

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

**Meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission
Held at City Hall, 141 West 14th Street, North Vancouver, B.C.
in Conference Room A on Wednesday, February 12th, 2014**

MINUTES

- Present: J. Jensen (Chair)
D. Farley
A. Jamieson
P. McCann
B. Phillips
M. Rahbar
C. Sacre
B. Watt
Councillor Bell
- Staff: S. Smith, Planner 2, Community Development
N. LaMontagne, Manager Long Range and Community Planning,
Community Development
G. Penway, Director, Community Development
C. Wilkinson, Planner, Community Development
S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk
- Guests: **845 West 1st Street / 725 Marine Drive (Rezoning Applications)**
Helen Besharat, Besharat Friars Architects
Joe Hutton, Dick Irwin Group (co-applicant)
Floris Vanweelderen, MMM Group (traffic consultant)
Rob Purdy, Chief Financial Officer, Darwin
- Absent: D. Marshall
M. Robinson
Councillor Buchanan
-

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m.

1. Welcome to New Members

G. Penway joined the meeting to thank members for their contribution to the work of the City.

J. Jensen, outgoing Chair, and S. Smith, Planner 2, welcomed new members and all members introduced themselves.

G. Penway left the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

2. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for the period February 2014 to January 2015

It was agreed to elect the Chair and Vice Chair by a show of hands.

S. Smith took the Chair and asked for nominations for the position of Chair. John Jensen was nominated and accepted. There being no further nominations, John Jensen was elected Chair by acclamation.

S. Smith asked for nominations for the position of Vice Chair. Paul McCann was nominated and accepted. There being no further nominations Paul McCann was elected Vice Chair by acclamation.

S. Smith reviewed the process for drafting the resolutions. Important items need to be included in resolutions so that applicants will act on them. Meeting minutes do not provide any guidance. It was recommended that members make brief notes of key points during the discussion period for reference when crafting the resolution. A discussion followed on the process for making motions.

Conflict of interest was also discussed.

John Jensen took over the chair at 6:20 p.m.

3. 845 West 1st Street (Rezoning Application and OCP Amendment)

Staff introduced the proposal to relocate the existing KIA car dealership from Marine Drive to the south side of West 1st Street. The amendment to the current OCP may be required due to the proposed land use, which includes a commercial component; an amendment will not be required if the draft new OCP is endorsed by Council as it includes an updated light industrial use category that permits a wider range of uses. This category is called Mixed Employment. Currently a car detailer and wholesaler operate on the eastern site; Kia uses the other two lots.

The applicant proposes to consolidate three parcels and construct a new car dealership building consisting of a showroom, service department and office space.

Staff asked for the Panel's input on the proposed use as well as the width, directional signage and surface of the two driveway access aisles, the interface between the outdoor vehicle display with the public realm, storm water permeability, signage and lighting, and the pedestrian experience from the sidewalk. This includes the potential of pedestrian/vehicle conflicts at the two driveway accesses.

Helen Besharat, Besharat Friars Architects, outlined the project to the Panel:

- The building mass will be located to the east of the site with the parking on the west side.
- Most of the buildings on West 1st Street have blank facades and parking at the front of the building.
- The two storey building to be built at 4.5 metres, above the flood control level. It will be the first building on West 1st Street to deal with the flood control level.

- Entrance signs have been moved 15 feet from the corner to enhance visibility for exit and egress.
- The canopy has been changed to red to introduce vibrancy to the design.
- There is landscaping along the property line against the retaining wall. There will be a green wall on the front façade.
- Lighting on the site will be LED down-lights, spillage of light from the transparent showroom on to the sidewalk will be inviting to pedestrians on West 1st Street.
- There is a modest amount of storm water management on site.
- The building will meet ASHRAE 2010.
- Special glazing (low e glass) on the west side will combat solar heat gain, the building will connect to LEC, and a solar ready roof element will be installed.
- The proposal meets the intent of the City's Marine Drive Guideline of moving car dealerships from Marine Drive.

Questions from the APC included, but were not limited to:

- How many employees will there be? **A:** Presently 39; it will be over 60.
- Are there staff-designated parking spots? **A:** This is a grey area.
- What is the normal ratio for parking? **A:** There is no normal; some dealerships have none. We are providing 41 non-inventory spots, 39 inventory spots, 8 stalls for visitors, 2 disabled, 6 service loaner car spots, service customer spots.
- Where will the rest of staff park if there are only eight spots? **A:** It is close to public transit; most companies have a car share program. It is anticipated that about 2% of staff will arrive by bicycle, 9% by transit, 9% will walk, so 20% of the staff will not be driving. The total parking provided exceeds the parking requirements of the City. Staff with no spots will park on the street. Irwin could also store inventory in Squamish.
- **To staff:** Does the whole site have to be raised for the flood plain? **A:** There is a flood control level for buildings to ensure they are built above a certain grade.
- Is there additional density available on the parking lot; would they be able to build a parkade? **A:** It would likely require Council approval in the future unless the Amending Zoning Bylaw is more permissive. **Applicant:** We welcome the possibility of adding parking being included in the Bylaw.
- Have you thought about how to address the storm water management concerns of the Advisory Design Panel outlined in their resolution? **A:** Presently, it is limited to the permeable pavers in some parking spots. The recycling and treatment of grey water for washing cars is not energy efficient. Harvesting grey water for so few washrooms is not possible. We are exploring alternatives.
- Any thought to making the south perimeter greener? **A:** There is little room on the south side. We are exploring the possibility of further greening where the car stops are. We would have to talk to BC Rail about greening the wire link fence as it would overhang their property.
- What about the site lighting; will residences from Marine Drive be affected by light pollution? **A:** No, they will all be down-lit LED. There is just going to be enough light to show faces to respond to CPTED at night. The building will be occupied seven days a week.
- **To staff:** What is the OCP amendment? **Staff:** As part of the current Official Community Plan update all light industrial lands are grouped together under a new category called Mixed Employment. We will keep it light industrial but will acknowledge the changing nature of some of the businesses by updating the

terminology to Mixed Employment which could still include automotive retail if the draft OCP does not move forward with this updated land use designation.

Comments from the APC included, but were not limited to:

- I like the project; I like the transparency and the move to West 1st. I would ask for a motion to foresee parking requirements for the future.
- I am happy to see car dealerships move off Marine Drive; it embraces the nature of West 1st Street.
- You should expand the permeable surfaces; use pavers in car inventory spots.
- Within the zoning changes some thought should be given to expansion of the parking structure so it does not overpower the building.
- I would like to see right in, right out entrances; staff should consider traffic calming measures to ensure only right in and right out. People will want to turn left, which would be a danger to cyclists passing by in the bike lane.
- Try to slope off the site so that you do not have to fill the whole site and flood neighbouring properties.
- Swales might be a good option to pick up water from the surface for storm water management.
- It might a good idea to expand the west side canopy to mitigate the heat load.
- Consider a green roof.
- I am concerned about employee parking and street parking.
- I was concerned about the rezoning from industrial, now it makes sense.
- I ride a bike along there so can understand the concern re the driveways; you make a compelling case for two. Moving the signs will help to better see cyclists. Anything to improve visibility will help.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Planning Commission has reviewed the OCP Amendment and Rezoning Application for 845 West Street and recommends approval, subject to the approval of City staff, of the following:

- That the applicant include provision for future parking capacity;
- That more permeable surface area be used in the parking area and bioswales to enhance storm water management; and
- That staff work with the applicant to provide additional traffic calming measures to reduce left turns out of the subject site, in part for the safety of cyclists in the bike lane; and,

The Commission supports the OCP amendment in principle.

Carried Unanimously

4. 725 Marine Drive (Rezoning Application)

Staff introduced the project which proposes to rezone the existing CS-1 (Commercial Service) Zoned property to a Comprehensive Development Zone to permit a new five storey building with a sixth storey bedroom/loft space, inclusive of retail commercial space at grade with residential above. The project will have 85 strata units and 15 rental units. The proposed commercial parking ratio complies with the Zoning Bylaw. The applicant is seeking a bonus of 0.3 FSR for the rental units.

Staff asked for the Panel's input regarding the use, density, massing and height in the context of a predominately four-storey Marine Drive streetscape, the sixth storey loft space's integration into the building's architecture, the materials and colour palette, the exterior treatment at the landscaped patio and plaza areas, the interface with the pedestrian pathway to the south, the retail unit treatment and potential to enhance the pedestrian environment, the retail signage concept, the design treatment of the residential entry, and the design of the western elevation.

Helen Besharat, Besharat Friars Architects, described the project to the Panel:

- The retail on the main floor is very transparent with exposure on Marine Drive and is designed as flex spaces for a combination of small and large retail. Retail has not been very successful on Marine Drive. The density of the project and the new "Shore" building to the south will help the success of retail stores.
- There is a landscaped patio to the west off Commercial Retail Unit 1 and a public plaza on the eastern side which is the proposed site for public art as it is the most visible site.
- The pedestrian pathway along Mosquito Creek will be a positive addition to the public realm; it will eventually connect to the Spirit Trail.
- There is a smooth transition in building height from north to south.
- There is very careful treatment of the south side to respect the privacy of the "Shore" building.
- The units are diverse and are designed to respond to students, empty nesters and different levels of income.
- There are two bedroom and den units; the den could become a third bedroom.
- There is a swale on the south side of the site to manage storm water.
- Solar-ready roof top elements especially for hot water will be installed.
- The heating will be radiant heat baseboard connected to LEC.
- The larger units are adaptable design with 20 units Level 2 and 80 Level 1.
- The development allows for the extension of the bike lane on Marine Drive.
- The project will meet ASHRAE 2010.
- Patterned glass on unit balconies will hide any mess on the balconies.

Questions from the APC included, but were not limited to:

- Where are the rental units? **A:** They will be mixed in but are not designated yet. They will be a mixture of different unit sizes.
- Will the applicant be managing the rental units? **A:** We are open to that.
- 751 Marine Drive seems a lonely bit of property; was the owner approached? **A:** We had an open house last week; the owners attended and wanted to make sure that site is clear for right turns, units close to them need to know that there will be some noise there. The owners are not open to a joint project.
- The rentals will have fixed rent? **A:** They will be at market rental rates.
- Will owners be able to rent out? **A:** It will be typical of other units; not decided yet.
- The building will be a strata; so you will be a member of the strata? **A:** Yes.
- Can you describe the bike facilities for the retail? **A:** Two areas designated for retail and there is a bike rack at front entry for the residential. Showers are provided for cyclists.

- Can you explain the landscaping? **A:** The number of trees on Marine Drive is based on the Marine Drive Streetscape Guidelines. There is a berm and a swale up at the pedestrian walkway and a planted area on the podium.
- What about the roof? **A:** There is a green roof on the second floor and planters for each balcony. There are pots on the top floor.
- Will the Right of Way between the “Shore” development and this application be used to create a pedestrian link? **A:** We are meeting with City staff and the “Shore” representatives on it.
- What about the parking? **A:** It meets Bylaw requirements.
- 68 feet will be the highest building on Marine Drive? **A:** The building form on Marine Drive is predominately four storey but there are projections above.
- Did you consider putting a mural on the south facing wall? **A:** It is a fire wall. Concrete block will be used in two tones.

Councillor Bell joined the meeting at 7:45 p.m.

Comments from the APC included, but were not limited to:

- I like the dual parking offered on the site. The addition of the bike lane is important. I was initially concerned about the position relative to the “Shore” development; but it provides a nice setback with the plaza. It is a great design and the greenway will give a nice separation.
- I compliment the developer on putting together a very solid proposal that will enhance the neighbourhood.
- **To staff:** Is there a plan for the intersection? **Staff:** I am not sure about the long term plans. It has not been resolved.
- The intersection is dangerous for pedestrians using the trail system; will pedestrians be discouraged because of the intersection? You have done a wonderful job with the creek side. The pathway is great.
- I like the project a lot. The architectural details are well thought out. It is pleasing to the environment. I like the treatment of the east and west corners with public nodes.
- I like the idea of pedestrians being encouraged to walk around the site.
- I have no issue with the 6th floor; the lofts are set back.
- Some of the retail along Marine Drive has opaque glass which is very cold for pedestrians. I hope that there is a strategy for dealing with that. The modulation on the main elevations is very interesting because of the setback. I wonder if something like that could be added to the retail level to give depth to the façade so that is it not one straight line along Marine Drive.
- There should be some way to add porosity to the larger of the two plazas; perhaps adding stairs to make it approachable from all sides. The landscaping seems to create a corner; it should be opened to the park.
- Perhaps have a designated carwash area in the parkade.
- I hope that some of the larger units are kept in the rental pool.
- You are going to see the building coming down Keith Road; there is a visual impact with a building lined up with a road.
- I would support four stories plus loft except at the corner as seen from Keith Road.
- The project has no trees on site. Perhaps the retail niches could have trees.

- The eastern end is a signpost; it is very symbolic and needs good public art to define it; it is an urban space and requires real thought on the layout.
- I do not support the massing and height. The 0.3 FSR equals 15 units; about one floor. I do not support 0.3 FSR for market rental; I would support it for below market rental.
- The units are too small for families.
- The Marine Drive Guidelines are still quite recent.
- The building does need expressive character as seen from Keith Road.
- The provision of landscaping is a bit tight; more could be done.
- I would prefer it to be shorter with the same treatment at the back.
- **To Staff:** How are rental units defined? **A:** Each development is different.
- We should give them some credit for rental units. The building will go through a lot of wear and tear because of it and interior materials should reflect that. It will be a disadvantage for the developer to do that.
- I am against lowering the height.
- Re: community donations; maybe a bit more in terms of public art.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Planning Commission has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 725 Marine Drive and recommends approval, subject to the approval of City staff, of the following:

- The Commission encourages the inclusion of larger units (more bedrooms) in the rental pool of units;
- The applicant is encouraged to use high quality materials in common areas inside the building;
- Greater pedestrian permeability to the greenway from the eastern plaza is encouraged;
- The Commission recommends a different treatment, or modulation, of the commercial retail store fronts, and the Commission discourages the use of opaque glass or other efforts to reduce visibility from the exterior;

The Commission supports the greenway and looks forward to further information from staff on the public art component of the eastern plaza gateway.

The Commission supports the height of the proposed building, in principle, in keeping with other development in the area.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the motion be amended by deleting the words “The Commission supports the height of the proposed building in principle in keeping with other development in the area.”

Carried Unanimously

The Commission then voted on the original motion as amended.

Carried Unanimously

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Commission supports the height of the proposed building, in principle, in keeping with other development in the area.

**Carried
6 in favour
2 against**

The presenter thanked the Commission for their comments; they will consider all the comments and felt it was important to have a mix of people; families etc.

There was a short break at 8:30

The Commission reconvened at 8:40 p.m.

5. Duplex Development Permit Guidelines

C. Wilkinson, Planner, Community Development reviewed the proposed Duplex Development Permit Guidelines.

There are five guiding principles: increased housing choice, enhanced neighbourliness, enhance liveability, architectural excellence and variety, and exceptional energy performance.

The Duplex Guidelines do not propose an increase to the maximum allowable FSR, and do not require any changes to the Official Community Plan. The minimum lot size will remain the same.

The approval process would migrate from a Council approval process to a staff approval process based on the parameters set out by Council.

In response to input from the Advisory Design Panel, there will still be an element of neighbourhood involvement in approval of the proposals.

The Guidelines try to lift the cellar out of the ground a little to improve light, air, access and enhance liveability for those residents.

The Guidelines also suggest moving the front setback forward five feet to increase the rear setback to make a more useable back yard.

Storm water management guidelines are still being developed.

The core objectives of the Guidelines are to improve the contextual sensitivity to context, architectural quality and livability of duplex developments on a lot-by-lot basis.

The Guidelines seek architectural excellence because duplexes have high visibility in the City landscape as they take up the majority of residential land. The City is currently proposing to rezone the remaining "Single Family" One-unit Residential lots in the Mid-block area to a "Duplex" Zone based on the existing RT-1 Zone. The draft

Official Community Plan proposes to make all duplex development subject to Development Permits.

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

- What if the neighbours are against the extra height? **A:** If an application strictly complies with the permit, staff are compelled to issue the building permit. If an applicant felt that they complied and staff disagreed, it would have to go to Council. Variances would require council approval.
- Will there be a route for appeal? **A:** It exists now in our Zoning Bylaw. We would report to Council outlining the issues; the applicant would request to be a delegation and Council would make the decision.
- Why is it just in the midblock area? **A:** The Guidelines have been drafted in a way that they could apply to other designated Level 2 areas in the future.
- Are you going to allow flat roofs? **A:** We will support all building forms; the uppermost storey would be at 22 feet.
- How will you deal with privacy concerns with adjacent windows? **A:** The Guidelines discourage habitable rooms of competing uses facing each other. This is vetted in our current process.
- Are we requiring four off-street parking stalls? **A:** That is the current Zoning Bylaw requirement.
- I am not sure about affordability as one of the guiding principles; it is difficult to find a duplex for under \$1 million.
- Are duplex lots allowed laneway homes? **A:** Coach houses are not allowed accessory to a duplex, only to a single family home.
- Will neighbours be bothered by the secondary suites? **A:** Duplexes are permitted to have them today. The Guidelines are just making them more liveable.
- What about garage treatment – having two carports rather than a four car garage? **A:** The standard approach currently is a two car garage with an open carport on each side.
- Can you treat a secondary suite as a laneway home? **A:** Not in duplex zones.
- Could there be something put in the landscape requirements for outdoor lighting? **A:** Yes; it depends on the wording.
- It seems a good idea to take some heat off Council with the number of small applications.
- The development permit process is common in other municipalities.
- What is the size of a secondary suite? **A:** It is a proportional relationship to the main unit: 40% or 990 square feet.
- Are basements allowed in garages? **A:** Staff have reported to Council in response to a request to investigate. Cellars are not prohibited.
- I like the Guidelines with the diagrams. It is very useful.
- Re: storm water: I encourage green roofs, especially on garages. It would also conserve energy. You should put something in about passive solar gain.
- Where are the other RT-1 areas? **A:** The vast majority are in the midblock area.
- What do I gain as a homeowner? **A:** People are concerned about resale value. It is positive; creating a higher degree of certainty for the development industry, and positive for assessed value: properties have been assessed at a two-unit rate for approximately five years.
- Did anyone opt out? **A:** We received one letter but think they may have been confused.

- Will there be a review in the future? **A:** We are not proposing it at this time.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Planning Commission has reviewed the proposed Duplex Development Permit Guidelines and recommends approval, subject to the approval of City staff of the following:

- That there be a maximum of two enclosed parking spaces out of the four required spaces;
- That the guidelines encourage green roofs to reduce rain water run off; and
- That passive solar gain be considered under energy efficiency measures.

The Commission supports the five policy revisions; and

The Commission supports the possibility of the provision of storage space in or under garages.

Carried Unanimously

6. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission held January 8th, 2014

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission held January 8th, 2014 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

7. Business Arising

Reminder that the next Commission meeting will be on February 27th to discuss the OCP.

S. Smith handed out information on future OCP Community Engagement events.

8. Staff Update

S. Smith reviewed relevant planning development, project and policy items from the January 13th and 20th Council meetings.

9. Other Business

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission will be held on Thursday, February 27th, 2014.

Chair