

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, February 20, 2008**

MINUTES

- Present:** K. Hanvey, Chair
A. Hii, Vice Chair
T. Cailles
J. Heilman
K. Kristensen
N. Paul
R. Spencer
K. Terris
P. Winterburn-Chilton
- Staff:** G. Venczel, Development Planner
E. Maillie, Committee Secretary
C. Perry, Development Services
R.H. White, Director, Community Development
- Guests:** G. Crockart – Architect T. Clark – Applicant
C. Moorhead – Architect D. Porter & J. D'Eath – Applicants
K. Halex – Architect B. MacLean – Developer
D. Thomson – Landscape Architect
- Absent:** Councillor R. Fearnley
-

A quorum being present, the Development Planner took the chair and called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and introduced Richard White, Director, Community Development. Introduced Richard White

1. Welcome New Members

Richard White welcomed new Panel members T. Cailles – Business Representative, J. Heilman – Construction Representative, and K. Kristensen – Landscape Architect.

2. Overview of Meeting Process

R. White gave an overview of the Panel's role and advised that Councillor Fearnley is the Council liaison for the ADP. The Panel was referred to the material provided on conflict of interest for personal or business reasons. Major projects now underway in the Planning department include the Central Lonsdale Planning Study which is undertaking a comprehensive review of the central Lonsdale area and a number of projects are anticipated along Marine Drive.

R. White left the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

The Development Planner took over as chair and reviewed meeting processes on voting, conflict of interest and public attendance.

3. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

The meeting then proceeded to the election of Chair and Vice Chair for the period February 2009 to January 31 2009. The Panel agreed to election by a show of hands and the Chair asked for nominations.

K. Hanvey was nominated for Chair. The nomination was accepted.

R. Spencer was nominated for Chair. The nomination was declined.

N. Paul was nominated for Chair. The nomination was declined.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT Kevin Hanvey be elected Chair of the Advisory Design Panel for the year ending January 31, 2009.

Carried

Nominations for the position of vice Chair were requested.

A. Hii was nominated for Vice Chair. The nomination was accepted.

J. Heilman was nominated for Vice Chair. The nomination was accepted.

The nominees gave an outline of their backgrounds and left the room while the election took place.

The nominees left the meeting.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT Augustine Hii be elected Vice Chair of the Advisory Design Panel for the year ending January 31, 2009.

Carried

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT J. Heilman be elected Vice Chair of the Advisory Design Panel for the year ending January 31, 2009.

Defeated

A. Hii and J. Heilman returned to the meeting and were advised of the decision

K. Hanvey took the Chair and called the meeting to order at 5:55 p.m. and requested that members introduce themselves.

4. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held January 16, 2008

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held January 16, 2008 be adopted.

Carried

5. Business Arising

None

6. Design Awards

The Development Planner advised that in past years the City has given Design Awards for completed projects in the City and ADP has selected the projects to be recognized. To assist in this review, the Panel is being asked to consider striking a sub-committee to prepare criteria to be applied during this review. Completion date for the project is anticipated to be Spring 2009.

K. Hanvey, P. Winterburn-Chilton and K. Kristensen volunteered to participate in the preparation of criteria for Design Awards. The sub-committee will provide update to the Panel on their progress during this process.

7. Staff Update

Council Process

Council has revised the process followed in reviewing rezoning applications and now delays 2nd reading until a later meeting rather than on the evening of the presentation. This may extend the processing time for some applications.

142 West 24th Street

- Went to PH and Council has now rejected it.

Meeting Protocols

In discussion it was confirmed that:

- The advisory body speaks as one voice and comments are not assigned to individuals.
- The Chair can make resolutions.
- Meetings are informal but protocols are followed.

8. 1133 Lonsdale Avenue – Rezoning

G. Crockart – Architect, T. Clark – applicant’s representative, and T. Cherniak – Landscape Architect were introduced.

The Development Planner gave an overview of the project and its relationship to the Central Lonsdale Planning Study (CLPS) now underway. Staff support street improvements along the block as the CLPS is considering the Central Lonsdale area

to be a pedestrian zone and looking to provide a stronger retail at grade to relate to pedestrian traffic. This project is 2.3 FSR while the site allows 2.6 FSR.

The Architect reviewed the location of the site and the context of the area. The site was rezoned a few years ago and then bought by the current applicant, and owner of the neighbouring building, who wishes to create a second office building with retail at the ground level. The retail components will have clear glazing and direct access from the street.

Parking access will be from the rear lane and underground parking to the new building will be combined with that in the existing building which is accessed from the existing entry at the rear. Building scale and elevations were reviewed and exterior finishing materials of metal and glazing were explained. Sustainability detail as provided in the presentation was reviewed.

The building owner will have offices on the 4th floor of the building and signage will also be requested.

Landscape treatment will address the whole block and street treatment will be continued to the north corner, along 12th Street and into the rear lane. Garbage and recycling will be relocated inside the garage and planters will be located to this area. Third and fourth floors of the building will have roof decks with large pots for seasonal colour.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Changes being made to existing building?
- Have City building grades been used?
- Will building be LEED certified?
- Will there be onsite storm water management?
- Interface with neighbouring residential building along the lane?
- Concerns with plantings at rear lane and problems with homeless and drug use in the lane and how this can be addressed.
- Will trees be the same type as existing?
- Has consideration been given to maintaining relationship between buildings but having some distinct differences?

It was noted that the mandate of the Foundation that owns the building, is to serve the benefit of children.

The Development Planner advised that the City is possibly considering density bonus for office space in the City as part of the CLPS process currently underway. Also, proposed signage must be reviewed by staff before it is considered by the Panel.

The Chair read the resolution passed by the APC after their rev

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Mirroring of the first building not compatible. Project would be more successful if slightly different manner applied using same materials.
- Will there be third building if Salvation Army relocates in the future?
- Neighbourhood input is important.
- Need to address north wall.
- Superb job blending building and retail treatment along the street and adds life and ambience to the street.
- Shade device needs to be considered at west façade.
- Hope that Salvation Army will stay.
- Classic building but north façade must be addressed to blend in with Salvation Army building.
- Project is successful at this scale and builds on successful building to the south.
- Well animated streetscape with simple floor plates, stepping back at the fourth floor.
- Concerns at detail level and sustainability relative to ASHRAE which is a minimum performance standard. If considering density bonusing on this site would recommend adoption of LEED rating system.
- Concern with north wall façade – same problems exist in other areas of Lonsdale. And needs to be addressed further.
- Pleased to see the building and office component.
- No problem with repeating architectural vocabulary but there are opportunities that would make it a little different while still relating to the existing building.
- North wall is highly visible and needs to be addressed.
- Interesting to see what would be considered for public art contribution.
- Appropriate for the Panel to say what they think of the building signage.
- Good addition to the street and commend applicants.

Applicant's comments:

North wall is the issue. Have attempted to avoid the blank wall façade but will address it further.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 1133 Lonsdale Avenue (Graham Crockart Architect) and recommends approval, subject to approval by the Development Planner, of the following:

- **Further design review of the architectural treatment of the north wall to enhance its appearance;**
- **Consideration of storm water management for the entire site;**
- **Consideration of sustainability criteria, specifically adoption of the LEED rating system if density bonusing is to be considered;**
- **Consideration of differentiating the two buildings to a greater degree through the introduction of alternate glazing colours and types;**
- **Consideration of a Proposal for public art;**
- **Provision of further details of the signage package.**

Carried

N. Paul declared a conflict of interest, due to her professional involvement in the next presentation, and left the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

9. 256 East 1st Street - Rezoning

C. Moorhead, Architect, D. Porter and J. D'Eath, applicants, and N. Paul, Landscape Architect, were introduced and the architect reviewed the context of the site which is zoned industrial. The house on the site is on the City Heritage Register and the applicants wish to retain it but move it forward towards the street and place it over a single storey commercial building yet to be built. A new commercial building is proposed at the rear of the site with a courtyard separation between it and the heritage house in its new location.

Existing trees at the front of the site will be removed to permit construction of the commercial building at the street and planters will be installed. A sample board with exterior materials and colours was displayed and explained.

Landscape Architect reviewed the proposed landscape design to address this narrow site in an industrial area. The south facing front entry will have large specimen Japanese maple with planter boxes and plant material that spills down. The interior courtyard is shady and a rain garden effect is proposed with raised planter beds. The roof top at the rear has a deck will have planters with hedging and plant. Permeable material will be used at the rear lane and consideration is being given to having a rock pit under the driveway so that water from the roof and patios will be directed there.

The Development Planner advised that staff concerns have been raised on responsibility for landscape maintenance in the event of more than one owner on the site. Overlook and privacy may also be issues. Staff is happy to have the heritage building maintained and with its relocation to the front of the site but there are concerns that the wide stairs at the street make it seem like a public space rather than entry to a private house. Staff would like the stairway to be narrowed to indicate that this is private space.

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

- How will the house be relocated to its new location?
- Will an extensive mechanical system will be necessary for the industrial space under the house?
- Will the main entrance to the industrial space be from the south side?
- What will be done to alleviate potential threats to the building to the west and footing?
- What is the rationale for moving the house forward to the south?
- Slope at parking from lane is 11% - has this been approved by the City?
- Is work underway already?
- Has a heritage consultant been retained?
- Has noise attenuation been considered if there is an industrial use under the house?
- Stairs at front will be semi-transparent – what is the detail?

The Development Planner advised that staff will be looking at uses in the Zoning Bylaw to make sure that type of uses will not be disruptive to residents.

The Chair read the resolution passed by the Advisory Planning Commission after their review of the project.

N. Paul left the meeting at 7:45 p.m.

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

- Good addition to this area.
- Concern would be treatment at the end of the stairs but confident that team will create a successful project.
- Innovative and interesting project.
- Refreshing mixed use in different forms but question the move of pushing the house forward, especially with the streetscape on 1st Street which is industrial in character.
- The house is squeezed in between two buildings and office space would fit better to the south.
- Appropriate for consideration under heritage award program.
- Interesting scheme – think streetscape will be fine in this area and off the lane is not an attractive area. Believe it will be successful.
- Project with enormous damage and needs.
- Don't support staff concerns that stairs should be narrower. This is the right architectural approach but rendering suggests that the stairs are monolith that the building above sits on. Stair needs to be solid – cast in concrete with concrete or slate treads. Open stairs would be messy over time.
- Stairs should turn to the west on the driveway.
Nicely thought out scheme and look forward to completion.

Applicant's comments:

Agree that, while staff does not support it, this project needs strong stair at the street.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 256 East 1st Street (Charles Moorhead Architect) and recommends approval of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for a thorough presentation.

Defeated

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 256 East 1st Street (Charles Moorhead Architect) and recommends approval of the project subject to approval, by the Development Planner, of the following:

- **Further development of the stairs on 1st Street and consideration of materials and construction techniques other than those currently proposed.**

N. Paul returned to sit as a member of the Panel at 8 p.m.

10. 219 West 17th Street – Rezoning

K. Halex – Architect, B. McLean – Developer, and D. Thomson, Landscape Architect were introduced and the architect gave an explained the location of the site and context of the surrounding area. It was noted that there are lanes on the east and south sides of the site. The site has lanes on the east and south sides; photos of the existing laneway were displayed.

Three dwelling units with connecting garages between are proposed for the site. Garages will have green roofs. Front entries to the units are from the street and garages are accessed from the east lane. Cellar space is provided under the garage. Outdoor spaces, interior floor plans and access to the roof decks were reviewed. Exterior finishes and colours were explained.

The Landscape Architect reviewed the site plan. Green space will be retained at the street front and evergreen shrubs at the unit entries will maintain visibility from the street. Plantings at the outdoor areas will provide privacy. Permeable pavers will be used at the driveways and hedging at the lane will mark entries. A pedestrian walkway down the lane will provide access to the visitor parking area and roof deck plantings will be visible from the lane.

It was noted that the applicant is asking for a height variance.

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

- Clarify access to the units.
- Do green roofs get full sunlight?
- Is green roof an amenity space or stormwater management?
- What is the City policy for using lanes as access to units?
- Confirmation that these are strata units?
- Entry to main floor at alcove – could high window be added?
- Why not use a reverse floor plan to get living space higher?
- Why not use green roof as amenity space?
- Does project exceed the height envelope?
- Will owners maintain their own garden areas?
- Are you aware that sidewalk is needed at 17th Street?
- Is overlook to neighbouring property being addressed?
- Is relaxation of setback at the east being requested?
- Roof detail?
- How will green roof on frame structure be built?

Comments

- Units seem very dark and central unit has little exterior light.
- Concur with comments on light especially on ground floor.

- Very tight space but overall form handsome – shape of the building and modulation.
 - Would benefit from having living area on second floor to take advantage of views and get light into the unit.
 - Façade of north building – screens are high and would restrict views.
 - Project well put together.
 - Encourage applicant to provide clearer presentation material – difficult to read.
 - Concern that large basement storage area and large workshop, may be turned into a bedroom.
 - Access to rooftop casts shadows on others and assembly could be trimmed.
 - Roof top storage seems excessive for storing outdoor furniture.
 - Would benefit from trimming roof access assembly and relocating living space to the second floor.
 - Would like to have access to green roof at second floor and more windows.
-
- Site development planning is very strong and tightly planned on a challenging site.
 - Form and character of the units is handsome with street appeal.
 - Like the architecture and if we are to consider more affordable forms of housing and intensive land use this is the type of project we need to support.
 - Broadly speaking, supportive but acknowledge and emphasize concerns around light into the units. Don't think open plan helps introduce light.
 - Rather than having a dog-leg stair consider another configuration of stair to bring more light into the units.
 - Concern that tree at lane will block sight lines for cars entering the lane.

The Chair read the resolution passed by the Advisory Planning Commission after their review of the project.

Applicant Comments:

- We hear your concerns about natural light but reiterate that it's an open plan and, taking the fenestration plan into consideration, feel positive that there will have enough light into the main floor.
- Can consider reducing the bulk of the superstructure at the roof access.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 219 West 17th Street (Kent Halex Architect) and recommends approval subject to approval by the Development Planner of the following:

- **Further review of the railings at the second floor green roof above the garage;**
- **Review of the interior space planning and access to the outdoor spaces in order to maximize the access to outdoor space and natural light;**
- **Relocation of the strawberry bush at the southwest lane entry to allow clear sightlines at the lane.**

Discussion on the motion addressed:

Since maximum window limits are already established, how can additional light be introduced into the units?

If the applicant presents a new plan with living areas at the second level I believe that the project come back to the Panel.

The meeting then voted on the motion.

Carried

11. Other Business

The Panel requested that staff give an overview of proposals before the presentations and that the Panel be advised of any particular issues that need to be addressed and included in the resolution.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, March 19, 2008.

Chair

S:\COMMITTEES\ADP 35302420\MINUTES\2008\2008 02 20 E.doc