

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, November 20th, 2013**

---

**MINUTES**

---

**Present:** B. Harrison  
B. Allen  
H. Besharat  
K. Bracewell, R.C.M.P  
J. Marshall  
D. Siegrist  
A. Epp  
Y. Khalighi  
M. Saii  
Councillor Bell

**Staff:** E. Adin, Deputy Director, Community Development  
C. Perry, Supervisor, Engineering Services  
S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk

**Guests:** **Foot of Lonsdale Update**  
Heather Reinhold, Manager, Waterfront Project  
Joseph Fry, Hapa Collaborative, Landscape Architect for City  
John Patkau, Patkau Architects for Presentation House Gallery  
Peter Suter, Patkau Architects for Presentation House Gallery  
Reid Shier, Director, Presentation House Gallery  
Helen Besharat, Past Board Member and Member of the Facility Committee  
Cheryl Stevens, Board Chair

**117-135 West 1<sup>st</sup> Street**  
Jennifer Randall, Development, Fairborne Homes  
Chris Philps, Principal, Fairborne Homes  
Cam Halkier, Principal, Shift Architecture  
Bill Harrison, Landscape Architect, Forma Design

**Absent:** M. Messer

---

A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m.

## **1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held October 16<sup>th</sup>, 2013**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held October 16th, 2013 be adopted as amended.

**Carried Unanimously**

*H. Besharat declared a conflict of interest due to her involvement in the next project being presented, and left the meeting at 5:50pm and returned as an observer.*

## **2. Foot of Lonsdale Update and Presentation House Gallery Design**

Heather Reinhold, Manager, Waterfront Project reviewed what has happened since the presentation at the October 16<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Design Panel:

- There was an open house on November 5<sup>th</sup> with over 100 attendees; 80 questionnaires were completed.
- The project has been presented to the Integrated Transportation Committee, The Heritage Advisory Committee, The Advisory Planning Commission, and The NS Advisory Committee on Disability Issues, and will to be presented to the Parks & Environment Advisory Committee on November 21st. The intention is to incorporate the feedback in design revisions and go to Council for a referral for rezoning in early 2014.

Joseph Fry, Hapa Collaborative, the Landscape Architect for the City, reviewed the public realm design:

- The project is a major public realm initiative including the deck structure which will be rebuilt, and reconfiguration to Carrie Cates to provide bus parking and a vehicle turn around.
- There are constraints on the building in terms of responding to the Spirit Trail.
- The design will support the activities of Shipbuilders to the east.
- The tidal plaza concept for the open space has been refined with enlarged planting areas. A slope of less than 5% will provide barrier free access. The water on the plaza will have a reflectivity that will be seen up Lonsdale, and could be programmed to pulse or create patterns. When dry, the plaza can accommodate approximately 800 people for farmers markets, outdoor movies etc. The restaurant patio space has been enlarged.
- There are two options for the Cates Deck: Option A – a storm water display garden with suspended tiers of wetland plants on the lift dock, which will capture and filter storm water, or Option B, a dock with the PGE station in the centre. There will be a weather-protected colonnade along the west side of the deck. The options were each supported by about 50% of the attendees at the Open House.
- A mega wooden bench dividing the Spirit Trail and a lower walkway at the south end of the site is proposed.

John Patkau, Patkau Architects, described the design of the Presentation House Gallery:

- There is very little change to the building envelope from the previous month although a chiller has been added to the roof.

- The ground floor, which is part of the outreach of the building, has been enriched with retail space on the North West corner which will increase the animation of the building. There is a café with exterior seating on the south side overlooking Burrard Inlet.
- The main entrance is on the east side on the public space at the Foot of Lonsdale.
- The main floor has a reception area and large shop with books and speciality items, and an interior multipurpose space which will be programmed with public-oriented activities.
- The plan has been refined for the upper level. There are three segments: the 4,000 sq. ft. principal gallery, a 2,200 sq. ft. event space with a large exterior deck overlooking the harbour, and back of house space - offices, preparation rooms.
- The gallery space is now a more neutral space with the focus on the art; the wood made the space too busy for art and has been removed.
- The gallery and event space both have same roof monitor system lit with north light.
- The upper deck has a large terrace but is largely contained with walls for art; this is in contrast to the lower floor which is fully glazed so that it visually connects to the exterior.
- The building is 45 feet tall and is aligned with the street edge of Lonsdale to the north.
- The west elevation adjacent to Washington Marine is open on the north west corner.
- The building is designed on a skewed plane which rotates the building out to Carrie Cates court pulling people around to the public space.
- The building does not shade major public spaces.
- The building surface will be a crinkled metal; the technology does not currently exist; mock-ups are being developed and the applicant will be working with a building envelope supplier.
- The soffit of the building is 12 feet above ground and will be highly reflective with the ground plane reflected in the ceiling plane. This may be continued into the lobby.

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

- Will there be an issue with reflection from the façade? **A:** The degree of reflectivity will be adjusted so it will not be blinding; the crinkled surface will break up the light. We will be making a large model for testing. We can reduce the amount of reflectivity by using a different finish, a soft muted finish.
- What is the public input? **A:** The design reflects the feedback from the open house. There was a clear preference for the tidal plaza so we took some aspects from the other design. People were split 50/50 on the use of the deck.
- Will there be a mural on the north wall of the building to tie it into the historic setting? **A:** It has not been considered at the moment. We are exploring public art and illumination. There will be significant installations of public art but the form has not been determined.
- Will you provide more shade areas and benches on the plaza? **A:** We did explore it but the line of trees already there provides good solar shading and frames the view. The soffit of the building will provide a lot of shade. Tables and chairs can be put in the plaza for events. The west edge will have fixed seating.
- Does the Cates deck have to stay there or could it be moved? **A:** It is an existing structure so we have chosen to retain it. Council could decide to remove it. It would be difficult to rebuild.
- Will the granite paving be slippery? **A:** No, the finishes will be acceptable and provide resistance to slipping in the rain.
- Will the wood finish need a lot of maintenance? **A:** It has good sun exposure along the edge so it is in the right location for its application. There would be very little maintenance involved.

- What will the shading do to the plaza late at night? **A:** For most of the day the building does not shade the public space.
- If the PGE is not relocated where would it go? **A:** There are three options: demolish it, place it elsewhere in the City, perhaps Waterfront Park, or keep it at the Foot of Lonsdale. Your input is welcome.
- To staff: What land does the Washington Marine Group own? **A:** They own a sliver of land and water and lease a portion of the City lands.
- Have you looked into having portholes on the plaza so that people can look down to see? **A:** A lot of the space under the plaza will be fill.
- There is no negative value to using fill? **A:** The space under the plaza has minimal habitat value; the use of fill will also avoid long term costs.
- Have you looked into the noise on the bar grating? **A:** We can study it.
- Why did you put the exit from the café on the south side? **A:** The principal entrance is on the east, the Building Code encourages you to place exits diagonally opposite. It has a small impact on the café as it is undercut. We think it is in an optimal location.
- What will the overhang be like to be under? **A:** It will be an unusual experience because of the reflective soffit. There will be a light ground surface.
- Did you explore the idea of getting people closer to the water? **A:** We have looked at options but because the dock is 25 feet high and there are tides and wave action from the Sea Bus we were told that it is not a good idea to have close contact with the water.
- Would it be possible to walk down the display garden? **A:** Only half way.

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

- I am positive about the design; there is a lot of natural surveillance and my concerns re skateboarders have been addressed.
- I strongly support the display garden on the Cates deck; it is a positive feature and the design allows interaction with the water.
- I really like the tidal plaza; I liked the size of it before the design changes.
- I like the visual porosity of the cable rail; it should be as porous as possible.
- I have mixed feelings about the “mega bench”. The one at Granville Island is popular. I wonder about the porosity; I have a concern about limited ability to connect through.
- I love the bar grating but am concerned about noise. I love the aesthetics and porosity.
- It is very positive that weather protection is provided on the Cates Deck.
- The PGE Station absolutely must be preserved, but not here. Is there something further to the east? It would be more appropriate to that area. A heritage object near the gallery will take away from the strong sculptural quality of the building.
- The success of the gallery will depend on the metal façade, sculptural quality. Keeping it as simple as possible will be a success.
- The reflective facades are very positive; you are creating an art experience. I would like to see integrated lighting.
- I have a concern about the service stair facing the water and would encourage some review of it as it takes up a proportion of the café front.
- It is important to minimize the size of “backness” on the west side of the façade.
- It is a gem set into the space, but the west façade does not relate to anything except a walkway and laneway. It needs to be loosened. It is a dark space in shadow; it will be a negative space. Perhaps the building could be rotated. There is a need to take away from the harsh line. There should be a flow all around the building.

- I am concerned about maintenance of the mega bench; wood gets wet and stained. Is there a way to make it more durable? The durability of all materials needs to be reconsidered. Lighting will play a big part in showcasing the gem of the building.
- I would have no problem if the building was taller.
- Can the soffit be damaged with rocks?
- I cannot review the project with respect to materials so it is hard to comment at the moment. The package needs to be more embellished. The materials are not labelled. The elevations look transparent but I do not think the west side is. We need more resolution on materials.
- The mega bench could be brown concrete. The concrete seating areas in Olympic village seem to work.
- I like the idea of the waterfront unobstructed as much as possible.
- Vis-à-vis the sightline from the water; the upper deck looks like an eyebrow looking out at you. The south face is harsh with a sliver where the deck is.
- The west wall is 45 feet tall; it will feel like a back alley. Is there some opportunity to diffuse it, perhaps with lighting?
- I really love the tidal plaza. It would be great to make sure that the money is there to make sure that it happens. It is unique; there is nothing else like it in the City.
- One idea to create uniqueness would be in the sawcut designs; you could create a unique identity to the area surrounding the building.
- I have mixed feelings about the mega bench; it is kind of fun.
- The intertidal deck will be very interesting.
- Thank you for an extremely thoughtful presentation; the project has fantastic potential as a gathering place and terminus, it is going in the right direction. I support you fully.
- Perhaps the building could cantilever at the back corner for porosity.
- I do not want to sit on concrete.
- My biggest concern is the cost. I am worried that the budget will have ramifications.
- The materiality needs to be proven out and brought back to ADP.

Presenters' comments:

- In terms of fundraising, the City is responsible for public realm and has a separate budget. The Presentation House Gallery has been given \$2.5 million by the City and has to fundraise the balance for the building.
- We are still in the exploration phase and are more than happy to come back to discuss the materials and public art plan.
- With regard to the western edge there is a 1.5 metre easement. Our intention is to soften the "alley". We have a program constrained on all four sides. We would have to fill in somewhere else. The surface will be light and reflective and luminous; we hope there will be no sense of darkness in the daytime. It is an urban space. It might not be as interesting to have the building in full openness. There is an opportunity to bring in small scale detail to bring it down to the human scale; we can mitigate the west elevation further. The Washington Marine building is open on their side.
- We understand the concerns re materiality and look forward to showing the Panel the model.
- The sun shines into the plaza in the afternoon.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Foot of Lonsdale Project and Rezoning Application for the Presentation House Gallery and recommends approval of the project as presented. The Panel commends the applicant for the quality of the proposal and looks forward to further clarification of the follow items:

- The “mega bench”;
- The development of the west elevation and how it meets the lane;
- Further exploration of the exterior overhang spaces;
- The main façade material, an understanding of the soffit of the building, and all the building materiality;
- Materiality for the public realm; and
- Further development of the design details for the project.

**IN ADDITION** the Panel would like to see:

- Contextual sections with more clarity, including a view analysis that includes a view plinth looking out to the marina;
- More drafting clarity with respect to drawings that are to reflect the lighting plan and with the materials labelled.

The Panel believes the PGE station should be preserved and relocated from the site to a more appropriate location for this heritage resource.

**Carried Unanimously**

*H. Besharat rejoined the meeting at 8:40 p.m.*

*B. Harrison, Chair, declared a conflict of interest due to his professional involvement in the next project being presented and left the meeting at 8:45pm. Y. Khalighi took the Chair.*

### **3. 117-135 West 1<sup>st</sup> Street (Rezoning Application)**

The Chair read the resolution from the October 16<sup>th</sup> Design Panel meeting.

Cam Halkier, Shift Architecture, reviewed the response to the resolution:

- The building has been simplified and clarified, and there are significant improvements at the lane.
- To calm the façades the brick colour has been changed to a grey to contrast to the heritage building. Roof forms have been simplified. The fins on the north and south sides have been replaced with translucent privacy screens.
- The commercial retail podium has been sculpted to provide recessed entries. Signage is more prominent and no longer a continuous band; each unit has an individual sign.
- The timber beams have been eliminated but retained at the residence entrance.
- Also where the NS and EW lanes meet, the building has been pulled back.
- Retail use in the lane at the corner would push the building up to an eight storey building, and is not being considered.
- Walls on the upper levels have been aligned to calm the façade.

- The podium on the lane now has a recess above the first storey with open air parking to get natural light into the parking lot.
- The wall at the lane has been dropped three and a half feet and with recessed planters for a more human scale.
- Previously, all corner roofs were canted to drain to the interior of the building. They will now drain to the exterior. The roofs have been brought down with a lower slope.
- A garden shed has been added to the community amenity area on the roof.
- At the north east corner the metal panel has been changed to clapboard siding.
- The previous design used 18 " horizontal panel; this has been changed to larger panelling and moved away from the horizontal expression, which has been maintained at the balconies.
- Windows have been added to the south wall of the community amenity space above the lane.
- The new design has vines growing up two stories on the south east corner.
- There has been a preliminary fire and code analysis; a fire wall will not be required.

Bill Harrison, Forma Design, described the landscape plan:

- The plan did not change on the ground plane. The public realm is unchanged and follows the City guidelines.
- The planter slab has been dropped at the podium level so it will feel bigger. We have explored the idea of recycled material which will not rot.
- The roof top scheme has been reviewed to make it very usable. The covered amenity space remains. The stainless steel planters are simple and portable and will make an interesting pattern to walk through.

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

- There is a BBQ in the outdoor kitchen; is there a water supply? **A:** There is a sink inside.
- The greenery on the podium might not be grass? **A:** It will be artificial.
- Is the guest parking secured? **A:** There are two different parking lots: the upper level is commercial parking, the lower level secured for residents and visitors.
- What is the soffit material? **A:** A combination of hardipanel and ribbed metal. We are discussing using wood with the client and fire department. We would like to use it on the four corners of the building however, once we bring the material down we would have a code issue; otherwise we will look at using a panel with a wood grain.
- Did you look into natural light access to the stairwells? **A:** When you come up a half level you have a full length window looking at the mountains which activates the stair. We will not be able to get light directly into the corridor and are hoping to entice people to use the stair as it will be lighter with views.
- Why are the end units on the first floor higher? **A:** They have higher ceilings; they are the highest value units. We want to articulate the mass of the building.
- There is access to commercial parking though the back of the stores? **A:** Yes.
- Where is the delivery zone for the CRU's? **A:** It will take place on 1<sup>st</sup> Street. **Staff:** The City provides one loading zone per block.
- Will the building be sprinklered? **A:** Yes.
- Will the planters drain? **A:** They have to drain; the roof will take the water away.
- You took the fin away on gridline 3? **A:** We felt the design was better with just the fin on gridline 7; it gives the adjacent deck more light.

- Will the rear decks be lit? **A:** Just ambient light from the apartments. We will do whatever we need to for CPTED. It is a dead end lane so it is important to find a solution.
- There has been talk about cut outs in the lane to grow vines up the wall? **A:** The City will have to allow it as the vines need to be protected at the base.
- I like the canopy; the retail canopies are skinny? **A:** They are seven feet and extend out to the property line. The residential canopy is larger because the building is set back.

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

- The design is much improved especially with the colour change. It helps to have the opening in the lane; it would be better if you added some greenery to it.
- There is a lot of roof surface on the building; I encourage you to capture storm water to irrigate the roof and street planting rather than it all going into the drains.
- It is a better solution to have moveable planters on the roof; if the residents do not use them, they can be changed. It allows flexibility. The improvement will work well.
- It is nice to see the roof issue resolved. Nice to see the entry ways to retail have been recessed. The façade looks much more attractive.
- You have positively responded to most of our comments.
- I suggest changing the stair corner colour on the north façade from dark to light; having two tones on the same plane does not contribute to it reading as a vertical element.
- There have been some improvements on the south elevation; the reveal lines on the concrete and expression can take further improvements.
- I find one of the nicest elements is the fin at gridline 7; there is a good opportunity to repeat it between gridline 7 and 1 at the balcony. It is a large building; the fin element reduces its scale and is a positive element that can be repeated.
- I am supportive of the project.
- I would like you to consider exploring the choice of material and location of soffits.
- There is a proportionality issue relating to the windows; the proportions need further exploration perhaps through the use of a different window form so it does not appear repetitive or the use of darker and lighter tones.
- I have a problem with the use of hardi in a panel form. Does it require a sleeker panel? Perhaps the corner could be metal. I like the use of the brick. I am not convinced about the entry; the timber could be repeated elsewhere to tie it together.
- I support moving the walls back and the calming of the general massing. I am not in support of removing the fin. Now it is calmed the building needs it. The soffits should be in wood. The design needs more wood.
- I support taking the stair material up and around. I would like more glass in the stairway.
- The wood canopy is great; it is very elegant.
- I would encourage more porosity to the retail stores from the parking so that people feel welcomed.
- It is a positive move to pull the second floor back.
- You should break up the lane façade by repeating the colour used on 1<sup>st</sup> Street above the commercial units.
- I would support the applicant in adding more greenery on the lane façade.
- The changes at the rear are a good thing for natural surveillance. The greenery increases territoriality. Lighting on the lane would increase safety.
- **Question to staff:** Is there a way to connect people from the lane to Rogers Plaza? **A:** The grades do not work.



**ADP Architect's summary:**

- Lighting treatment should be integrated into the lane.
- More green should be added to the podium to the lane façade.
- Continue the brick material and wrap to the lane.
- Consider additional glazing from the parking to the CRU's.
- Consider the use of wood soffit and extending the materiality into other parts of the building.
- Consider a more permanent robust material such as metal panel.
- The enclosure around the stairs to have a vertical extension and horizontal expression that is uniform.
- The fin on grid 7 should be repeated on the south elevation.
- Continue exploration of window proportions.
- Develop a storm water management plan.

**Presenter's comments:**

- Our approach is that the Design Panel and City are part of the team. The comments from last time led to a better building. We can take what has been said today and layer on some additional tweaking of the design. We are not sold on the second fin but will look at it again. We will recommend wood for the soffit and will work with the code people to bring it down the façade.
- There has to be a storm water management plan to go the City so it will be looked at and incorporated into the plan.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 117-135 West 1<sup>st</sup> Street, and recommends approval subject to the approval, by the Development Planner, of the following:

- The lighting treatment to be integrated into the lane;
- The addition of more greenery to the lane façade;
- Continuation of the brick material wrapping to the lane;
- Consideration of adding glazing from the parking to the Commercial Retail Units;
- Consideration of the use of wood soffits and extending the wood appearance materiality into the siding of the vertical fins, and other parts of the building as appropriate;
- Provide more permanent robust material such as metal panel (in lieu of the hardipanel everywhere) on the corner (location such as the white prominent façades);
- Further consideration of the enclosure around the exterior wall surrounding the stairs to provide a uniform vertical extension and continuing this material horizontally so it appears uniform;
- Repeat the "fin" expression and wood appearance cladding on grid 7 on the street elevation, and on the south elevation so the building parts appear more uniform; and, thereby replacing the privacy screen indicated on grid 7;
- Continued exploration of a different window proportion/size in particular sections of the façade to avoid their monotonous repeating appearance; and
- The development of a storm water management plan.

**Carried Unanimously**

*Y. Khalighi left the meeting at 8:35 pm*  
*C. Perry left the meeting at 8:35 p.m.*

*B. Harrison took over the Chair at 8:35 p.m.*

**4. Business Arising**

None.

**5. Staff Update – end of the meeting**

E. Adin, reviewed relevant planning development, project and policy items from the October 21<sup>st</sup>, 28<sup>th</sup> and November 4<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Council meetings.

**6. Design Award Consideration**

This was discussed.

**7. Other Business**

The Chair encouraged members to visit the suggested sites for the design tour.

**8. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:55 pm.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, December 11th, 2013.

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Chair