

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, July 16, 2008**

MINUTES

Present: K. Hanvey, Chair
T. Cailles
K. Kristensen
N. Paul
R. Spencer
K. Terriss
P. Winterburn-Chilton
Councillor B. Fearnley

Staff: G. Venczel, Development Planner
E. Maillie, Committee Secretary
C. Perry, Development Services
K. Russell, Development Planner

Guests: I. MacDonald – Designer
M. McMains – Designer
C. Moorhead – Architect
B. Curtis - Designer
N. & I. Calla - Owners

Absent: J. Heilman
A. Hii
J. Bitar

A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held June 18, 2008

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held June 18, 2008 be adopted.

Unanimously Carried

2. Business Arising

None

3. Staff Update

(a) 654 West 15th Street – Smart House

The Development Planner referred to the City Clerk's letter and Council resolution requesting that staff work with an applicant who wishes to pursue an alternative plan to build housing that addresses affordability by creating partially finished units. It is anticipated that this proposal will come to the advisory bodies in the fall for consideration and recommendation to Council.

(b) Larson House

At the request of the applicant, the basement plans were revised to include a 3-piece washroom; the wet bar addition was rejected. Council approved the project as revised.

(c) NVSD #44 – QM and Lonsdale School Sites

The OCP amendments and rezoning applications for Lonsdale and Queen Mary School sites, received 1st and 2nd Reading at Council this week. The developer has now withdrawn from the project but the School District anticipates other developers will come forward.

4. Coach House Community Working Group – Update

K. Russell, Development Planner, gave an overview of the process of the Coach House Community Working Group as they work toward developing design guidelines for coach house development in the City. Members were appointed by Council; Bob Spencer is the ADP representative on the group.

Single family zoned areas (RS) with potential for one unit development have been identified and were displayed on a City map. A "Coach House" is described as a detached secondary suite which must be rental. While a coach house must be smaller than the main house on the site, no ratios have been established at this time. Some of the benefits and issues of coach house development identified by the Working Group were reviewed.

An information report will go forward to Council at the end of July. The group will prepare guidelines in the fall and ADP will have an opportunity to review these before they go forward to Council for consideration later this year.

5. 346 East 8th Street – Infill

The Development Planner advised that this proposed infill development was reviewed by the Panel in late 2007 but following input from neighbours at the Information Session, the design was revised.

I. MacDonald, Project Designer, reviewed the location of the property and advised that the existing heritage house will be retained and will be added to the City's Primary Heritage Register. The proposed infill will be located at the rear on the west of the site with a side yard to the east. The design of the infill addresses the heritage house through its roof design and siding. A materials board was circulated and the interior layout was explained.

A parking variance is requested. Two tandem parking spots are provided in the driveway; no parking is provided for the infill. Engineering Department is recommending removal of the driveway and no on-site parking.

The Landscape Architect reviewed the outdoor space and explained the design layout which establishes privacy and delineation for each of the units. The existing tree in the middle of the site between the houses will be retained. Permeable paving materials are used throughout. The driveway is located on the west side at the street front. Access to the rear infill is at the street.

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

- Rationale for room locations?
- Why is the building so high?
- What does "lane dedication" at the rear of the infill mean?
- If and when lane is built would retaining walls and grading be required?
- Will covenant be placed for heritage designation?
 - House will be placed on primary heritage register.
- How can it be assured that infill will not become two units?
- Is existing house changing in any way?
- What concerns did neighbours have with the earlier proposal?
- Does the existing topography drive the split level section or is it a planning device?
- Are windows shown accurately?
- Is roofline correct showing no rainwater gutters or leaders
- Does roof finishing material turn onto the fascia/barge board?
- Is chimney suppressed within the building?

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

- Modification of the roofline to reduce height by 3 or 4 feet would save money and be more friendly to the neighbourhood.
- Suggest removing one of the three bedroom windows and spacing the remaining two.
- Seems a little barnlike while the existing building is a traditional form.
- Off-site parking would create more livable option for residents.
- Concerned that there is a potential to have four units on this site.
- Like the project .
- Strong scheme and only concern would be with detail. This is a traditional residential form and to create a stripped down minimalist interpretation successfully, the detail must be exquisite. If eave detail is completely suppressed and it is gutterless then it will be recommended that time be spent on working carefully through the details.

Applicant's comments -

Believe that absence of parking would make project less livable. Will be happy to consider asymmetrical roof if recommended by the Panel. Sidewalk will be widened to 6' and stairs will be pushed away from the street. The owner acknowledged that

potential number of units is a concern in the neighbourhood but it is the owners intent to create more family living space and not add suites.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 346 East 8th Street (Ian MacDonald. Mary McMains. Myles Mackenzie) and recommends approval subject to the approval, by the Development Planner, of the following:

- **Reduction of roofline height and consideration of an alternate roofline profile;**
- **Further safety review of the driveway by engineering staff;**
- **Application of covenant to prohibit development of a secondary suite.**

Unanimously Carried

N. Paul declared a conflict of interest due to her professional involvement in the next project and left the room.

6. 2600 Western Avenue – Rezoning

The Chair read the resolution passed by the Advisory Planning Commission on July 9, 2008.

The Development Planner advised that current zoning is RS-1 Level 3. The applicant had considered curb cuts along 26th Street but Engineering did not supportive this. Engineering supports residents parking on the street and prefers that driveways not be added along 26th Street. They will also be asking for sidewalks to be installed to make it more pedestrian friendly.

C. Moorhead, Architect, reviewed the location and context of the site. It was noted that while .75 FSR is permitted, staff are looking for .65 fsr above grade; the applicant is requesting .66 fsr. A duplex unit will be located at the front of the site with a single unit attached to the triple garage at the rear. Roof ridges are oriented at an angle to minimize impact on neighbour to the north. A model of the proposed development was displayed and a materials sample board was circulated. Exterior finishes included Hardi Plank, asphalt shingles and vinyl windows. Front units will be 1,200 sq. ft. and rear unit 900 sq. ft.

The Landscape Architect explained the fencing, plant detail through the site and street trees. Walkways throughout the site will be of permeable paving.

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

- Depth of light wells?
- Are there overhangs on the property lines?
- Western elevations shows hip roofs and model shows flat – which will be used?
- How will residents access units from the garages?

- Has consideration been given to having north pathway between garages and units?
- Is it intended that residents park on 26th Street?
- Will sidewalks wrap round to Western?
- Will there be a gate at kitchen entry at Unit A from 26th Street?

N. Paul left the meeting at 7:55 p.m.

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

- It would be useful to have sections to explain how the light wells work.
- Access to single unit seems constrained – suggest entry parallel to garage wall to make more comfortable.
- Like design – interesting and different.
- Design is refreshing and like orientation.
- Model is useful to review the design.
- Third unit does not seem to have the same flair as the others.
- Happy with design and creates sense of being along the street.
- Much to like about the scheme but not convinced by the angled position of the buildings on the site. Understand external influences but site planning, urban manners and odd serrated angles leave unsatisfying residual spaces.
- The Chair directed that his concerns be recorded that this form of irregular site planning which disregards existing urban “pattern language” is irresponsible.

Applicant’s comments -

The Architect thanked the Panel for their comments.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 2600 Western Avenue (Charles Moorhead Architect) and recommends approval of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for a thorough presentation.

**Carried
1 – Opposed**

N. Paul returned to the Panel at 8:05 p.m.

7. 342 East 10th Street – Rezoning

The Development Planner advised that this property is zoned RS-1, OCP Level 2.

B. Curtis - Designer, and N. and I. Calla, owners, were introduced. Original house on the site has been restored by owners and propose to use similar materials and architectural treatment on the proposed infill. The new house will use residual fsr on the site (850 sq. ft.).

Hedging on west property line will be retained. Building sections were reviewed and explained.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- How is the upper floor overlaid over the main?
- Percentage of infill to existing house?
- Locations of garbage and recycling areas for each unit?
- Type of muntins on infill?
- Separation of outdoor spaces at infill and house?
- Are light wells being included?
- Section C – should light wells be shown?
- How was orientation of the infill roofline determined?
- Is the house listed on the Heritage Register?

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

- Development of cross sections may clarify the spaces.
- Landscape plan needs more work and better resolution of outdoor spaces.
- Posts on infill don't seem grounded.
- Greater separation between buildings would greatly improve site planning.
- Dormer at west elevation seems unusual.
- Trellises are not represented on drawings – landscape plan to show how outdoor spaces work.
- Drawing content needs to be clearer when presenting to advisory bodies.
- Should not replicate original house when doing infill and would suggest simple windows to create difference.
- East and west site elevations have a lot of building with little residential open space
- With elevated infill backyard spaces would be oppressive.
- Insufficient information on the drawings to properly evaluate.
- Parts of the project skilfully handled but shortcomings fail the scheme

Designer's comments:

Respect comments on windows and will address concerns raised in the Panel's comments.

Owner's comments:

Project started as a garage to the infill presented now which is designed to complement the existing house. The neighbourhood is undergoing duplex development and while the house does not completely respond to the current lifestyles, the applicant has elected to have the house listed on the Primary Heritage Register and add an infill rather than demolish the existing house and build a duplex. It is recognized that while the landscape may not be ideal, it is comparable to others in the area. The applicant wishes to proceed with the project and supports the Architect's work.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 342 East 10th Street (Bill Curtis & Associates Design Ltd./N. & I. Calla) and does not recommend approval pending resolution of the following issues:

- **Clarification of the amount and allocation of open space between the existing house and the proposed infill dwelling;**

- Clarification of site and building sections to show trellis locations and further consideration of the trellis details;
- Further consideration of the overall site plan related to the development of the landscaping;
- Further clarification of the volumetric expression of the infill dwelling. (Note: a 3-dimensional model – physical or virtual – is strongly recommended for the next presentation).

Carried
- 3 Opposed

8. Other Business

(a) Drawings

There was discussion of the quality of materials being presented to the Panel for review. To ensure accurate review :

- sections should be detailed
- context drawings should include buildings on neighbouring sites and print size legible without magnification.

The Development Planner advised that the development information material provided to applicants is being clarified and will be available in the fall.

(b) Solar panels

It was noted that the Panel may be asked to address weight and location of solar panels at some time in the future.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, August 20, 2006.

Chair

S:\COMMITTEES\ADP 35302420\MINUTES\2008\2008 07 16.doc