THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel
Held via WebEx on Wednesday, March 17th, 2021

M I N U T E S

Present:  
N. Petrie  
M. Messer  
S. Mitchell  
M. Muljiani  
K. Ross  
D. Burns  
K. Blomkamp  
M. Tashakor  
M. Rahbar  
K. Bracewell, RCMP

Staff:  
D. Johnson, Planner  
R. Fish, Committee Clerk

Guests:  
H. Reinhold, Deputy Director  
H. Turner, Director, NVRC  
P. Fast, HCMA Architecture  
C. Phillips, PFS Studio Landscape Architect

Absent:  
Councillor A. Girard

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

1. Committee Orientation and Welcome to New Members
   
   D. Johnson took the Chair and welcomed the new members to the Panel. The members introduced themselves.

   D. Johnson gave members a presentation on the advisory body process and introduction to the mandate of the Advisory Design Panel.

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

   D. Johnson asked for nominations for the position of Chair; Scott Mitchell and Mehrdad Rahbar volunteered. There being no further nominations, Scott Mitchell was elected Chair.

   D. Johnson asked for nominations for the position of Vice Chair; Marie Muljiani volunteered. There being no further nominations, Marie Muljiani was elected Vice Chair.
Scott Mitchell took the Chair at 6:00 p.m.

3. **Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held February 17th, 2021**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held February 17th, 2021 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

4. **Business Arising**

There was a discussion on architects being included on design teams for projects greater than 5000 sq. ft.

5. **Staff Update**

Staff reviewed the status of ongoing development projects.

6. **Co-Creation Workshop – ADP Member Invite Request**

Staff requested two members from the Panel to participate in the Co-Creation Workshop scheduled for April 8th, 2021. K. Blomkamp volunteered.

7. **Harry Jerome Recreation Centre**

Staff, P. Fast, HCMA Architecture and C. Phillips, PFS Studio Landscape Architect presented on the Harry Jerome Recreation Center. The main points included but were not limited to:

- Guided by a vision statement and principles that strikes at the heart of community recreation in North Vancouver, built in a natural environment.
- Will incorporate a variety of strategies addressing environmental sustainability.
- Gold certification for accessibility.
- Centennial Theater will remain on the site.
- Access to the site is very constrained and the site slope is quite steep at almost 10m.
- There are many programs to be accommodated on the site.
- Integration with the natural environment is important.
- Framing the building around a central courtyard.
- Programs are arranged in a loop to provide opportunities for cross connection.
- View corridors capture views to the mountains and help with wayfinding.
- Parking will be underground and arrive off 23rd Street from a single parkade entrance.
- Building form is organized to create outdoor spaces with distinct programs for all ages.
- Outdoor plaza has large lawn area for gatherings and recreation.
- Central courtyard provides continuity of public space.
- Site organization creates permeability for people to move and cut through the block.
- The Green Necklace is an important part of active transportation which arrives at the front door and joins through the city.
- Loading in the building is between Centennial Theater and the recreation centre.
- Introduced a large lawn space for play and gatherings.
• Silver Harbour and the children’s area incorporates a large buffer zone to separate the two and contain the active recreation.
• The corridor from the parking to Centennial Theater includes an art walkway and animated the edge to make it more active with a unique paving pattern.
• Outdoor spaces are well and safely lit.
• Taking advantage of water run-off for infiltration and using a range of native plantings.
• Materials include concrete block, upper boxes will be corrugated metal, glass and obscured glass to mitigate glare issues.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

• Has there been any thought to how skateboarders might use the rest of the space? A: We will integrate it as much as possible to reduce conflict in larger areas. We want a welcoming space for everyone and are focusing on an intensive area of the site because the current skate park is its own territory and is well used.
• Have there been discussions about restricting skateboards? A: We are not limiting the site, it is open and permeable but we will keep them away from steps and stairs as an operations issue.
• To staff: What are the anticipated hours of access and operation? A: Same hours the center currently has; 530AM to 10:30PM but will adjust according to demand.
• Is the underground parking secured during closed hours? A: No.
• Is the skate park covered? A: No, we wanted exposure to the site.
• Is there a line of sight into the courtyard area from 23rd? A: At certain locations, once you get to a higher grade. It depends on the elevation of the site.
• Will there be increased congestion at the climbing wall entry? A: It is a multi-functional space. We want to program and still allow for pedestrian flow. The climbing wall has a limited requirement for space and room to move around it.
• Is there a water element? A: There is no permanent water system on site that requires pumps and cleaning of the water, there is only storm water drainage.
• Could you provide more details on what was done for sound buffering in Silver Harbour? A: It is active and quite animated. The font door is the same elevation of St. Georges and there is interconnectivity that allows for easy access. Landscape containment provides a buffer to contain more intense activity. They have space on the south side for varying activities away from the rest of the site.
• Will there be consideration at the main entrance to avoid glare and heat penetration? A: We are looking at something to bring down solar gain.
• Access to the parking off of 23rd Street will take a lot of traffic, why are there not two access points? A: This decision was made based on the traffic engineer’s recommendation, there are other restrictions factored into this decision. We have done many studies with traffic consultants.
• Can the courtyard be partially covered and include a coffee shop? A: There are overhangs around the perimeter with benches and there will be a coffee shop.
• Will the main stairwell be wide enough that people will be encouraged to use them? A: They will be highly visible and as wide as possible.
• Will the roof drainage be hidden inside the roof in-between panels and run out? Will it be within the envelope? A: It will be within the building, coming down centrally.
• Is there an acoustics engineer? A: Yes.
• Why is there only one loading position? A: This is based on actual operational needs.
• To staff: Are there any plans to improve Centennial Theater or will it stay the same? A: We will try to deal with it in the long term Capital Plan.
• Is the ramp overpass going away? **A:** Yes, our stairs wrap down through the lower plaza that engage Centennial Theater.
• Has NVRC provided comments on the interior layouts of the programs? **A:** Yes.
• Will there be drop off daycare? **A:** There will be 2 hour preschool programs that are recreational based but no child minding.
• Are there also ramps up 23rd for accessibility? **A:** If you move east, we’ve taken advantage of the sidewalk moving up.
• Was there consideration in the skate park to include mountain biking? **A:** We are working with a skateboard consultant who is working with youth groups to develop the design. It is intended to be plaza style with a more urban plaza approach.
• How big is the central outdoor courtyard? **A:** 20m x20m.  
• Is there bike parking at the entrance? **A:** Yes, under the overhang of the building.
• Is there an opportunity to add glazing to the upper portion to allow for views of the public art piece on Centennial Theater? **A:** Yes, there are views from the pool on the south side to the outdoor terrace.
• Is site coverage 50% overall? **A:** Yes.
• Have you considered changes to the roofscape? **A:** We will make sure to not put any large scale mechanical equipment on the roof.
• Is the public art corridor the only place being considered for public art? **A:** There will be a public art plan put together for the site.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

• There are some intrusions of the building forms. Clip and taper forms now to keep the view as a strong, appealing and compelling part of building design.
• Excellent integration of the Green Necklace. Good effort to delegate cars further down the list and make pedestrians a priority.
• Focus more on the north west corner facing Lonsdale and the freeway and how to balance that corner to address views from the vehicular vantage.
• Ensure the open unsecured parking has robust lighting.
• There is no natural surveillance in the area until the residential buildings are up. It will be a targeted area for people seeking shelter in the parking garage.
• Look at anti-skate strategies and the issues taking place at the Lonsdale Quay with requests for some covered area. It will have to be dealt with through operations once the building is up, you risk running into substantial issues.
• With no consideration of water in the project, from a mental health standpoint and holistic sensory perspective, to not have auditory elements incorporated into the space, it doesn’t bring in a connection to the north shore feel.
• Consider more strategies for the sound buffering but also have a visual connection, more glazing or raising the building will connect it more to the recreation center.
• Drop-off and loading zones do not seem to be enough for such a facility. Look at adjacent streets to see if there could be temporary or hourly parking.
• Concerned with the traffic flow and how it will work with different directions of cars.
• St. Georges and 23rd Street parking access will get difficult.
• Consider how cyclists and cars will interact with drop-off and pick-up.
• Look at mechanisms to help solar exposure of the southern part of the building.
• Consider the location of the art and ensure it’s not an after thought.
• Could incorporate an entrance on the west of 23rd Street under the multi-purpose area at grade but it may impact other aspects of the building.
• Consider leaving a hidden channel where retractable screens could be introduced.
• The landscape is well handled with the integration of the interior and exterior and how they compliment each other on such a large site.
• Integration of rain gardens at the top of the slope might be affected. There may be an opportunity for integration at the bottom of the slope.
• The architecture creates many opportunities for relationships between the massing and breaking down large program areas.
• Sustainability needs to aim high on those targets.
• The loading area is concerning, north-south access may not be successful. You don’t need to celebrate pedestrians at the loading area.
• There are big areas of glass where highway noise may be generated.
• Materials of the building are timeless and classic.
• Planning around inside and outside integration of landscape is well done.
• There may be an opportunity for outdoor spaces that are covered for a portion of the year for different types of weather.
• Consider public art at the entry or integrated into the building.
• Consider moving the existing art piece to let people enjoy it.

Presenter’s comments:

• Will protect the views as we develop the massing and form.
• Agree with comments around lighting and will prioritize that.
• Will address the Silver Harbour comments.
• We have been to ITC twice with review of the key traffic and drop-off area issues.
• Recently completed energy modeling and are still crunching data.
• Will consider the comments around solar loading of the atrium.
• Acoustics are always a big concern.
• A Harry Jerome tribute will be incorporated into displays inside the entrance.
• We are confident that 23rd Street and parking garage access works well.
• We will be conducting a public art planning process in the future.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Harry Jerome Recreation Centre application and recommends approval of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for the quality of the proposal and their presentation.

Carried Unanimously

8. **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

The next meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, March 31st, 2021.

__________________________
Marie Muljiani, MC, RCC
Chair