



MEETING MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting held at City Hall in Conference Room A, and electronically (Hybrid)
141 West 14th Street, North Vancouver, BC on October 17, 2023

*The City of North Vancouver respectfully acknowledges that this meeting is held on the
traditional and unceded territories of the Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish)
and Səlílwətał (Tseil-Waututh) Nations.*

Members Present

A. Llanos, Chair
D. Jacobson
J. Levine
R. Greene
L. McKenna
C. Toyota
D. Samaridis
M. Rahbar
O. Bibby
Sgt. K. Bracewell

Absent

Councillor S. Shahriari

Staff Present

S. Tandon Committee Clerk Secretary
Bram van der Heijden- Planner 1,
Planning & Development
Linden Maultsaid- Blair- Planner 1,
Planning & Development

Guests

F. Adab Architecture

Fred Adab, Architect
Malinder Brar, Applicant
Rod Maruyama, Landscape Architect
Pooyan Poostchi, Architect

Jim Pattison Developments

Mitch Cramp, Vice President
Jeff Winton, Development Manager
Mark Vaughan, Landscape Architect
PJ Mallen, Architect
Aaron Urion, Architect

The meeting was called to order at 5:40pm

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

The Agenda for October 17, 2023 was adopted as circulated.

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting on September 19, 2023 was adopted as circulated.

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Nil

4. 215 West & 259 West Keith Road (Rezoning Application)

The Delegation for 215 West & 259 West Keith Road joined the meeting at 5:40.

5. 215 West & 259 West Keith Road (Rezoning Application)

The City has received two rezoning applications from the same applicant on the same block of West Keith Road for similar developments. Each proposal includes a multiplex building with three principal units and three lock-off suites.

These applications are for a rezoning from the current Two-Unit Residential 1 (RT-1) Zone, to a new Comprehensive Development Zone with a base zone of Two-Unit Residential 1 (RT-1). A thorough zoning compliance check has yet to be completed. Any deficiencies in the zoning will be conveyed to the applicant at a later date.

The Official Community Plan (OCP) designates the subject site as Residential Level 3, which supports ground-oriented housing in a variety of forms such as townhouses, triplexes, and four-plexes, up to a maximum density of 0.75 FSR.

Both sites are located on the 200 block of West Keith Road, in between Chesterfield Avenue and Mahon Avenue. They are located close to transportation options on Lonsdale Avenue and a nearby portion of West Keith Road. They are within easy walking distance of many essential destinations (employment, grocery stores, medical/pharmacy, banks, recreation, active transportation, etc.).

Across the street to the north from both properties is Queen Mary Elementary School.

Across the lane to the south is the Ottawa Gardens Heritage Conservation Area (to clarify, neither property is in the heritage area, nor are the existing buildings on the City's heritage register).

The properties to the east and west of each site are a mix of single-family homes, duplexes, and multiplex developments with three or four residential units.

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

- Proposed built form and materiality;
- The appropriateness of the building interface with the street and laneway;
- Opportunities for landscaping improvements; and
- Opportunities for public realm improvements.

P. Poostchi, F. Adab Architecture presented the following highlights regarding the Rezoning Applications for 251 West & 259 West Keith Road:

- There are nine properties between the two specified locations. The project is situated in front of a school with a nearby playground. The zoning allows for duplexes (R2-1), but the proposal is for a triplex. There's a height difference of 9 feet for property 251 and 11.5 feet for property 259.
- The plan includes three main units and three lock-up units. The Floor Space Ratio (FSR) is 0.5, and the setback from the side is more than what's required by the zoning bylaw. Unit sizes range from 2100 to 2500 sq ft, including the lock-up units.

The north lock-ups are 640 sq ft, while a 2-bedroom lock-up suite is 840 sq ft. The north units have entrances directly from Keith Road, with one facing the south entrance. The lock-up units have side entrances. There's a detached garage to the south.

- The design emphasizes modern architecture and considers future development in the area. The north elevation design avoids identical units, incorporating proper articulation. The massing of the building is broken in the middle through setbacks and height variations, ensuring continuous maximum height. These design choices optimize natural light penetration into the building's interior.
- The project meets energy requirements and includes EV stalls for parking. The maximum height aligns with neighboring buildings. Exterior lighting is provided for security, including at entrances and guard areas. Privacy and security are enhanced with two gates separating the property's back. A secure bike room is accessible from the side. Windows are strategically placed for street views.
- Basement features mechanical and bike rooms. Three lock-up units connect with the main ones. North lock-up has ample natural light; south one boasts a private patio. All basements have side windows. Ground floor houses kitchen, dining, and another room. The first floor can be a bedroom or gaming area. The second floor includes 2 beds, 2 baths, and a washer. All units have roof access, providing outdoor space.
- Materials vary: hardy panels for sides, rear, and lathpore coated steel for the other project. Efforts made to minimize impact on neighbors' windows. Similar design elements exist in both, differing slightly in grade, materials, and elevation, particularly on the north side.

R. Maruyama, Landscape Architect presented the following highlights regarding the application:

- Both projects feature simplicity and functionality. Permeable paved entrances are incorporated, and side yards have inner paved surfaces with intermittent steps leading down to the lane. Shrubs line the side lanes for greenery. The building's frontage includes a terrace planting system stepping down, with a few trees planted. At the back, there are small planting areas, patios, and a green roof on top of the garage. Planters are utilized on the roof, some placed in the corners, accommodating trees and shrubs to enhance the space. Each unit features a hot tub, BBQ station, and patio furniture, with a consistent 2x2 configuration at the bottom.
- For 259 West Keith Road, the design remains similar with subtle changes. Alterations are made in terms of planting and adjustments along the grades, accommodating the variations as the grades differ on both sides of the property.

The delegation presented an animated fly-over video for the Panel.

6. 215 West & 259 West Keith Road (Rezoning Application)

Questions from the Panel covered the following topics:

- Concerns about planting trees in limited space, especially in front area, and landscaping discussion. Additionally, discussion on the landscaping around the building, specifically the trees planned for the main suite and lock-up units.
- Query about the rooftop design, specifically concerning the plan for an extensive green roof and whether there were considerations for a low-profile landscape application that changes with seasons.
- Members noted mismatched topography and building massing. Concerns arose about building height, especially in the south. Queries sought solutions to level topography, especially the south, and reasons for specific grade settings, linked to cellars.
- Suggestions about alternative entrance solutions for the unit at the back.
- Members expressed concerns about the south-facing bedroom, situated 9 feet from the neighboring building. Queries involved open window options and permanent privacy solutions, emphasizing the need for long-term resident privacy.
- The discussion highlighted 45% lawn coverage, surpassing the 35% requirement. Most surfaces, except stairs, were permeable.
- The committee discussed project aspects like the basement mechanical room and roof-mounted heat pump, raising concerns about potential noise from the dual-system air conditioning setup.
- Concerns were raised about the garbage closet positioned against the west property line. Members discussed the possibility of designating an alternative garbage area due to layout challenges posed by the existing configuration.
- A significant concern was raised regarding a neighboring tree on the northwest corner. Members questioned the tree's fate amidst the construction activities and inquired about the available report detailing the tree's condition and potential impact.
- The project aligns with Residential Level 3 policies, emphasizing low-rise medium-density housing and ground-oriented design based on the RT1 zone. Variances related to parking, units, density, and lot coverage were discussed, and the potential conversion to a Comprehensive Development (CD) zone was explored, aiming to harmonize with existing triplex structures in the vicinity.
- The absence of lighting in the rear, laneway, and fly-through video was discussed, raising concerns about door arch and sky pathway illumination. Members inquired about landscape and overhead lighting, expressing concerns about insufficient lighting on the east side and emphasizing the need for additional illumination.
- The discussion focused on unit identification from the street, with inquiries about distinguishing features beyond numbers. The response outlined separate entrances and signage, both at the main entrance and inside, to define each unit.
- The discussion covered material choices, including concerns about waviness (clarified as a non-issue). Questions were raised about rear gates, clarified as territorial markers.

- In the second round, concerns included high 45% coverage, issues with front elevation, and topographical discrepancies.
- Inquiries regarding the stone water management system. The need to review civil drawings and ensure a minimum distance of 5 meters was emphasized. There were questions about possible exemptions from detention tanks.
- Questions were raised regarding lighting, specifically about the absence of lighting in the rear, laneway, or fly-through video, as well as the illumination of door arches and sky pathways. Inquiries were made about landscape lighting and overhead lighting. Details about exterior lighting on the side and back were provided, but concerns were expressed about the lighting on the east side and the need for additional illumination.
- The discussion shifted to the identification of units from the street, with queries about how each unit would be distinguished.
- Questions were also raised about the purpose of gates at the rear, which were confirmed to be for defining territory rather than security.

Members presented the following notable comments:

- Concerns were raised about the 45% coverage, which was perceived as relatively high. Specific concerns were voiced regarding the front elevation of unit 215, especially the massive wall without windows on the east side, which was deemed a design issue given street and grade elevations. Massing discrepancies between the buildings and the lack of representation of the 9-11 feet topographical drop were highlighted. The limited green area, the proximity of the buildings, and the design of windows, particularly the opaque window, were discussed as areas of concern. It was suggested that the project should undergo a detailed building check review.
- Concerns raised included the number of units, shallow site depth, and excessive hard surfaces. Recommendations were made to address these issues by adjusting the site layout, introducing more soft-soaping, and improving drainage solutions.

Concerns about units lacking sunlight led to proposals for improved livability, including additional windows and enhanced lighting solutions.

- Symmetry and balance were highlighted, with a request to soften or add features to certain parts of the building, such as a block on the second floor that appeared to unbalance the overall design. The need for more natural light in specific units was stressed, along with suggestions for differentiating between units using creative lighting solutions in patios and entrance points.
- Limited Visibility and Access Points: Only two doors are visible for six units, making it challenging for first responders to locate all units in case of emergencies. Units 3, 4, 5, and 6 are concealed on the side and need to be visible from the laneway for immediate access by paramedics and police. Simplicity and clear visibility are crucial for quick response.
- Inadequate Lighting and Surveillance: The lack of lighting creates shady areas, affecting movement and safety. To address this, additional lighting is necessary to create an open

and vibrant environment, enhancing natural surveillance. Currently, there is only one entrance and exit point, making it essential to improve visibility and security.

- **Security Gates and Bike Storage:** While gates define property boundaries, they can inadvertently block bike storage areas. A robust security apparatus is needed to prevent bike theft while maintaining property security.
- **Backyard Lighting Solutions:** Implementing both motion-activated and steady lighting in the backyard can enhance security, ensuring well-lit spaces for residents and deterring potential trespassers.
- **Built Form and Density:** During the discussion, there was a general consensus on the appropriateness and scale of the built form. Members emphasized the importance of maintaining the current density due to the urgent need for more housing. However, concerns were raised about the liveability of the lock-up units. Members suggested adjustments such as resizing bedrooms, adding windows for better ventilation, and enhancing outdoor spaces to improve the overall quality of living for residents.
- **Setback and Garage:** There was some confusion regarding the setback of the garage from the lane, with debate over whether it was 3 or 4 feet. Opinions were divided on the built form, with some members proposing a reduction in density, particularly at the back of the property. There was a unanimous agreement on the choice of materials, although refinements were suggested for certain elements, notably a protruding block that required modification.
- **Landscaping and Practicality:** Concerns were expressed about the long-term practicality of permeable pavers in landscaping. Members requested a comprehensive building code review, which is currently underway. Additionally, there was a proposal to incorporate trench drains in the bottom units to address potential drainage issues.
- **Safety and Lighting:** Participants emphasized the significance of adequate lighting, especially in hidden corners lacking natural surveillance. Addressing concerns about bike theft and enhancing bike storage facilities were highlighted as crucial components for improving safety and security in the area.
- **Differences in 259:** Discussion centered around the distinctions between the two projects, particularly in terms of façade and material choices, especially noticeable to the north. Although similarities were noted in the south elevation of both projects, specific differences were identified, emphasizing the need for unique architectural elements to distinguish the buildings effectively.
- **Elevation Differences:** There's a similarity in the elevation differences between the two projects, with one being around 9 feet. Mentioned cons from the first project seem to persist in the second one, including setbacks and the number of units, albeit with minor changes.
- **Landscape Architecture:** The landscape architecture appears very similar between the two designs, with differences primarily noted in the staircase locations. Additionally, the second design incorporates an existing eucalyptus tree, and the report indicates similar roof conditions in both designs.

- The exemption of cellars from certain regulations was discussed, emphasizing the need to adhere to the 5-foot depth requirement under the average grade.
- Some members found the second design to be more inviting and friendly. Concerns were expressed that granting variances might set a problematic precedent, leading to similar applications in the future and potentially causing challenges for the planning department.

7. 215 West Keith Road Continued..

It was moved and seconded

1. Improve the livability of the accessory lock off suites by adding glazing wherever possible,
2. Review the bedroom sizes and quality of sunken outdoor patio spaces,
3. Review the street elevation to soften architectural feature on the eastern side,
4. Review of use of permeable pavers, and increase the amount of soft landscape wherever possible,
5. Review grading to improve livability and to follow the natural topography of the site, and
6. Design development of wayfinding and lighting aspects to ensure safety and legibility of the units from the street, and to provide improved security of the gate location

Carried Unanimously

8. 259 West Keith Road Continued..

It was moved and seconded

1. Improve the livability of the accessory lock off suites by adding glazing wherever possible,
2. Review the bedroom sizes and quality of sunken outdoor patio spaces,
3. Review of use of permeable pavers, and increase the amount of soft landscape wherever possible,
4. Review grading to improve livability and to follow the natural topography of the site, and
5. Design development of wayfinding and lighting aspects to ensure safety and legibility of the units from the street, and to provide improved security of the gate location

Carried Unanimously

9. 315 West 3rd Street (Rezoning Application)

The Delegation for 315 West 3rd Street joined the meeting at 7:18pm

The City has received a Rezoning application for 630 Brooksbank Avenue. 351 West 3rd Street. The application proposes a 5-storey wood frame rental apartment building consisting of 53 total units, one level of underground parking, and a roof deck amenity area.

The application was originally presented to the ADP on October 19, 2022. At this meeting, the panel did not recommend approval pending the resolution of a number of issues, and requested the application be resubmitted for further review by the panel.

PJ Mallen, Architect presented the following highlights regarding the Rezoning Applications for 315 West 3rd Street Road:

Regarding the enhancement of the public realm, the shift is evident: rising from lane level rather than relying on a public art mural. The adjustment includes a double-height volume for parking, lowering the south elevation, and strategically integrating programs on the Forbes upper parkade level. This new arrangement incorporates indoor amenity spaces at street level, enhancing visibility and transparency.

Addressing safety concerns and vandalism, the previously blank wall on Forbes will now house active programs for increased surveillance and better street visibility, replacing opaque walls.

Sight articulation refinements involve expressing the ground-level tree line in harmony with the building's design. This includes a podium base, Squamish Nation art consultation, and landscaping modifications to shield the patio area. Planters are now canted, providing some obscurity when viewed from higher levels, complemented by taller grasses and increased tree numbers. The grade slopes gradually toward the building entry.

Considering the utilization of space, adjustments involve repositioning the interior amenity space to benefit from the landscape. While some outdoor spaces are available, the main focus will be on the roof. Program elements include a community garden with planter boxes, a canopy-covered play area, trees with art accents in the corners, cooking facilities, and a large communal table that can be divided into smaller units. On the east side, rooftop units are planned to avoid direct sunlight.

Revisiting the building's design language, the initial plan with podium-level trees has evolved. Elongated balconies, varied color schemes offering hatch and pattern, and the removal of certain trees now characterize the updated design following collaboration with the staff.

Building Entrance has emphasis on aligning it with the road, incorporating formalized trees and seating areas. Considered subtle color changes for added vibrancy and an oversized address point, strategically positioned near the bus stop.

For Parking Level Security for Bikes, there is a proposal for a high-point placement within the building for bike security. Previously, a blank, opaque wall has now been redeveloped to enhance street visibility. This lobby space includes amenities for strollers and bikes, such as cleaning facilities, albeit with limited storage for only three bikes in one designated area.

Initially opting for architectural trees with specific soil requirements, the plan has shifted towards smaller planters to demarcate balcony spaces. This alteration reduces bulk volumes and enhances visibility on Forbes Avenue.

As for Mural proposal, collaboration with the Squamish Nation led to a proposal for a concrete mural on the Forbes elevation, serving as Squamish Nation art. The selection process will involve public participation, aiming for visible concrete art, although the artistic concept remains undetermined until the artist's creation.

The delegation presented animated fly-over video for the Panel at 7:13pm.

10. 315 West 3rd Street (Rezoning Application)

Questions from the Panel covered the following topics:

Understood! Here are the points structured as individual statements:

- Concerns were raised about the alignment of public art with the building's frontage and corner placement.
- Queries emerged regarding the entrance's design, including the incorporation of colorful elements and privacy considerations.
- Discussions centered on the building's construction materials and potential modifications.
- Considerations were made about traditional architectural elements and their visual impact.
- Detailed discussions clarified the layout, particularly the bike area and its lighting.
- Conversations focused on neighboring property access and design improvements.
- Reviews emphasized unit layouts, especially adaptable units and accessibility features.
- Questions arose about the potential collaboration between artists for corner art and murals.
- Confirmation discussions ensured design element continuity throughout the building.
- Suggestions included treating the second-floor balcony differently to highlight its significance.
- Detailed discussions focused on landscaping plans and design rationale.
- Queries were raised about setback regulations concerning underground parking.
- Discussions highlighted the rationale behind indoor amenity placements and space constraints.
- Clarifications were provided about window design choices for ventilation purposes.
- Discussions revolved around the representation of the mural's base as concrete in drawings.

Members presented the following notable comments:

Improved Safety Measures: Acknowledgment of substantial safety improvements, especially regarding walking areas around bikes. Emphasized the importance of robust locks for bike storage. Highlighted the need for adequate lighting in parking areas to prevent mischief, suggesting motion-detecting lights for enhanced safety.

Nighttime Visibility: Appreciation for the front signage and landscaping but suggested improving nighttime visibility at the entrance, especially if the address is illuminated. Suggested enhancing the entrance's prominence in the evening.

Concerns about Wood Frame Shift: While the project looks fantastic, there were concerns about preserving the essence of the design with a shift to wood frames. Questioned how to maintain the original look and feel over time, especially with the rooftop amenity, proposing indoor amenity considerations.

Illumination for Public Art: Appreciation for the availability of public art but emphasized the need for sufficient illumination to allow people to appreciate it fully.

Bike Accessibility: Highlighted the need for ample clearance for bikes, considering daily bike riders and the potential use of an auto operator.

Scale and Marking of Entrance: Raised concerns about the scale of the Japanese Maple trees in relation to the building, suggesting they might overpower the entrance. Proposed alternative ways to mark the entrance more prominently.

Rooftop Amenities: Praised the rooftop amenities, mentioning the play and sitting areas.

Resolution for Adaptable Units and Balconies: Emphasized the need to address issues with adaptable units and balconies.

Indoor Amenities Utilization: Encouraged the use of indoor amenities throughout the year, suggesting they'll be heavily utilized.

Addressing Hot Spots and Landscaping: Suggested addressing hot spots on the south side and praised the landscaping efforts on the north and Forbes sides, particularly in the bike area.

Enhancing Amenity Space: Suggested relocating the amenity to the outer wall for better natural light. Explored options to enhance glazing around the bike amenity area and reconfiguring windows to reduce tall walls.

Segmenting Vertical Murals: Liked the vertical murals but suggested breaking the canvas into smaller sections for enhanced visual appeal.

11. 351 West 3rd Street (Rezoning Application) Continued..

It was moved and seconded

1. Review the detailed design of the building entrance to incorporate lighting and further emphasize the entrance;
2. Review access to bike room from Forbes Avenue focusing on ease of circulation and movement;
3. Review placement of lower amenity space to provide greater access to natural light;
4. Review layout of adaptable units and alignment of living space with balconies to ensure accessibility;
5. Review sizing of Japanese Maple at the building entrance;

6. Review security of bike storage areas, building entries and the parking entrance;
and;
7. Recommend maximizing covered spaces on the rooftop.

Carried Unanimously

8. Date of Next Meeting

The date of next regular meeting is scheduled for November 14, 2023

9. Adjourn

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:40pm

A. Llanos, Chair

DRAFT