

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, March 19, 2008**

MINUTES

- Present:** K. Hanvey, Chair
A. Hii, Vice Chair
T. Cailes
J. Heilman
N. Paul
R. Spencer
P. Winterburn-Chilton
- Staff:** G. Venczel, Development Planner
E. Maillie, Committee Secretary
G.C. Penway, Deputy Director, Community Development
C. Perry, Development Services
- Guests:** K. Halex – Architect
S. Levant
A. Whitcelo – Concert Properties
B. Hemstock - PWL Partnership
I. Young – NVSD #44
R. Ciccozzi – Architect
R Woodstock – Architect (Amacon)
B. Heaslip (HYAD)
C. Kovacs – Architect (HYAD)
P. Grant - Architect (NVSD #44)
- B. McLean – Owner
B. Beatson – Cpnert Properties
M. Whitehead – MCM Architects
I. Abercrombie NVSD #44
J. Wollenberg – Consultant
S. Seefeldt - Architect (Amacon)
R. Vrooman (Amacon)
L. Kessler – Architect (NVSD #44)
R. Muruyama – Landscape Architect
- Absent:** K. Kristensen
Councillor B. Fearnley
K. Terriss
-

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

1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held February 20, 2008

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held February 20, 2008 be adopted.

Unanimously Carried

2.

Business Arising

None

3. Staff Update

(a) Applications adopted at Council:

- 648 West 14th Street
- 602-608 Forbes Avenue

(b) 801 Harbourside Drive

In response to a question on the need for the Panel to review this Building Permit application, the Development Planner advised that while the site has been rezoned and design guidelines are in place, ADP is asked to review large projects that have a significant impact on the area.

(c) NVSD #44 Presentations

It was noted that no architect is identified as being associated with the project in the materials presented to the Panel for review. The Development Planner advised that this material is not part of the material to be processed and staff will require that the formal presentation package at the next stage identify the Architects and Landscape Architect involved. The Chair noted that, under the Architects' Act, materials for a project of this nature to be presented to the ADP must be represented by an Architect.

4. 219 West 17th Street – Rezoning

The Development Planner advised that the applicant has now addressed the issues raised by the Panel at its review last month. The Chair read the resolution passed by ADP at that meeting and asked that the Panel focus on the points raised in the resolution. In response to the question from the Chair as to why the applicant is returning to the Panel, the Development Planner advised that staff felt that the direction given by the Panel was not addressed as requested, and that since an alternative approach was used that the ADP should have an opportunity to review it.

K. Halex, Architect, and B. MacLean, owner, entered the meeting and were introduced. The Architect explained that in response to issues raised by the Panel, the following had been addressed:

- A colour angle study was undertaken. The lighting study addresses the summer and winter solstices which have resulted in revisions to interior walls and exterior glazing to introduce more light into the main and upper floors.
- Strawberry bush has been removed.
- Awaiting input from the Fire Department and staff on need for railings at roof decks.

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

- Applicant has made significant improvement in introducing light to the interior space and pleased to see that happening.
- May be privacy issues but owners can respond to those.

- Project appears as an elegant glazed lantern and doors at the top can provide air circulation.
- Rational solution to concerns.
- Commend the applicant for successfully addressing the concerns raised at the last review.

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 of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for a thorough presentation.

Unanimously Carried

5. 233 West 1st Street – DVP Signage

The Development Planner advised that ADP is being asked to consider implications of the signage design and impact on the streetscape. Following this, staff will review the application from a technical point of view and prepare a recommendation in accordance with ADP comments.

S. Levant, representative of TransGlobe Property Managers, reviewed the signage proposed:

- Two fascia signs at the top of the building's north and south sides to identify the building location and owner.
- Two signs at the street edge
- Signage at the parking area.

It was noted that the banner signs shown on the presentation material have been removed.

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

- Is it normal practice for property management companies to be identified as building owners?
- Does the property management company have offices in the building or is it just for branding?
- Why is Trans-Globe is not mentioned in the signage?
- Will the building be painted blue or just have blue signage?
- Location of signage at the top of the building?
- Should space be reserved at the street edge for tenants?
- Could point protruding from the sign be modified to minimize chance of injury?
- Will there be two blue signs on the south east corner?
- In what manner does the signage not conform with signage bylaw?
 - Signage above 2nd storey is not permitted.

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

- First West Centre identifies the building not the name of the company.
- Prefer less signage.

- Don't believe that it's obtrusive but not sure if it meets the bylaw.
- Would have struggled to accept banner signs but signs at top of building are modest and no concerns with signage presented.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the application for Development Variance Permit for signage at 233 West 1st Street (TransGlobe Property Management) and recommends approval of the project and commends the applicant for a thorough presentation.

Unanimously Carried

6. 801 Harbourside Drive – Building Permit

The Development Planner advised that staff have referred this Building Permit application to ADP for review because of its impact within the area.

K. Hanvey stated that, while he deals with Concert Properties on a professional basis, he has no involvement with this project and has no conflict of interest.

Brent. Beatson & Alan Whitechelo – Concert Properties, Mark Whitehead – MCM Architects and Bruce Hemstock PwL Partnership Landscape Architects. Mr. Beatson reviewed the location of the site and advised that a previous proposal for this site has been discarded and this new proposal undertaken. This proposal is for a development with four connected 3 storey buildings. Three key items addressed in this proposal are sustainability, LEED Silver certification (and perhaps Gold certification) and creation of a building that will be as flexible as possible.

M. Whitehead reviewed aerial views of the sites showing the context of the Harbourside Business Park area. The proposed 3-storey development includes a coffee shop at street level on the corner of Fell Avenue and Harbourside Place and balconies around the outside edges of all of the offices. Parking is located at grade. The design and detail as contained in the information package dated March 13, 2008 were reviewed and a materials board with samples of glazing and colours for tower identification was displayed. Geothermal, permeable paving and stormwater management will be addressed on the site.

The Landscape Architect gave an overview of the landscape design as it addresses the building and the street. Outside seating areas are located by each entry tower. A berm on each side of the site shields the view of the parking area from the street. Permeable pavers and landscape rings that allow grass to grow through create a green surface at the interior courtyard. Shade trees are planted within the courtyard and basalt features create a strong element within the parking areas. Stored rainwater will be used for irrigation.

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

- Assume that picture on front of package is an impression only?
- Is café to be a two-storey space?
- Has consideration been given to having public art on this site?
- Has green roof been considered?

- How will stormwater management be handled?
- Rationale for using the four colours at the buildings?
- Maximum height of south side trees at maturity?
- What is the experience walking down Harbourside Drive?
- Can pedestrians see through the site to the waterfront?
- Detail of rationale of ships – white, clean building line?
- Will mullions be included in glazing?
- Glass railings on balcony edge?
- Is there landfill under this site?
- Will benches to be located at Harbourside place facing the water?
- Where is the mechanical plant?
- Discrepancy in sections on northern 3 storey building – which is correct?
- Admire clean aesthetic design of the project - is there a plan to deal with signage for tenants?
- Building exterior finish other than glazing is metal panel – will slab edging be white painted concrete edge?
- Solar altitude angles show solid passive design – are there additional strategies to deal with this on the west side?
- Will the development be phased and, if so, in which order will buildings be developed?

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

- Location of driveway at Harbourside Place may be dangerous.
- Character area of waterfront area not followed in building but see it in landscaping.
- Colours seemed wild and may benefit from being toned down.
- Would like to see rendering of neighbouring building.
- Like the concept and good addition to the area.
- See no reason to have trees on the south side.
- Like clarity and order of the scheme and simple forms and shapes - nice office space.
- See difficulty in fitting into the guidelines for the area and urge applicant to consider detail under balcony edge – end up with less than 3 feet especially on north side which could be dark.
- Building is appropriate for where it is and landscape design is good.
- Departs from guidelines and understand that focus will be towards the water but would like to see public art throughout the site.
- Trees give shade and allow view to the water and sun protection.
- Favourable comment – strong scheme – passive and sustainable design strategy laudable.
- Good scheme and support colours on circulation towers.
- Simple building and detail must be carefully addressed.
- Strongly support development of further solar shading on north side and on south side too.
- Landscape design good.
- Development imperative to provide parking and courtyard provides a good opportunity for outdoor amenity space in the sun.
- Keep the roofs clean.

Applicant's comments:

- Courtyard seating is good notional idea but don't believe that people will lack amenity space. Tenants have balconies and Harbourside Park and benches are available.
- Cognizant of driveway issues and will follow through.
- Overhang will be reviewed.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the building permit application for 801 Harbourside Drive (Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership) and recommends approval subject to the approval, by the Development Planner, of the following:

- **Review of driveway locations/access to ensure traffic safety.**
- **Ensure that if any mechanical plant is required on the roof it is not visibly obtrusive.**
- **Consideration of public art.**
- **Further development of the passive solar shading strategy to ensure that solar control on the western facades is adequately addressed.**

Unanimously Carried

7. NVSD #44 – Former Lonsdale School Site

The Development Planner asked the applicant to give an overview of the development proposals and density bonusing for the benefit of new ADP members.

The Chair read the drafts of the resolutions passed by the Heritage Advisory Commission on March 11th and by the Advisory Planning Commission on March 12th.

I. Abercrombie and I. Young – NVSD, J. Wollenberg – Consultant, R. Ciccozzi – Architect, S. Seefeldt and R Woodstock – Architects (Amacon), R. Vrooman (Amacon), C. Kovacs – Architect and B. Heaslip (HYAD), L. Kessler and P. Grant, Architects (NVSD #44) and R. Muruyama – Landscape Architect were introduced.

J. Wollenberg advised that the NVSD #44 is proposing to relocate its current administration centre to the site of the former Lonsdale School site in a new building to be designed to accommodate the Artists for Kids' Gallery. A portion of the site behind the new administration centre will be donated for a non-market housing development to be undertaken by HYAD (Housing for Young Adults with Disabilities) and the balance of the site will be sold for market residential development. The funds from the sale of this land will be used to fund the new administration centre and gallery since this type of school facility is not funded by the province. When the new administration building is complete and the existing one is no longer in use, the Queen Mary School site will be reconfigured and the site of the existing administration centre and its parking lot, will be sold for market residential development. The revenue derived from the sale of these lands will fund the new

administration centre and additional funds from transferable density rights will be sold and used to fund the restoration of Ridgeway and Queen Mary Schools. Previous direction from the Panel encouraged greater density on the Lonsdale site but feedback from the neighbourhood does not encourage this.

It is proposed that Lonsdale School be demolished and materials and features from the school be integrated into the design of the new developments on the site. The heritage Chestnut trees at 22nd Street and Lonsdale will be retained with the exception of two which must be removed to create a fire lane. The City is encouraging single vehicle access into and out of the site at West 21st Street. The school building will have 86 parking stalls and the residential development has 256 parking stalls.

Site Landscape - The Landscape Architect reviewed the landscape design which addresses the site as a whole and links its three components. Historic Chestnut trees along 22nd Street and Lonsdale Avenue have been reviewed by an arborist and will be retained with the exception of two being removed to provide fire access. The root zone of the trees must be protected and buildings setbacks address this. The existing Ray Sargent will be retained and the City is being asked that consideration be given to integrating it into the site development. Pedestrian circulation for residents and public were explained. Materials from the old school will be used in the landscape and paving. Some of the Black Locust trees at Ray Sargent Park will be removed to improve the approach to the gallery.

Question -

- How will planting conditions address the significant amount of large planting on suspended slab?

HYAD (Helping Yong Adults with Disabilities) - B. Heaslip, Consultant for HYAD) advised that this organization is formed by twelve families with children 20 – 30 years who have disabilities. A majority of units will be design to Level 2 Adaptable Design. Funding comes from family members and it is hoped that BC Housing will also participate.

C. Kovaks, Architect, advised that this building is 3-storey flat roof construction with 12 units on upper floors for residents and two manager's suites on the main floor. Sixteen parking stalls are provided for this building, eight of which will be designated for HYAD visitors, managers and caretakers. The balance will be available to others on the site. Consideration is being given to introducing more wood on the exterior with hardi-panel on the two upper floors and integrating granite from the school site.

Question:

- Does this development provide sleeping rooms with shared kitchen?
 - o No. All units are separate one bedroom suites with communal kitchen and social room on main floor.

NVSD #44 - P. Grant, Architect, advised that the Administration and Gallery building will be a non-combustible building set back 10 metres from Lonsdale Avenue and 22nd Street. The Artists for Kids' Gallery will be located on the main floor with entries from Lonsdale and from 22nd Street. The streetscape at Lonsdale will create a strong cultural exposure into the gallery.

The administration centre will be located on the upper floors with the top floor to be designated to meeting / function rooms for the School District and Gallery. Levels 2, 3, and 4 will have curtain wall component and there will be a light well down through the centre of the building. Geothermal will be integrated into the building through the Lonsdale Energy Corporation. The exterior of the building will be clay masonry and will complement the adjoining residential development. Timber from the Lonsdale School will be included in the building design.

Questions:

- What is the significance of 4th level setback?
- Building is largely curtain wall with floor to ceiling glass – why does south elevation look like north elevation?
 - o More development is being undertaken to respond to elevations.
- Look forward to seeing development of facades in next presentation.

G. Penway entered the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

AMACON - R. Ciccozzi, Architect, stated that contemporary architecture is being used for this project and the flat roof maintains views for neighbours and reflects the school being demolished. Masonry will be used to replicate materials existing in the Lonsdale School building. Buildings step down to address the slope change through the site and timbers and granite from the school will be integrated into the site design. The development will be mainly one and two bedroom units.

Questions:

- North elevation on 22nd Street seems long – could it break into two at the jog at the roof?

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Why not consider north/south buildings which may also benefit neighbours across the lane?
- To what degree do different parts of the project speak to each other?
- Is Public Art contribution being contemplated?
 - o At Lonsdale: large windows open into the Gallery and considering use for public display to the street; smaller glazing will allow visual access into the working part of the gallery.
 - o Asking the City to consider outdoor sculpture park.
 - o Considering a commemorative component at rounded gallery entry; relocation of arch from school to the south east corner of Ray Sargent Park as entry to the site; photo commemorative display associated with the site in gallery lobby.
- Site circulation – single access/egress to underground parking?
- Cul-de-sac at 22nd for fire and drop-off only?
- Location of access ramp – does lane behind residences at 21st require access to parking areas?
- Is lane used for servicing?
- Why not have access from Chesterfield?
- With many public buildings in the neighbourhood can a parkade be built?

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

- Excited about the gallery and support this location.

- Residential building seems long and massive and would benefit from being broken up in some way.
- Residential buildings could be more elegant and still house same number of people.
- 2-dimensional drawings don't help the Panel – encourage future presentations to show other views of the project.
- The project is heading toward being nice overall but there appears to be consensus that residential building, particularly the north façade facing 22nd Street, would benefit from breaking up the massing.
- Like it but have concerns with massing of two residential buildings.
- Look forward to seeing completion of the gallery building and clean-up of the corner where the playground is.
- Nice green spaces and landscaping heading in a positive direction.
- Consider breaking up buildings.
- Higher building has to be independent but complicates balance of the site for the 3- storey buildings.
- Residential buildings large on the site and create change of grain. Would have liked to have seen studies that consider alternatives but not an easy problem to solve.
- Supportive of the site plan development – siting of buildings and strategy is solid.
- Clear intent to salvage heritage trees is very important.
- Relationship of school administration to the park is very strong.
- Long axis on the east/west is preferable where solar access is easier to control.
- Terrace house model is unbeatable so would not consider breaking up of buildings especially with the tall trees. Buildings will be humane on streetscape and present urban face to adjacent development.
- Like the site planning and development of the landscape with high degree of porosity of the site as a pedestrian walk through the site unencumbered.
- Supportive and going in right direction.
- Hope that traffic study indicates single access at 21st Street is right to do. Would not encourage access off 22nd or chesterfield and strongly encourage developers to retain 21st Street as access even if traffic study says otherwise.

Applicant's comments

Tried to animate buildings with recessed balconies and considered a grand entry but believe that the understated design relates better to the street level.

The Chair read the resolution of the Advisory Design Panel following the first presentation in June, 2007.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the preliminary proposal for the OCP amendment and rezoning application for 2151 Lonsdale Avenue / former Lonsdale School site (NVSD #44 / Amacon / HYAD) and recommends approval in principle and looks forward to future additional details relating to:

- **Provision of Sustainability Statements with detailed commitments for all projects. LEED™ certification is recommended (particularly for the School Board Building), however, projects that do not commit to a formal**

certification process, should commit to providing documentation to the City demonstrating their delivery of sustainability commitments – in a manner similar to the South East False Creek process in Vancouver.

- Architectural treatment of the buildings.
- Further resolution of the landscaping.
- Provision of public art.
- Refinement of building massing of the residential component.
- Review of use of recycled building materials.
- Provision of the Traffic Study report.

Unanimously Carried

8. NVSD #44 – Queen Mary School

J. Wollenberg, Consultant, advised that the main issues in this proposal are the rezoning application to subdivide the property into three sites, two of which will be residential and the third to be Queen Mary School which is to be retained in perpetuity as a school. There will be no changes to the school at this time except the transferrable density and its separation from the residential sites. The City has suggested that consideration will be given to closure of the intersection at 8th Street.

I. Abercrombie, NVSD #44, explained the context of the existing site and the proposed subdivision. Revenue from some of the proposed density transfer would go towards the upgrade of the school. Seismic upgrade of school will cost more than replacement of the school so the upgrade will be delayed until seismic, mechanical and other necessary upgrades such as undersized gym are addressed.

The Landscape Architect advised that some of the issues raised by the Advisory Planning Commission have been addressed. These include landscape at the residential buildings to create privacy at balconies and a buffer to the street. A 25 foot of green buffer zone has been provided at the playing field and residential building. An absorptive landscape area to allow for storm detention and landscaping at playing field edge is being considered. Views from existing buildings are significant and plantings are being restricted to small trees and shrubs to retain these views.

R. Ciccozzi, Project Architect, stated that a contemporary architectural design is proposed for this project using similar materials as on the QM school. Greater articulation is created at the edges of the building and the buffer are at the playing field has been increased to improve separation and CPTED issues. It was also noted that the entry has been relocated away from the roundabout to minimize accidents.

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

- In the event that 8th Street closes how will entrance be addressed for emergency vehicles?
 - o Street will not be closed but closing or narrowing of the intersection may be considered.
- Has any consideration been given for special needs children to live near the school in the housing?
- Proximity of residences to playing field can present problems.

- Previous review advocated strongly for different development of this site driven by the fact that the view down Chesterfield is wonderful and advocating this site as a gatepost. Understand the development imperative and cost but project is uninspiring. Have other forms of massing been considered to create more height. A change in the direction of the playing field may help create a more interesting form.

G. Penway, Deputy Director, Community Development, gave some background of an earlier proposal for development of the site and lack of public support for higher buildings or more density.

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

- Swath of open space to the south by the community gardens and playground would be good opportunity to increase trees and improve the scale/
- Look forward to architectural component in next presentation but believe it is straight forward.
- Wish it could be massaged – creates more of the same on the west side of Chesterfield.
- Consider reorienting the field and addressing the street edge.
- So much potential for views and unfortunate that it is limited to 4 storeys.
- Need more densification close to main corridors.
- Concern with entry on Chesterfield with amount of traffic flow down Chesterfield.
- Understand why we have what is being presented but don't like it.

Applicant's comments

If there were a reasonably clear path in political terms and in community acceptance to more height and density we would have been there but the hard political reality that is not acceptable. SD needs the revenue from this land and need approval

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the preliminary proposal for the OCP amendment and rezoning amendment and rezoning application for NVSD #44 Queen Mary School and recommends approval in principle and looks forward to:

- **Provision of Sustainability Statements with detailed commitments for all projects. LEED™ certification is recommended, however, if the project does not commit to a formal certification process, the developer should commit to providing documentation to the City demonstrating their delivery of sustainability commitments – in a manner similar to the South East False Creek process in Vancouver.**
- **Further exploration of gateway concept (on Chesterfield).**
- **Further review of driveway locations after completion of the Traffic Study.**
- **Further development of both the form and character of the architecture and landscape site design**
- **Consideration of further detail and resolution of the parkade retaining wall at the south property boundary of the southern building.**

Unanimously Carried

9. Other Business

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, April 16, 2008.

Chair

S:\COMMITTEES\ADP 35302420\MINUTES\2008\2008 03 19.doc