

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

**Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel
Held at City Hall, 141 West 14th Street, Conference Room A
on Wednesday, January 18th, 2023**

MINUTES

- Present:** D. Burns, Chair
K. Bracewell, RCMP
A.M. Llanos
L. McKenna
M. Muljiani, Vice Chair
M. Rahbar
K. Ross
M. Tashakor
- Staff:** M. Menzel, Planner 2, Planning and Development
D. Johnson, Development Planner, Planning and Development
B. van der Heijden, Planner 1, Planning and Development
T. Huckell, Committee Clerk-Secretary
- Guests:** 146-160 East 2nd Street
Riaan de Beer, Anthem Properties
Kevin Keresztes, Anthem Properties
Adrien Rahbar, Anthem Properties
Norm Chin, DYS Architecture
Oren Mizrahi, Connect Landscape Architecture
- 452 East 1st Street
Ben J. Hou, Natland Group
Amir Farbehi, Inspired Architecture Inc.
Gaelen Griffiths, PMG Landscape Architects Ltd.
- Regrets:** Councillor Shahriari
-

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

1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held December 14th, 2022

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held December 14th, 2022 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

2. Staff Update

We have received several applications for the Panel positions that are vacant, or will become vacant when various terms end on January 31, 2023. These should be going to Council for consideration in early February.

M. Rahbar declared a conflict of interest for the item pertaining to 146-160 East 2nd Street and recused himself from the meeting, leaving at 5:33pm.

3. 146-160 East 2nd Street (Rezoning Application)

The Delegation for 146-160 East 2nd Street joined the meeting at 5:36 pm.

The City has received an application for a rezoning application for 146-160 East 2nd Street. The application proposes an eight-storey mixed using building consisting of 68 residential strata units and approximately 822.2 square meters (8,850 square feet) of ground floor commercial space fronting East 2nd Street. The building is situated over three levels of underground resident parking for 100 vehicles. The proposal includes a public pathway along the entire western edge to provide pedestrian access from East 2nd Street to the rear lane.

R. de Beer, Anthem Properties, described the project to the Panel. Key points included:

- This is a small infill site, about 18000 square feet. The neighbourhood character changes quite significantly from west to east, north to south. At the edge of the commercial activity zone that connects to Lonsdale.
- Site is surrounded by highrise towers, mostly with retail at street level. Triggers the need for some innovation, especially to achieve the two storey street wall.
- Our vision for the site is a building that complements the context already there, while strengthening a lot of aspects, such as the public realm.
- Massing was guided by the site parameters that were put forward to us.
- We've separated the two parking layouts: resident plus visitors, and commercial. Emphasizing the commercial podium with the two storey element.
- The residential component has a wide range of sizes and types. A unique development from our point of view in that it has a significant amount of family units.
- Have taken sustainability into consideration.
- Materiality was guided by the desire to maintain a west coast feel.
- A key aspect of our proposal is the street front; have put a lot of emphasis into how to enhance the experience. Catering to smaller CRU tenants, with glazing to create transparency and animation to the streetfront. Extensive canopy to provide protection.
- The mezzanine retail units add another layer of animation. Wanted to conceive of something other than traditional second floor office space.
- Staff worked with us to make the mid-block connection possible. Will not be accessible for wheelchairs; that would have required an elevator, which would have removed retail and mezzanine space. Will have landings and non-slip surfaces, with a clear sightline from top to bottom. The stairs are broken up into sets of 4-5 steps, rather than a single intimidating long run.
- Will also have a public art opportunity.
- For sustainability, we are meeting step code 3. Are exceeding bike storage requirements.

Oren Mizrahi, Connect Landscape Architecture, reviewed the landscape plan. Key points included:

- Lots of context and opportunity here. The focal point of the design is to celebrate the vibrancy of Lower Lonsdale and activate the public realm, with dynamic spaces for people to live, work and play.
- The primary focus at grade is the public realm. Following the Lonsdale streetscape guidelines.
- Some adaptive vegetation on the roof; drought tolerant. Some opportunities to bring planting out into the lane and soften edges.
- Landscaping is really focused on the community culture, and nature, on the North Shore.

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

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Will the planters on the street be maintained by the development, or are they on City property? **A:** Ultimately, I think streetscape would fall back to the City. If raised planters are a concern during design development, we could reconsider; they are not core to the design.
- Will the mid-block connection be a right-of-way? **A:** It will be a registered right-of-way with the City, with public access.
- What is the rationale for placing an amenity facing north? **A:** As a corner location, we felt that it maximized daylight and views.
- Why are the parking entrances separated? **A:** Largely due to functionality. Trying to fit the program into this constrained site. To transition a very high level down to parking at the bottom of the structure, would have wiped out the entire podium. Ramps technically would not have been viable for this development. So our approach was to come off East 2nd Street. Additionally, this limits the use of the lane for residents. Our strategy was to intentionally break them up.
- Not familiar with the details of the building to the west; what is the relationship? **A:** What you're seeing is the gazebo structure on the top.
- Is the parkade entry off East 2nd Street conforming? **A:** There will be a variance required. Given the constraints for the site, staff decided to support a variance.
- Is the garbage collection area for residential and commercial combined? **A:** No; there are separate rooms for commercial and residential waste management. Access for pick-up would be from the same entry point.
- Can you elaborate on the design of the mid-block connection? Did you look at any additional amenities? **A:** The majority of the level area would be towards the northern half of the right-of-way. There were some thoughts into how the right-of-way would be treated; for example, consideration of public art. There is significant opportunity there, but for now we are looking at just the stair design.
- Can you talk about lighting treatment in the mid-block connection? **A:** A key consideration is light pollution. We want to keep lighting above people's heads, so a person is also lit in that space. This would also help to open it up to public safety. If we keep the lighting low to the ground, there is the risk of it feel dark and only people's feet feel lit up.
- Where is your entrance for bike stalls? **A:** Off the lane. So individuals accessing the commercial units as a customer, won't have access to the bikes.
- Have you considered any anti-graffiti options? **A:** Would most likely recommend coating.

- Has there been any discussion around the height limit of the OCP? Wondering about the relationship to setback relaxations, that this application would need to meet the density.
A: The height is regulated by the OCP. Any proposed building higher than that, would require an OCP amendment and that is a more rigorous review stage. If the applicant wanted to go that route, we would assist, but this project does conform with the OCP. Height compared to adjacent towers, is a zoning bylaw condition. They are currently meeting the separation requirements.
- Will you be providing any additional pedestrian crossing safety measures at the 2nd Street entrance? It is directly adjacent to another vehicular crossing; will there be paving pattern changes? Lighting? **A:** Recognize that concern; we do want it to be a pedestrian dominated space. It won't be a smooth driveway; have also added some vision glass on the parkade, to allow more lines of sight.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Appreciate that this will be replacing a problematic building. Be aware that any place you have building access is a weak point.
- You've handled parking well, but whenever you have parking coming out to a busy thoroughfare, it usually needs a parking light. Need to seriously consider from a pedestrian safety aspect.
- Worried that the walkway will be a large canvas for graffiti.
- Understand the concern about light pollution, but you'll need to consider nighttime activities. The local homeless population can be driven by sustainable crime. Also consider the planters proposed for the laneway; make sure no one can hide there. They must be low, absolutely lit, and obvious.
- You must give first responders a rally point that illustrates where the building entrance is, as opposed to the commercial.
- Like the materials and façade you've presented.
- Unfortunate there's not a little more mindfulness for disabled pedestrians.
- It is very difficult to find parking on that street, both at day and night. Would like to see an increase in number of the commercial parking stalls. That area will become increasingly dense.
- Understand the topography is limiting, and would be a much different project if you had to come off the lane. But it is a big negative to have the driveway access for vehicles cutting across the sidewalk.
- Good landscaping, good urban design.
- The midblock connection is challenging; have talked about lighting and murals, but think it needs some work to ensure that it's a pleasant place to walk through and feel safe.
- Not sure the location of the amenity space is the right choice. Understand you want to take advantage of the corner but believe it makes that middle unit suffer a bit. That unit is tucked away; would invite you to move it north.
- From a planning point of view, the main entrance feels a bit squeezed.
- From a building perspective, like the massing and the application of materials. Would invite you to consider a little refinement; the two units that sit facing south, on the same plane, have a sudden change of material without a lot of articulation.
- At the end of the block on the east side, not convinced the placement of windows is ideal. Would invite you to review at that end; the articulation of the balconies facing the windows to the west, could be part of a more singular expression. The balconies seem too close, even with the amenity inside.

- The first three balconies seem extremely close to the adjacent building; believe that will be an issue, ask that you reconsider the depth of those balconies.
- Appreciate the design of the project but ask that you really put more emphasis on the interblock connection; strikes me as being relatively stark. Consider a few wider areas and possibly some seating at the far end. Urge you to consider that public realm improvement.
- Understand your rationale and site constraints but would reiterate the emphases that have been made regarding the parking access off of East 2nd.
- Think the overall massing of the project is well put together.

Presenter's comments:

- Thank you for the feedback.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 146-160 East 2nd Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- further design development for vehicular access of East 2nd Street, pertaining to vehicular and pedestrian safety;
- further design development to ensure CPTED concerns around landscaping and building interface across the lane;
- further design development of the west property line balcony interface with adjacent buildings for proximity and safety concerns;
- further design development for wayfinding and building residential entrance, differentiation from commercial;
- further design development for north-south right of way connector, to improve pedestrian interface and urban realm, CPTED and lighting; and
- further design development of south residential massing, relative to midrise and podium interface;

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

Carried

K. Ross is recorded as voting in opposition to the motion.

The Delegation for 146-160 East 2nd Street left the meeting at 7:05pm.

M. Rahbar rejoined the meeting at 7:05pm.

4. 452 East 1st Street (Development Permit Application)

The Delegation for 452 East 1st Street joined the meeting at 7:09pm.

The City has received an application for a development permit for 452 East 1st Street. The proposed development is a 10-unit townhouse development, with each containing a lock-off unit. The location is subject to the Moodyville Development Permit Area (DPA) Guidelines.

A. Farbehi, Inspired Architecture, described the project to the Panel. Key points included:

- Design challenges included the slope from back to front; this affected parking access. Couldn't create underground parking.
- Site is in the middle of residential level 4A of the OCP.
- Everything complies with the zoning bylaw except some height as explained. There is an exception for steep heights in the Moodyville Design Guidelines.
- First responder access provided on both sides of the site.
- Balconies are separated by privacy panels.
- Planters planned for the roofdecks. Planting with evergreens on the pedestrian connection, street to laneway, to soften the edges. All planting will be robust / climate resilient. Full season interest; fall colours, spring flowers, winter silhouette.
- Proposing to use permeable paving in the auto court, to return a little stormwater into the ground, though it is quite a sloped space.
- Are using an opportunity for landscape lighting to provide better circulation through the site. Are proposing bollards and step lights in appropriate locations.

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

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Some concerns with respect to the driving court. Could you explain the hard surface treatment and soft surface treatment, if any, of that area? **A:** We had imagined this to be uniquely concrete unit pavers – permeable – in the auto court, from edge to edge.
- What are the demographics being targeted for this type of development? **A:** Most likely small families, as well as seniors who are downsizing. We also reviewed some possibilities to provide adaptable layout for bedrooms. We couldn't come up with an adaptable layout for Unit 8 but we were able to do it for the others. All the front units will be compliant with CNV Level 1 policy.
- Can you clarify the garbage collection design? **A:** Beside the visitor parking space. Can easily reach the garbage room; fully compliant with the City's space requirements.
- It has been common for the areas such as the driving deck you've designed to become children's play areas. Have you given any thought as to how you might look to the safety of people using that driving area, for example when a car comes from the north and turns the corner? How will you emphasize public safety? **A:** Haven't gone far down that level / detail of design. Could potentially provide some speed bumps, a reflecting mural. There will also be a change in texture; the driving surface will change from ramp to concrete unit paver.
- If someone turns the corner too tightly, they will be in the pedestrian zone. Do you have plans to consider additional pedestrian safety elements at that edge? **A:** We were thinking to provide a strong curb level to prevent that, such as an 18 inch height. That would be quite noticeable for drivers.
- On the west side of the building, you've got a concrete edge with fencing on top of it. What was the rationale for that design? **A:** We generally provided a retaining wall all the way from top to bottom. This will be adjacent to a single-family development, and privacy is definitely a major concern for the neighbour, so we thought it would be good to have a concrete base and then a privacy fence. We have used a similar strategy on East 3rd, so the form matches the single-family character on the other side.
- Was underground parking explored, to allow use of the surface as a public amenity space? **A:** We did explore all options for underground parking. Because it is a very steep

site, we couldn't get underneath. What you are seeing in the design is the solution we arrived at.

- Do you need a staging area for the garbage? Do residents bring it up to the lane? **A:** Think it will most likely be staging at the lane, but ultimately that require confirmation from the garbage collection agency.
- Understand the height requirement is being relaxed; is this because you need the number of floors that you're pushing up into the height limit? You appear to be pushing the livable floor up into the roofdeck space. **A:** Yes, because to make the project feasible and livable, we had to find that density. By adding the transformer, garbage room, visitor parking, we lost quite a lot of area on the site.
- Is the ramp space for two cars, or for a single vehicle? **A:** Single.
- Will the walkways on either side of the development be public or private? **A:** They are on private property.
- How are you defining your territoriality? **A:** Principally by the grade change. The first pitch of stairs is about 1m.
- The City likes walkways to be public. How will you tell people not to walk through those spaces? **A:** A potential alternative is a gate; but we find the grade change is generally psychologically enough.
- Wayfinding for first responders is critical. If one needs to attend in the dark and it's raining, how would we find access? How does your wayfinding work? **A:** It's definitely part of the design plan. Every unit will have a dedicated number, and the number will be illuminated to ensure visibility. There will be an annunciator panel at the front.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Worried that there is a pattern of too much density on this type of site. One less unit would allow wider access points.
- Believe the driveway court is not well treated. Don't find permeable surfaces comfortable for children to play on. Over time, pavers like the ones proposed, shift around. Don't see that the surface is being treated at all, as well as a lack of greenery. Permanent embedded planters in the balconies could spill into the very harsh driveway.
- Would have liked to see more variety in the materials throughout the project. Afraid that over time this project will look tired.
- Believe the driving aisle is pretty tight. Would hope that you might find something more robust than an 8 inch curb to keep the pedestrian and vehicle realms separate.
- Concerned about the turning circle that will be required for some units coming down the driving aisle and into the plaza. Looks like an uncomfortable space for drivers. Children will be playing there; we might not like it but that will be the reality.
- Think further about the retaining walls on the east and west sides; though practical, this is a residential neighbourhood. There will likely be development predominantly to the west, so consider an approach that will give it a softer edge, or something that provides a little more variety as you walk from the street side to the lane.
- In the landscape treatment, try to ensure the maximum amount of light is penetrating into the lock-off units, via conscientious placement of plant materials.
- The building to the north seems very tall; consider ways to minimize the impact of that height.
- In the last four, you have a bedroom facing south with outdoor space facing north. At that level, you will an issue of a bedroom overlooking a bedroom. Wonder if there is an opportunity to reduce the massing; or if there is even a need for the rooftop space over

the master bedroom. Possibly an opportunity to have a south facing outdoor space. If the master bedroom moves to the north, you can arrive at a much simpler resolution.

- The garbage collection room seems a bit bunker-like; consider ways to articulate differently.
- Having some trouble with this kind of building form, which is coming into play, in these blocks. If ultimately every property follows suit, might look more uniform, but in the meantime, duplexes and lower buildings are stuck with an uncomfortable situation with adjacencies, etc.
- Like the courtyard, but also question some of the transportation solutions. Think the landscape aesthetic suffers. With the merging at the lane, you need room to do a bit of transition in safe way.
- Think the lock-off units off the lane are not particularly livable. Are a little subterranean and not that desirable a living space with no buffer like a front yard or sidewalk.
- Agree that both sides need some kind of security gates, to differentiate between the public and the private realm.
- The wayfinding and identity of the back units from East 1st Street are not really demonstrated here yet; need to work on that.
- Suggest more planting be incorporated into the laneway setback.
- Believe there will be younger families in this complex, and the potential for conflict in the driveway area. Small children are not always visible and quite concerned about the safety of the ramp.
- Also a safety concern that the pathways on either side have no gates or barriers.
- Appreciate that the units can be adaptable, but there are a lot of stairs in these units. Feel like accessibility has been missed in this design. People want to age in place as long as possible.
- Numerous safety concerns. Once the building has been built, they will all fall onto the operations of the residents. The driveway, going in and out, is a hazard.
- Will be imperative that you define your territoriality on either side. Additionally, first responders will need clear lines of sight.
- Do feel that the north building massing is excessive in scale, relative to the front.

Presenter's comments:

- Thank you for the feedback.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Permit Application for 452 East 1st Street and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the issues listed below:

- further design development for CPTED and landscaping interfaces between the motor court drive aisle and pedestrian walkways;
- further design development for the interface east and west between the development's retaining walls and adjacent sites;
- further design development for CPTED concerns relative to barrier and public access for the north-south corridor connectors;
- further design development for CPTED related issues around wayfinding and building connection;

- further design development for south facing interface between landscape and façade light access, and weather protection;
- further design development for a reduction in massing along the north building;
- further design development for simplification of massing and detailing of the garbage volume located to the east;
- further design development for enhancement of laneway landscape interface and access to light for the lower lock-off suites;
- further design development between visitor parking and garbage facility; and
- further design development for exploration of material choices and articulation with the existing building design;

THAT the Panel looks forward to reviewing the applicant's response at a future meeting;

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

Carried Unanimously

The Delegation for 452 East 1st Street left the meeting at 8:25pm.

5. Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:26pm.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is to be determined.

"Certified Correct by the Chair"

Darren Burns, Chair