

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, December 9th, 2015**

---

**MINUTES**

---

- Present:** B. Allen  
J. Boyce  
K. Bracewell, RCMP  
K. England  
A. Epp  
J. Geluch  
S. Gushe  
A. Larigakis  
P. Maltby
- Staff:** D. Johnson, Development Planner  
S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk  
M Epp, City Planner
- Guests:** 1301-1333 Lonsdale Avenue  
Paul Sander, Hollyburn Properties Ltd.  
Stefan Aepli, Francl Architecture  
Pablo Rojas, Francl Architecture  
Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Ltd.  
Richard White, Planning Consultant
- 233 West 5<sup>th</sup> Street  
Christopher Cade, Owner  
Bert Chase, H.S. Chase Architects  
Karl Wein, Karl Wein Associates
- Absent:** M. Tsai

---

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

**1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2015**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held November 18th, 2015 be adopted.

**Carried Unanimously**

## 2. Business Arising

It was announced that Mary Tsai had resigned from the Arts Commission; a new representative will be appointed in 2016.

## 3. 1301-1333 Lonsdale Avenue (OCP Amendment and Rezoning Application)

M. Epp introduced the project which is an application to build a mixed use development with 27,000 square feet of commercial area and an 18 storey, with a partial 19<sup>th</sup> floor, residential tower with 144 rental units of varying sizes including one three-bedroom unit on each floor. The site is designated as a Special Study Area.

An OCP Amendment is required as Hollyburn Properties Ltd. is proposing a height above the current Official Community Plan (OCP) maximum height limit of 120 feet. The requested increase would allow a height of 191 feet.

Staff asked the Panel for their input on the building design, sustainability features and also the proposed height increase and relationship to Lonsdale Avenue, the placement and massing of the tower, the Lonsdale Avenue frontage and streetscape and opportunities to maintain the vibrant character of smaller retail shops, opportunities to enhance active design elements, including internal circulation and the proposed pedestrian connection through the laneway. Is it appropriate that the massing of the tower means the project will not be able to achieve the usual 45 degree angle setback from the centre of Lonsdale Avenue?

Paul Sander introduced the team and the company. Hollyburn Properties is a rental operator; this is the company's third project in the area.

Stefan Aepli, Francl Architecture, described the project to the Panel:

- Francl Architecture designed the Prescott building so understands the intersection.
- It is a key intersection which will be a gateway of towers to Central Lonsdale when fully developed.
- The project will provide over 27,000 square feet of office and retail space which is 7,000 square feet more than presently exists.
- The design creates a pedestrian scale of interest on Lonsdale Avenue with smaller commercial retail units rather than one large anchor tenant.
- The main entry of the project faces City Hall to improve the open space; the design opens up the City Hall forecourt by curving away on the south west corner, creating an interesting, open landscape.
- The two storey podium steps up from City Hall, transitioning up to the four storey podium on the east side of Lonsdale Avenue.
- The applicant would like to upgrade the lane to create a mews connecting to City Plaza and the library.
- The residential tower is slender east-west to step it away from Lonsdale Avenue and also keep it from being too near to City Hall; the design is elongated along Lonsdale Avenue.
- The clean, contemporary architecture will be attractive to younger people and downsizers.
- The cornice line responds to the Prescott on the other side of Lonsdale Avenue.

- The second floor cantilever is evocative of the City Hall “box” floating on 13<sup>th</sup> Street continuing around the corner to Lonsdale Avenue.
- The curvature continues at the ground plane.
- The second floor on Lonsdale Avenue covers the streetscape for rain protection and a sense of intimacy.
- The materials are warm consisting predominately of concrete with wood motifs and green/blue hues echoing the colours of the north shore mountains.
- Every floor has a three-bedroom unit for a total of 16 units in the building.
- 22% of the units are two-bedroom units.
- There is a rooftop amenity space with indoor and outdoor areas.
- The building will be connected to Lonsdale Energy Corporation. It is hoped to achieve better than ASHRAE 90.1. It is a long-term rental building so the owners want it to be durable.
- There will be Insulation behind the spandrel panels.

Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Ltd., reviewed the landscape plan:

- The plan engages with the City Hall landscape.
- There is a repetition of the water, stone, block elements in the civic precinct incorporated in the plaza design which includes moving and reflective water features.
- The design tries to engage the lane with the building.
- Loading and unloading areas are important as there is more turnover in tenants in a rental building.
- The landscape treatment on Lonsdale Avenue continues down 13<sup>th</sup> Street but is greener.
- There is lots of room for the sidewalk and support planting.
- There is a second level amenity patio for the commercial units with a patterned gravel roof.
- On top of the building is an amenity space with outdoor play and gathering spaces and urban agriculture, deck spaces with outdoor kitchens and fire pits; it is designed as a series of outdoor rooms stretched around the building.

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

- Will access to the underground parking conflict with the pedestrian mews? **A:** The pedestrian area is vertically separated from traffic with a curb.
- The design of the floor plane reminds me of the village at Park Royal; what specific elements have you included that are unique to this building and to the context? **A:** We had to deal with the grade change so wanted to make it interesting. We wanted to incorporate the granite used in the Vista landscaping. The water echoes the library design. We wanted reflective water and included the bridge for access to the residential building. The water feature is to separate and highlight the residential entrance. We want the design to relate to City Hall.
- To staff: Has the landscape design been taken across City property? **Staff:** It is being reviewed.
- It seems to be in some conflict with City Hall? **A:** We have intentionally made a clean line from the property line in the design; the remainder will be subject to discussion with the City.
- What are the opportunities for Public Art? **A:** We are talking to the Arts Office and will be following the proper procedure. We think this corner is good because it is very visible.
- Are there rain gardens on Lonsdale? **A:** We are working on that. **Staff:** We want them to meet the streetscape guidelines with exposed aggregate and broom-finished concrete.

- What would the shape of the building have been if you had stayed within the 45 degree regulation? **A:** We could not get the 45 degree angle at 120 feet or the building would be pushed very near to City Hall and would overpower it. The tower is really narrow east west; we tried to minimize the impact on Lonsdale Avenue. The 45 degree guideline was to maximize views to the mountains and the building does not impact them.
- What is the main reason for a taller tower as opposed to the lower slab? **A:** The lower building would be much squatter and would block more views than the taller and narrower shape. The slab block had a much greater impact on City Hall and the light in to the offices.
- What are the materials on the second and third floors of the podium? **A:** Wood screens and white metal panels.
- Is the tower glass tinted? **A:** No, the glass has low e coating.
- Why not LEED certification? **A:** LEED costs a lot to administer. We expect to do as well as LEED.
- What about cooling on the west façade; how will it be cooled in the summer? **A:** We will probably deepen the balconies and may have more spandrels.
- The balconies seem too small to accommodate families? **A:** The three bedroom balcony is six feet deep and wraps around.
- The turning looks tight in the loading areas? **A:** The traffic consultant says it works.
- To Staff: How does the noise bylaw apply to loading and unloading? **A:** The Noise Bylaw does not apply to beeping back up noise.
- Will the Scotia Bank site be redeveloped and become taller? **A:** We do not think so, but there are no guarantees. We are careful about our placement with regard to the northern property line. There is a significant setback. **Staff:** It is not a tower site.
- Was there consideration for having amenity space on the second floor above the commercial units? **A:** We did consider it but decided it was better to have all amenity space on the top roof. There are private decks on the second floor.
- Could the private patios be larger? **A:** The size could be modified. They range from 300 to 400 square feet and are quite deep.
- Was there a study of using the 120 foot limit on a slab design? **A:** We tried different massings; we felt there was lesser view impact by going higher with a smaller foot plate.
- Was there any thought to bringing amenity space lower so it was nearer to the lower apartments? **A:** No. I am not sure it would offer a benefit to in a 16 storey building and there would not be an outdoor portion.
- Why has the number of parking stalls increased? **A:** We were not comfortable with the overlap of the visitor numbers. We have 15 in addition to the bylaw requirements.
- Where are the change facilities for the bike storage? **A:** On Level 2 for the office floor.
- Was there an opportunity to open up the pedestrian connection at Lonsdale like the Prescott? **A:** We considered the façade on 13<sup>th</sup> Street; the ground plane wraps around the curve and is a dynamic, not a hard turn. It is a new interpretation of the Prescott. The corner is not treated as a corner; we wanted the 13<sup>th</sup> Street side to be the corner. It is a building that does not really have a back as it is surrounded by public buildings.
- The tower casts a shadow on the east side of Lonsdale on June 21<sup>st</sup> and September 21<sup>st</sup>. People tend to take the sunny side of the street. Is there a way to negate it? **A:** The west side of the building will be much more active.
- How will the bike lanes on 13<sup>th</sup> Street work in the future with this building with more cars? **Staff:** We are taking an additional 10 feet from the site to allow for public realm; the bike lane will not change, but it will give a better pedestrian realm.

- How will the access to the parking be controlled? **A:** It will be gated with no recessed pockets and will be open during business hours. How will visitors access it? **A:** They will have to be buzzed in.
- To staff: Is there a policy on tower heights? **Staff:** It is a very detailed policy; all towers in the OCP have a specific height.
- Is there an increase in density? **Staff:** The OCP maximum is 3.0 FSR with the potential for a bonus to 4.0 FSR for 100% rental. There is a proposed transfer density from Block 62 for a final planned FSR of 4.86.
- What is the effective R value? **A:** We have not done a detailed analysis.
- Are you pursuing waste heat recovery? **A:** We will achieve it through hooking up with LEC. We are studying whether it can be done; it is not fully developed yet.

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

- Thank you for your presentation. I think the height and relationship to Lonsdale Avenue is fine. It is a signature building. The streetscape and connection to the back alley is huge. It complements City Hall quite nicely. I really like the project.
- I understand why it cannot be pulled further back from Lonsdale Avenue. The step back from Lonsdale Avenue is nice; perhaps it should move closer to City Hall.
- I commend the expression at the ground level. I would recommend more of the white on the residential tower; it needs more development to break up the repetition.
- It is important to maintain the animation of the street on Lonsdale Avenue.
- It would be good to consider what night-time enhancements can be made through lighting, similar to the adjacent corner.
- Encourage people to use stairs where possible and enhance the finishes for the office portion.
- Look at the size of the activity room to encourage people to use it; for the number of units it appears a bit small
- I understand the approach with the corner of Lonsdale Avenue and 13<sup>th</sup> Street. If there an opportunity, put CRU access at the corner to create a bit of a setback as you round the corner and create more activity there. You are not changing the volume at the base; it would add to the dynamic if people congregated at the corner.
- Thank you for a very nice package. I think it is a big ask but seems appropriate. The height and density should be given.
- It is great to see small shops in the new development; it is going to be a challenge for them to afford lease rates.
- I would love to see it certified LEED Silver.
- I like the covered sidewalk on Lonsdale Avenue with great access to the corner which is becoming the hub of central Lonsdale. Very well done.
- It fits in well and gives an interesting juxtaposition with Lonsdale Avenue. I favour the slimmer higher alternative. The placement and massing of the tower are to be commended.
- There is pleasant interaction with active design elements at the street level for residents and the public.
- The interaction on the roof is good. I congratulate you on using as much of the roof as you have.
- It is a fine and significant building that North Vancouver can be proud of.
- Very nice presentation. I applaud the fact that it is a rental building, the City needs more.
- The unit mix is really nice.
- The access to the bike storage is really good.

- I like the effort put into the roof amenity.
- I am concerned about energy performance and the envelope. The glazing to solid ratio is an issue; there will be a lot of solar heat gain into the units in the summer. The blinds will be down a lot.
- Re Lonsdale Avenue, it is our main commercial strip; I wonder about keeping the podium to two storeys rather than three stories to step down from the bank. I think you could have three storeys; it will not have a direct relationship to City Hall. It is more affected by being between two 19 storey buildings. The commercial podium looks clean and modern. I hope it can be animated. It is hard to design for variety; I do not think you will get the random character.
- Thank you for a thorough presentation and a legible set of drawings.
- I find the bulk and scale good. The taller massing is appropriate for the site.
- I like the quality and consistency of public realm. I am frustrated with the lack of resolution with the water feature; the elevation is very simplistic and I do not think it reflects the complexity of what you are trying to do. I would love to see some resolution of the corner as given to the tower.
- There should be some connection between City Hall and the project.
- There is a very big roof on the podium and small patios; they should be bigger. It should be a green roof, not gravel. You can do better than gravel.
- There are lots of amenities on the penthouse level but there does not seem to be walls to separate activities. You should add more greenery and screening to make it more comfortable for different users.
- It would be nice to see an exploration of rainwater harvesting and storage and reuse.
- The Level 3 roof could be partially green and a habitat roof to attract wildlife.
- Flame granite blocks and pavers are everywhere; it is a unique location with a lot to offer the community; see if there is an opportunity to incorporate more unique materials.
- I commend you on a clear and thorough presentation. The tower is in the right place; it is the best solution in terms of shading. It should be back from Lonsdale Avenue and away from the civic plaza.
- The podium and tower is fine. I have an issue with the marriage, the transition of the podium and tower. The tower is elegant above the podium. The white block on the second floor is most attractive.
- I like the idea of a glass base with the band floating above; however, there is an excess of glazing; it becomes a banal streetscape. Maybe the purity of the glass base might have more solid material and more articulation. There are giant planes of glass; more recesses and entryways would bring more character.
- The approach to the laneway is reasonable. It needs a little more development with respect to the water features.
- At the commercial entrance accentuate the circulation with the staircases rather than the elevator. It would be nice if the stairway were a more generous design element.
- You really need to stress the energy performance of the building and have more solid material that is not spandrel glass.
- The colour palette is little bit dark; it might be a bit gloomy.

**Presenter's comments:**

Thank you for your detailed comments. It is valuable to have feedback from professionals. We will take the comments and have detailed discussions. We need to work through official channels and will take them back to the design team.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the proposed OCP Amendment and Rezoning Application for 1301-1333 Lonsdale Avenue and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Revise the landscape plan for the Level 3 patio to include more generous private patios and add more greenery and wildlife habitat;
- Increase the thermal performance of the building envelope following energy modelling and investigate the solid-void relationship;
- Greater identification of the commercial units with more solid material and changes in plane of street level façade;
- Development of the residential entry and its relationship to the raised podium element;
- Break up the amenity space on roof with screening or landscape elements for more privacy for users;
- Further development of the central water feature;
- Design a more generous and visible stair to the Level 2 commercial units to encourage use;
- Greater resolution of the lane and pedestrian access with bollards for protection, drop off units etc.

The Panel wishes the applicant to strongly consider registering the project with LEED

The Panel supports the massing and placement of the tower.

The Panel commends the applicant for the quality of their presentation.

**Carried Unanimously**

#### **4. 233 West 5<sup>th</sup> Street (Rezoning Application)**

Staff told the Panel that, as this was a preliminary review of the project; no resolution would be required.

Christopher Cade, Welcome Properties, thanked the Panel for reviewing the project.

Bert Chase, H.S. Chase Architects, described the project to the Panel:

- The site is on the south side, midway between Chesterfield Avenue and Mahon Avenue.
- The property drops a storey north-south so houses on the upper side are half a storey higher than the subject property.
- It is in a transition zone with multi-family residential properties to the south, as well as two and three unit developments and single family homes on the street.
- The neighbours have good views to the south which are interrupted by steep roof peaks, and asked that the design allowed them to keep their southerly views.
- The design picks up elements from the neighbourhood but takes a modern contemporary approach. The porch element on neighbouring houses is echoed using post and beam structures with stone facing. The metal finish was selected to offset the dark heritage colours on the street.
- One unit is brought forward to minimize the width of the project on the streetscape.

- At the rear the design moves landscape areas for the back units out to the lane on to the roof of the garage to give an open south facing area.

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

- What is the retaining system? **A:** Stone planters stepping down.
- What is the green material? **A:** Hardiboard.
- At the next presentation is it possible to include rain garden detail that shows how it will interact with paved areas, patios and walks and plant material at 75%? **A:** Yes.
- The dryers / washers are all in the basement? Your plans show them on different floors. **A:** We will have to look into it.
- There are no windows in the roof access? **A:** It is just a staircase access to the roof.
- What about using the staircase for ventilation?
- Was there a lot of consideration that went into retaining walls and etc. vs access?
- How will you identify the entries to each unit? **A:** There will be addresses on the planter walls.
- To staff: Do you permit decks on top of garages? **Staff:** There is nothing in the Zoning Bylaw that prohibits them. We are looking for examples. **Applicant:** There is no oversight of the neighbours. The neighbour liked the idea.
- What kind of stone are you using? **A:** Split face stone.
- The building is very symmetrical and then the entry is offset? **A:** The elements are all slightly offset the design is not static.
- You have built up the grade in the middle of the site by how much? **A:** Three and a half feet; the intention is to separate private and semi-private space.

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

- I am not convinced on the façade materials, there are too many.
- You have great ideas on exterior space use.
- I like the location of the bike storage and recycling areas.
- You have made an effort to be neighbourly.
- My only concern is the access from the garage to the front unit.
- There is a large amount of hard surface; finding a way to introduce more green aspects into the walkways would be good.
- Look to simplify the material palette and do not rely on materials to differentiate the form. Find something that focuses on the form.
- I like the idea of the deck on the garage.
- On P9 it is a very tight space between the stair and window well.
- The side stairs are four feet wide; why not make them six feet: the width of the path.
- I have trouble reading the drawings; there are several different sizes of text.
- There is a checklist that goes with each project that needs to be reviewed.
- The mix of stone veneer and metal seem odd.
- There is a strange symmetry about the front with the door off center.
- Two bedrooms look like they have no windows only sliding doors which will make ventilation in poor weather problematic.
- I am not certain if there is any rain protection over units A and C.
- I would like to see the detail of the roof garden.
- The deck on the garages seems a little strange and the raised private area in the middle of the site is a little odd; it chews up a lot of usable space.



- There is a large amount of hard surface; you need to use permeable pavers. Validate the calculations on how much rainwater you are planning to capture. You are using up flat usable space with rain gardens.
- I find the artificial turf on the garage roof a challenge aesthetically. I do not like the astro turf.
- The rain gardens in the front yard right against the patio take away usable space. Do another type of infiltration strategy so it does not take up too much space.
- The raised portion of the back yard breaks the site up into little compartments. Something more naturalistic in sync with natural grades would be better.
- I like that you fit in nicely with the massing of the adjacent house.
- Access is ok. Garage is fine.
- On the side the strips of metal going up spoil the horizontal line.
- It will be a big challenge to build the roofs so the building is water tight.
- The design would be more elegant if it were simplified.

**Presenter's comments:**

Thank you for your comments. They are helpful. The neighbour wanted the project moved up five feet to give more room in the back.

**5. Staff Update**

D. Johnson reviewed the status of ongoing development projects.

**6. Discussion on ADP Submission Requirements**

D. Johnson reviewed the submission requirements; there are items on the checklist which staff determine are unnecessary for certain projects e.g. shadow studies. Staff are taking steps to improve the situation. The staff memo to the Design Panel will include the checklist and rationale will be provided for why something is not included. There will be training for all the development staff on what to do in terms of the checklist and quality of the submission.

**7. Other Business**

Staff reviewed the Terms of Reference of the Design Awards. Discussion ensued. It was agreed that awards would be awarded in 2017 or 2018.

**8. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2015.

A workshop on the draft Moodyville Design Guidelines will be held at 5:30 pm on Thursday, January 7<sup>th</sup>.

Chair



