

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

**Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel  
Held at City Hall, 141 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Conference Room A  
on Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2022**

---

**MINUTES**

---

- Present:** D. Burns, Chair  
L. McKenna  
M. Rahbar  
K. Ross  
M. Tashakor  
Councillor Shahriari
- Staff:** B. van der Heijden, Planner 1, Planning and Development  
T. Huckell, Committee Clerk-Secretary
- Guests:** 311 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
D. Lucio Picciano, DLP Architecture  
Meredith Mitchell, M2 Landscape Architecture (*joined electronically via phone*)
- 758-762 East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Jason Kooner, Applicant  
Pooyan Poostchi, F. Adab Architects Inc.  
Rod Maruyama and Associates Inc., Landscape Architecture
- Regrets:** K. Bracewell, RCMP  
A.M. Llanos  
M. Muljani, Vice Chair
- 

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

A brief round of introductions was completed for the Panel's new Council liaison, Councillor Shahriari.

**1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2022**

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2022 be adopted.

**Carried Unanimously**

**2. Staff Update**

None at this time.

### 3. 311 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street (Heritage Revitalization Agreement)

The City has received an application for a Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) for 311 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street. This would permit the development of a duplex on the same lot as the existing A ranked property located at that address (the Follis Residence). The proposal is in line with other HRA projects in the neighbourhood and includes removing the garage / deck at the rear of the house, and raising the house two feet to create a secondary suite in the basement.

*The Delegation for 311 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street joined the meeting at 5:35 pm.*

D. Lucio Picciano, DLP Architecture, described the project to the Panel. Key points included:

- Aim to keep the heritage house in its utmost original form. It is currently in quite good shape and the lifting won't impact it very much, but will raise the prominence of the house in relation to the street and sidewalk. The lifting will also create a much more livable basement suite.
- We specialize in passive house design, which we are proposing for the infill duplex. It is not possible to upgrade the heritage house to a passive certification.
- The addition being removed at the rear is a post-modern structure, without heritage value.
- The infill design will be contemporary, with some cues creating an allusion to the heritage house.

Meredith Mitchell, M2 Landscape Architecture, reviewed the landscape plan. Key points included:

- Including some low level retaining walls and a low metal picket fence.
- Planting a mixture of material, with amenities for individual units, but also some landscape buffers for the existing units.
- Each unit has functional individual yard spaces.

The delegation presented an animated fly-over video for the Panel.

#### **Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:**

- Curious why you haven't designed any enclosed garages? **A:** We're already densifying the site, so wanted to maximize the open space. Additional garages at the rear would bring the frontage closer to the lane and would make it feel busier at the back. Secondly, would make achieving passive house certification for the duplex more difficult. Finally, the façade is the primary face, even though it faces toward the lane. Enclosed garages would take away from the look.
- Notice that you haven't yet dealt with the garbage design; will it be enclosed? **A:** That level of detailed design hasn't been completed. Will likely have a screening enclosure.
- Would it be possible to raise the heritage house even higher? **A:** We would be open to that, but there has been some discussion with Planning in relation to the adjacent properties, and how the height would compare. We consider 30 inches the minimum but would certainly be open to raising it even higher.
- Would you consider moving the heritage house more to the north? **A:** We would be amenable. The idea of moving it forward was to create more distance between the

existing house and the infill development. Comments from Planning and the Heritage Advisory Commission suggest leaving it at its original placement.

- Why aren't you matching the roof pitch on the infill duplex to the existing heritage house? Understand you wanted a distinct contemporary design, but some heritage elements could have been copied. **A:** In order for the top floor of the duplex to be usable, have the maximum amount of headroom without going higher, and in consideration of the thickness of the walls (which does impact the interior), we are quite commonly left with this form. Allows the interior to be a much more comfortable space. Alternately we would have to raise the peak which is already 3 feet higher than the heritage house. We can't sink it any further, or it wouldn't conform to requirements for light.
- The upper deck, facing north, is large and generous, but the deck facing the heritage house won't get much sunshine. What was the rationale to face the deck north as opposed to south? **A:** This is a perennial discussion in Vancouver, especially in North Vancouver with an attractive view to the north. This configuration minimizes privacy issues with the proximity to the heritage house. Additionally, we are increasingly seeing severe summer weather such that a south facing deck is no longer unquestionably preferable to a north facing deck. We can more easily avoid overheating issues by keeping this deck facing north.
- The aerial 3D view showed parallel fences on the front yard. What sort of design did you have in mind? **A:** An aluminum rail picket. It is a very open design, granting full permeability visually into the site.
- Will the wood material you are proposing be exposed? What protection will it have? **A:** What we normally do with this type of wood is a partial scorching. It closes the cells in the wood so that it can no longer absorb moisture. It is then almost totally protected from UV damage as well. The protection will be in how we treat the wood.
- What solar protection do you have? **A:** Because these will have adjacent buildings, there are two very small windows on that west side; that is deliberate.
- Is the roofdeck between the two buildings accessible to residents? **A:** Yes.
- What amenities are planned for the roofdeck? **A:** It's quite large, works out to almost 300 square feet. We anticipate owners will want to populate it with their own material (e.g. dining / patio sets, sometimes exterior kitchens). That level of detailing has not yet been reached.
- Glad to see you're proposing a passive home, but can you speak to how you will deal with stormwater and any other thoughts on making the property more environmentally sustainable? **A:** We are not at the level of design for mechanical systems yet, but that is certainly on our list. In the past we've done everything from simple rain barrels to full underground systems that include the capturing of all water and reuse for toilets. These types of designs are a lot more affordable now than even five years ago. The most economical systems include a 10,000L subterranean tank. There are some limitations on where that can go, how much rain one needs. Would like to propose to the owner, but there are some limitations. Obviously there is more site coverage with the existing heritage as well as the infill duplex than if it was just a single building. Currently no confirmation or details on whether we're going to go that route. Additionally, most of the landscaping around the heritage building will have an absorbent soil. Expect that any drainage around the heritage building will be able to be drained through soft areas.
- What was the rationale behind all hard surfaces, with no landscaping, in the area of the duplex units adjacent to the lane? **A:** That is surface parking for four vehicles. Once in place we are limited by about a 14 foot strip for the main entrances. In the middle of that area will be the garbage and recycling enclosure.
- Can you elaborate on the entry sequence? Difficult to see from your presentation how you are handling the CPTED issues. **A:** The new fence at the front will have three gated

entries, with visible markers for the addresses. The main entry will be exclusive to the existing heritage house. There is over 10 feet of setback that will provide a sightline to both entries of the duplex.

- How accessible is the landscape? **A:** The landscape is actually sloped in front of the house. Because we are retaining trees in situ, we did some terracing to retain some flatter areas. There are walkways on either side but there is some stepping. We considered designing front yards with grass, but they wouldn't be very accessible, so we explored grading with open lawn areas at the side and heavy tree areas at the front.
- Will a lack of landscaping at the lane affect heat absorption? **A:** The asphalt is a primary concern and may act as a heat sink. We have chosen lighter materials because of that. Some landscaping there, perhaps a vine wall, could improve that. With the dimensions required for parking we're not left with a significant amount of space.

### **Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:**

- Concerned about the lack of green at the part of the development facing the back lane.
- Think the rear elevation at the lane is not resolved in terms of the architectural form. They will be used as main entrances but look like secondary entrances. If four to six residences are putting their garbage and recycling there, it will get very crowded.
- You have the opportunity to take some references from the heritage house and include in the duplex design; the drastic difference currently designed looks awkward. Could at least copy the roof pitch, if not the style.
- Think you could showcase the heritage house by raising it more. Believe that not moving it forward is not the right decision. Believe a generous north yard won't be used that often. Should use the opportunity to move it forward and create more distance between the front and the rear.
- Would like to see more social activation in the lane; children, neighbours will interact there so an inviting sense of community laneway is important.
- Believe the heritage house should not be brought forward; keeping it where it is meets guidelines for basic heritage principles. Appreciate that you've gone to the trouble of preserving plantings, also important for the heritage aspect.
- Like that the duplex in the back is compact and not overpowering; doesn't compete with the heritage house in front.
- Uncomfortable with the fairly high picket fences; would suggest further consideration be given to reducing or eliminating fencing where you can.
- Like the balconies and understand the trade-off between the north and south view, but think the windows at the ground level will be in conflict with the cars parked there. Consider windows on the side instead, to allow light in but maintain privacy.
- Appreciate the efforts for passive house design.
- Strongly encourage you to support some sort of stormwater capture. You have a great deal of roof surfaces in this project that will generate a lot of "capturable" water.
- Reconsider the interface between the heritage house and the duplex. There's a segment of lawn that could be designed to integrate better with the other open space areas. Try to soften the abrupt segregation with landscaping.
- Suggest finding ways to provide some sort of shade on the balcony.
- Generally like the project and appreciate that you're including the heritage restoration; recognize that has trade-offs.

**Presenter's comments:**

- Appreciate all the comments. Some things mentioned we had actually included in our original design, but were changed during a review of the project with the Planning Department.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Heritage Revitalization Agreement for 311 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- design development to explore the integration of rainwater management through landscape design;
- further design development for landscaping treatments in the rear and side yards;
- further review of adjacency of basement suite windows and parking pads;
- further review and design development on the front yard fencing, and creation of less separation overall; and
- further design development for garbage enclosure and location for the rear units;

AND THAT the Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

**Carried**

M. Rahbar is recorded as voting in opposition to the motion.

*The Delegation for 311 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street left the meeting at 6:54pm.*

**4. 758-762 East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street (Development Permit Application)**

The City has received an application for a development permit for 758-762 East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. The proposed development is a 10-unit townhouse development, with nine units containing a lock-off unit. The location is subject to the Moodyville Development Permit Area (DPA) Guidelines.

*The Delegation for 758-762 East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street joined the meeting at 6:55pm.*

Pooyan Poostchi, F. Adab Architecture, described the project to the Panel. Key points included:

- The two lots, at the corner of Queensbury and East 3<sup>rd</sup>, will be consolidated.
- All units will have one parking stall, and there will be one visitor parking stall on site.
- Nine of the 10 units will have a lock-off suite.
- The grade change from the northwest corner to the southeast corner is challenging, with a 16 foot drop.
- A privacy screen on the north will block overlooking from northern properties.

The delegation presented an animated fly-over video for the Panel.

Rod Maruyama, Landscape Architect, reviewed the landscape plan. Key points included:

- The landscaping is predominantly on the Queensbury face. There is a combination of shrubs against the buildings as a buffer. Working alongside the dedicated bike path on the street.
- Have planted on the stairways and the pavers of each unit to allow access / definition of the front entrance.
- In the middle area between the two developments, going into the garages, is all permeable paving. Some planting in front of the garages to add some life to that space.
- The buildings will have green roofs.

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

- Has the turning radius in the driveway been verified? **A:** Yes, it complies with the bylaw.
- How are you managing garbage collection and bicycle storage? **A:** Each unit has its own garage, including bike storage. Garage will be located at the northeast corner of the complex, outside of the unit that does not have a lock-off suite (the space was sacrificed for the garbage room).
- By how much was the building height relaxed? **A:** For the south building, 0.6 feet. For the north building, since roof patios are not considered in the guidelines, screening has been provided to mitigate. The overall relaxation we are requesting for the development is 6.5 feet. The rooftop structures do not really extend beyond what is allowed according to the zoning bylaw.
- Will emergency responders be able to access the complex from the Queensbury entrance? **A:** No, not meant to be a fire access.
- Have you explored the option of underground parking? **A:** We did consider, but it was largely impossible. The only realistic access was from the lane. Designing an underground parkade from that point was very difficult. Queensbury is designated to be a rapid transit route with a bike lane, which added limitations.
- Will there be any additional emphasis made for this corner, as a gateway to Queensbury Village; for example, a public art requirement? **A:** The Moodyville guidelines don't specifically discuss, but we (staff) could investigate.
- This development will likely be attractive to families; believe children will use that laneway space as a play area. Has there been any consideration to a dedicated play area, which would be safer than an area where cars are entering and exiting? **A:** Could potentially break up the space with increased definition, to intensify the pattern in the ground plane.
- What are your plans for lighting in that interior roadway? **A:** As illustrated in the plans, there will be exterior lighting all along the space. Believe it will contribute to safety.
- There are a number of windows along the south side that are quite large and will be subject to significant solar penetration. Have you considered anything else that might reduce the amount of heat that will get added to the building? **A:** Yes, all units will have heat pumps. Have also considered overhangs.

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

- Like the project; it's a tough site with the grade change. Like the building form. Commend you for the well defined front entries.
- Think the measurements of the driveway should be double-checked with Engineering.
- Like the way you've treated the lane and balconies; think it will be a very active space.

- Suggest you consider overhangs, as a shading device; this not only protects from heat but light as well which can be quite damaging.
- Consider eliminating the single visitor parking spot and instead using it for a social area / children's play space.
- Understand this is a difficult site being on a hill, but the height will affect the view of those above it. Tough to say the development should be given the relaxation requested. Suggest instead you change the unit design a little bit. Tweak it a bit to come closer to the planning / height guidelines.
- Some concerns with the privacy / safety of the sunken areas in the lane. Not sure that CPTED guidelines are met for people going into those spaces. Visibility from the street would be less than from East 3<sup>rd</sup>. Think the relationship of those lock-off units to the lane could be improved, along with their livability.
- The overlooks are a little undefined; could be a CPTED issue, especially along the Queensbury side. Needs something with a bit more secure access, like a landscaping edge or a gate.
- Think you've dealt with the architecture and massing well, but think the long driveway in the middle is unfortunate and not a good use of space; suggest you explore the option of underground parking. It would be a long ramp, but it is doable.
- There is a lack of amenity and community spaces overall.
- Appreciate the landscaping on the Queensbury frontage, but also suggest adding public art at the corner of Queensbury and East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street.

**Presenter's comments:**

- The feedback is appreciated, thank you.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Permit Application for 758-762 East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- design review of connection of the corner between ramp and parking;
- further design review for safety of the lock-off suites in the laneway, and to improve their relationship with the lane;
- design review for CPTED concerns relative to the openness and adjacency to Queensbury;
- further review and design for the quality of landscaping relative to Queensbury;
- further design and review for south facing solar shading;
- further design/development for improvement of the parking court related to lighting and CPTED;
- consideration of safety when designing the material on the parking court;
- consideration of alternate use of the visitor parking as limited common outdoor space; and
- further design/development and CPTED review for PMT and electrical room access area;

AND THAT the Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

**Carried Unanimously**

*The Delegation for 758-762 East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street left the meeting at 8:21pm.*

**5. Adjourn**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:22pm.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Wednesday, January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2023.

*"Darren Burns"*

Chair

*"January 18, 2023"*

Date