space;
  - 277 m<sup>2</sup> outdoor amenity space; and
  - Pedestrian access from west off St. Georges Avenue;
- Residential unit mix:
  - 15 studio units;
  - 40 one-bed units;
  - 20 two-bed units; and
  - 14 three-bed units (15.7% total);
- Shared vehicle access from the west off St. Georges Avenue to underground parking level P2; and
- Vehicle and bicycle parking requirements met.

The Official Community Plan (OCP) supports high-density mixed-use development on this site with a maximum overall density of 2.8 FSR, and a maximum height of 20.8m for this phase.

Development of the site is guided by Council-endorsed high-level principles, which include 1) contributing to the neighbourhood, 2) providing a distinct identity for the emerging community hub and 3) utilizing equitable, inclusive and sustainable design.

In addition to site planning and building design, staff would like to receive feedback on the proposal with respect to the Development Guidelines and, in general, regarding appropriateness of landscaping and opportunities for improving the public-private interface.

Collin Truong, Integra Architecture, described the project to the Panel:

- The building is designed to maximize potential light in the site.
- Generous setback on the east will contain a landscape buffer. To the west have designed an improved streetscape along St. Georges Avenue.
- Private rooms wrap the perimeter of the respite care facility, with a lounge at the northwest corner.
- Main entry of the residential building will be off St. Georges. The area will be open and well-lit, with security features in place.
- Shared access to the underground parking will be at the lowest corner of the site. A security gate will prevent public access down the parkade ramp.

Xiahui (Molly) Liu, Durante Kreuk Ltd., reviewed the landscape plan:

- The site has been designed to be a memorable addition to the neighbourhood. Have chosen a simple palette. A red accent colour will likely be used in planting.
- The entry space will provide some coverage for bikes.
- Well lit for safety, but designed to minimize the impact on the community.
- Where the building steps back is the residential amenity room. The residential amenity room will have an exterior amenity terrace. Residents on that level will have private patios to take advantage of the step in the building.

**Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:**

- Is there a plan for centralized air and heating? **A:** Have not yet reached that level of detailed design. On our other comparable buildings, we have a mechanical engineer completing the design for heating and ventilation. We are “future proofing” our buildings.
- Appears that the lower portion of the windows is the only openable portion. Would recommend a larger proposed openable window for all units. **A:** The windows tilt and turn, to allow as much natural venting as permitted for this project.
- Q re: gutters? **A:** We do envision a gutter for the main roof. Balconies will have some integrated rain water drains to capture rain and take it to the storm drains.
- Is there any particular material being planned for the east walkway that separates this project from the park? **A:** The red accent colour would apply to all areas, including between the building and the park. The walkway is shown for reference only, as it is not our property. Staff confirmed that the City will design it in the future. Desire is to integrate it but it will be reviewed with the building permit application. Vision is possibly a staircase, to welcome people from the western part of the City into the park.
- How does one maintain the landscape in front of the townhouse units on Level 2? **A:** Plan would be for either the tenant to do it, or to arrange for access through tenants’ units. Would occur with notice to and permission from residents.
- Do you intend to have outdoor lighting? **A:** Yes, there will be lighting at each of these outdoor spaces, in consultation with electrical engineers. Planning for sufficient lighting so that the space can be used properly and safely.
- Is there any consideration regarding protecting the direct natural light, and glazing, specifically for the south and west sides? **A:** We have considered a series of soft tress around the perimeter for some shadowing. Phase 2 to the south of the building will ultimately be an approximately 20 storey tower that will cast a shadow over the project as well.

- Could you elaborate on the main, ground floor entrance; where is the lobby located? **A:** There is a space in the northwest corner.
- What is the function of the private rooms? **A:** Part of the program for the respite space. There are sleeping rooms as well, for overnight stays. The area at the northwest corner is a visitor and residents' lounge space. Will be common area. There are 18 private rooms, and the design is circular around those rooms, so people with dementia are free to wander without hitting walls, but the area is also secured. The concept is to give caregivers a break.
- From the view along St. Georges Avenue, we can see ample overhang on a large portion, but it appears around one-quarter of the units have no overhang, no architectural sun shade device. Could that be considered? **A:** Had previously given thought to some solar device; good suggestion, will consider. We are also analyzing the future tower to see if it will be necessary to add some sort of window covering.
- Do we know anything more concrete about the size/height of that future building to the south that will impact the project? **A:** The rezoning allows for up to 18 stories for Phase 2.
- As this is a building permit review, how does this affect the panel's review? **A:** This is a unique situation for the City, being a high level rezoning. A development covenant that required a design review by ADP. Mainly we are considering the development guidelines that were mentioned earlier, to ensure that the design meets the objectives of a quality design in the public realm for the community.
- Is there any access from this building to the park? **A:** Challenging with the ground floor being used for respite care. Design is looking towards a visual feeling of connection, rather than an actual connection. For Phase 2, we are planning for an additional entrance for greater connection.
- Notice the railing heights are quite high above the residential outdoor amenity area; could you explain that design? **A:** The guard rails need to be 3 foot 6 inches high at a minimum. We need to make sure our outdoor area is as secure as our indoor area. We are a licensed facility; from that perspective, actually believe the wall needs to be at least 6 feet.
- Will the bike storage lockers have direct access to St. Georges? **A:** Yes.
- How far back from the road is the garage entry gate set? **A:** Approximately 15 feet.
- If the residential access has its entryway on St. Georges, and the respite entrance is on East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, how will you differentiate the entrances for first responders? **A:** Had a code review for the project. There is a remote annunciator. The main panel will be at the respite lobby. The remote annunciator panel will be at the residential main lobby. Do expect to work with the building department to have two separate, distinct addresses.
- Will the respite component be staffed 24 hours? **A:** Yes.
- Does the Phase 2 tower mentioned have a timeline with respect to development? **A:** Not imminent. As a very complex project, it requires a significant amount of City funds; at the discretion of Council in their budget process.

**Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:**

- Like how you've broken up the massing with wood texture, and wrapping the design with white.
- Really liked the landscape architecture.
- Appreciate comments with respect to windows; happy to know the larger one would be the openable one.
- If having a distinct identity is one of the principles, think the corner of East 2<sup>nd</sup> and St. Georges is weak on that. Overall like the project, but very weak on that corner.

- Think the inclusive sustainable design is all well done. But do think on a lower building, you could consider adding a green rooftop.
- Think the integration with the park is weak, particularly with the respite use. Need good visual integration. Since you're developing the park, should be an integral part of the scheme.
- Doesn't appear that you've kept the length of the building to 100 feet or less. You've done some things with respect to architectural massing, but at the street level it's very uniform. Especially on 2<sup>nd</sup>, think it needs more attention.
- Privacy issues at the street level need further consideration. Street access may be impossible for the respite units, but the bedroom units facing out are very close to the sidewalk. Need some attention there (e.g. landscaping, possibly between the windows to separate from the sidewalk).
- Liked the architecture and landscape architecture, but find the northwest corner of the building on the ground floor weak. Have an opportunity to create a more signature, prominent space there.
- The building itself is handsome and well designed, but the ground floor doesn't seem to match. Perhaps consider a different material (e.g. brick). Building is well presented but the ground floor is weak.
- Concerned about the entry to the residential building off St. Georges; it has a very large open area next to the entrance. If that area is not well managed in the design stage, could be inviting for intruders.
- Like the massing and design; understand that the northwest corner will be a main façade. But on the other hand it requires some direct light from the north side as well. You have those deep architectural fins on the north, moving to the west; may want to consider other features to allow more direct light, since the north face will get less light anyway.
- One of the primary predominate elements of the guidelines is a strong public realm massing connection at East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and St. Georges. Not sure why the building is set back there; you might want to explore options there to really make that the announcing corner of the building. Thank you've done a good job on the entryway elements.
- Think the massing material combinations are nice; think the overall massing is quite pleasing and the arrangement well handled. Understand there are cost constraints and you've managed it well.
- Agree that the park connections could be strengthened.
- Suggest you explore the east exit a little more; think the 2 bedroom units on that corner have a little bit of "wobble room".
- Understand that due to the presence of the respite facility, your ability to create a public connection from that part of the building is limited, but you have some opportunity to create a direct access point with stairs from Level 2 to the park.
- The corner of East 2<sup>nd</sup> has a fair bit of blank wall; the landscaping will need to build up the design there to make up the difference so blank walls are not exposed.
- Unfortunate that the future tower was not included in the drawings; it will heavily impact the future shadowing. Concerned about how much light will ultimately penetrate into the gardens.
- With respect to the accessible units, it appears that some of the bedrooms are unlikely to meet code; insufficient space for swing of the doors.
- The east side of the development is your weak, vulnerable area; with bike storage lockers exiting onto the street you will have to ensure robust locking. Worried that theft will be prevalent with rapid access out of the area via seabus and rapid transit.
- Will need a very effective lighting treatment with the setbacks, to ensure no dark areas.

- Appreciate the institutional aspect of the development in terms of the respite facility, but feel there have been some softening elements that may have been overlooked.
- Some form of cover for the gardens will benefit everyone for use during winter months.
- Agree that the bedrooms at street level can feel dehumanizing; if you can address a sense of comfort would benefit staff as well.

**Presenter’s comments:**

- Thank you for all the comments; will take into consideration in our design.
- Great comments; lots of ideas and creativity that we will be able to apply to solutions to some of the challenges that we have. Appreciate all members being here and sharing.
- Would like to emphasize that we fall under the umbrella of long-term care. We do understand the necessity of addressing the issue of feeling more homelike than institutional. Few of our clients are in their rooms during the day; mainly out in the activity areas.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has undertaken a design review for Phase 1 of the North Shore Neighbourhood House Site at 225 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, and recommends submission of the building permit application subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- further design development for an enhanced connection to the future park from the residential units;
- further design development to enhance and review the corner at St. Georges Avenue and East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street to further align with the design guidelines;
- further design development to create more usable outdoor amenity space for the residents and address CPTED concerns for bike access;
- further review on the outdoor lighting, specifically near the garage, and other areas in the south facing space;
- further design development of the East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street streetscape level regarding the maximum 100 foot length principle;
- further design development to address the issues of privacy from the sidewalk on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street into the ground-level units; and
- consider a covered portion of the outdoor amenity area;

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

**Carried Unanimously**

*The Delegation for 225 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street left the meeting at 7:26pm.*

**4. City of North Vancouver – Tree Protection Bylaw**

A. Garchu. presented on the City’s Tree Protection Bylaw. Key points included but were not limited to:

- The City is developing an initial Tree Protection Bylaw to help minimize tree loss and staff are looking for feedback on the initial framework. We are aiming for a 40% canopy across the region by 2050.

- City regulations for tree protection on private property currently vary, including:
  - Development Permit Area Guidelines
  - Streamside Protection Area Guidelines
  - Protected Tree Covenants
  - Sustainable Development Guidelines
- The City will be looking to hire an arborist to support the bylaw, who will ensure compliance with standards for tree protection during construction, soil volumes and quality, supportive irrigation infrastructure for replacement trees and other healthy tree establishment measures.
- Some goals we are applying to the scope of the first draft of the bylaw include:
  - Striking an appropriate balance of new requirements with the ability to administer and enforce
  - Clear guidance for developers on replacement requirements
  - Straightforward integration into existing workflow without negatively impacting the supply of diverse housing
  - Transparent decision-making process
  - Gathering quality data on trees and supportive infrastructure to improve monitoring of the urban canopy on private property
- The new bylaw will look to:
  - Introduce a new tree removal permit process for all existing and new multi-unit residential, commercial and institutional properties in the City
  - Define protected trees (e.g. size) and outline when a permit is required to remove protected trees
  - Outline the conditions where tree removal may be permitted
  - Establish fines and penalties for infractions
  - Lay out a clear process for tree removals that are an imminent hazard without permits
  - Outline best practices for the tree species replaced to ensure establishment
- The proposed bylaw cannot restrict tree removal in a way that would limit the ability to develop a site to the density permitted under zoning.
- The City has sampled best practices for the bylaw and will initiate an Urban Forest Management Strategy. These often accompany tree protection bylaws to set broader canopy and tree health goals for public and private lands, plan for climate adaptation and align with provincial and regional policies.
- Highlights of the draft bylaw include:
  - Protection for trees greater than 20cm DBH (diameter at breast height) on multi-family, commercial, industrial and civic/institutional lands where the City has land use jurisdiction (excludes CNV road right-of-way); will define “trees” and related items for clarity
  - Tree permit requirements including replacement specifications (1:1 for hazardous trees, 3:1 for removals) and an extended tree maintenance period
  - Clearer expectations for developers
  - Compensation considerations for carbon sequestration potential and other ecological services of trees
- Tree permits will be integrated into the Development Review Process.
- Next steps for the tree bylaw include presentation to Council in February and possible adoption in March. Complementary work includes:
  - Exploring new incentive opportunities for improved ecological services including pervious surface areas
  - Replanting programs supported through tree giveaways and corporate tree planting grants

- Returning to the Task Force with a scoping exercise for Urban Forest Management Strategy
- Develop monitoring strategy for the Initial Tree Bylaw

Staff would like to receive feedback on the proposal with respect to the following:

- Level of support for the initial Tree Protection Bylaw;
- Input on harmonizing and updating existing guidelines;
- Appropriateness of the level of protections;
- Thoughts on requiring ecological compensation; and
- Additional comments regarding the bylaw.

**Questions/comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:**

- What role will this design panel play in supporting the arborist's identification of trees on multi-family sites? As an advisory body, would the panel learn which trees were identified after the fact, or could the panel influence the arborist's identification of significant trees?  
**A:** Staff will seek clarification.
- To which trees does the 3:1 ratio mentioned earlier apply? **A:** It would apply to protected trees that are being removed. If the tree permit application was approved, the developer would have to plant 3 news trees. Preferably this would be on site, close to where the mature tree was removed. If it cannot be replaced onsite, then an offsite location would be determined.
- Would be interested to learn more about how the City plans to identify protected vs. heritage trees; Richmond has heritage tree guidelines. **A:** A protected tree would have a DBH (diameter at breast height) greater than 20cm. A definition/description for a heritage tree is what we're looking to outline for the next iteration. We are still exploring ways to create a registry.
- Suggest you consider the ability to appeal what the staff arborist says (e.g. by an applicant, developer, or this panel). There can be a lot of public pressure to retain trees. Curious about the mechanisms.
- Recommend a covenant that replacement trees cannot be taken down without City fines. Many people get around this because replacement trees are young, but they should be allowed to age to ultimately genuinely replace the tree that was lost.
- Consider some kind of mechanism of control to ensure that developers aren't forced into a restrictive scenario on a limited footprint.
- Also consider some built-in mechanism to ensure there will be a deep enough root well to allow for healthy planting.
- Not entirely sure what the role of the arborist will be; may have the potential to bog things down so hope it won't increase the bureaucracy/time; recommend being thoughtful of streamlining the processes.
- Compare how the City of Vancouver allowed some leeway on which trees were considered (what arborist report was needed for which trees). Look for efficiencies (i.e. don't want to spend a lot of extra work on trees that won't be saved anyway).
- Question that you are not including single-family properties at this point; that is where a lot of these trees are.
- Any time you create uncertainty, you escalate the costs; the bylaw needs to be extremely clear.

- The concept of a tree protection bylaw is great but you'll need to think beyond the boundaries of any given property; trees have an expansive root system and don't just grow to the property line. Part of the bylaw should extend beyond the property line.
- Ecological compensation makes sense; would support it.
- The City of North Vancouver is quite urbanized. Rather than trying to increase the canopy of the entire City, consider producing a map and focusing on zones where the City can achieve an increased canopy. Rather than stressing about particular lots where achieving that number may be practically impossible, could still support the ecological goal for the City overall.

**5. Adjourn**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Wednesday, February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2022.

*"Marie Muljani"*

Acting Chair

*"February 16, 2022"*

Date