

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, April 18, 2007**

MINUTES

Present:	D. Lee, Chair A. Hii, Vice Chair K. Hanvey N. Paul P. Winterburn D. Rose Councillor R. Heywood	
Staff:	G. Venczel, Development Planner E. Maillie, Committee Secretary J. Braithwaite, Development Technician R.H. White – Deputy Director, Community Development	
Guests:	T. Miller – Intracorp D. Ramsay – Architect P. Kreuk – Landscape Architect M. Rahbar – Designer D. Rose – Landscape Architect	G. Dumbleton - Architect D. Harper - Owner M. Ido – Landscape Architect R. Changizi - Design Assistant
Absent:	R. Spencer K. Terriss B. Dabiri	

A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held March 21, 2007

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held March 21, 2007 be adopted with the amendment of the resolution in Item 8. to show the address of the property and the architect to be -

“1400 Block Bewicke Avenue (Jordan Kutev Architect)”.

Unanimously Carried

There was discussion of the recent position of the insurance industry not to insure buildings with green roofs. The Development Planner will ask the City Planner for guidance on how the ADP should handle asking developers for green roofs.

Action: Development Planner

2. Business Arising

None

3. Staff Update

(a) Project Updates

850 Harbourside and East 11th and St Andrews Avenue

- These projects were adopted at the March 26th Council meeting.

350 East 10th Street

- Council has now referred this project to Public Hearing.

Western Avenue Planning Study

- The OCP Amendment Bylaw received first reading at the April 2nd meeting of Council.

Nucasa Signage

- The DVP for signage was rejected by Council and Council requested that there be enforcement of non-compliant signs in the area.

Demolition Waste Resolution

- Council passed a motion made by Councillor Keating that the City promote re-using demolition waste. Staff are now reviewing this.

The Panel suggested that the applicant should prepare a disposal plan and indicate what materials can be re-used. It was noted that the GVRD has a plan that may assist the City in this process.

4. 158 West 13th Street – DVP Height

T. Miller – IntraCorp, D. Ramsay – Ramsay Worden, and P. Kreuk – Landscape were introduced. Mr. Ramsay reviewed the earlier proposal approved for this site which had one 19-storey and one 17-storey tower with a 6-storey podium. This podium was reduced to 2-storeys and IntraCorp has been considering transfer of the density to another site or selling it to another developer. At the suggestion of staff, the applicant now wishes to apply for a Development Variance for height that would add two floors to the west tower, making the east and west towers the same height.

The design of the east and west towers was reviewed and the designs of the six-storey podium and two-storey podium were compared. The two-storey podium minimizes shadowing of the courtyard to the north and will allow each townhouse to have a private roof patio. The townhouses on Chesterfield Avenue will remain at four-storeys.

The Landscape Architect gave an overview of the landscape plan within the site and around the edges at the street. It was noted that the landscape on this site addresses private, joint private/public and public use. The finish at the east side of the site on 13th Street will be determined after the City decides on the location of the entry to City Hall. The courtyard between the east tower and City Hall includes a water feature and walkway from the civic plaza at 14th Street to the east tower lobby and City Hall.

Private roof decks at the two-storey podium townhouses will have plantings and units at the top of the towers will have large private patios with landscaping and fireplaces.

Richard White – Deputy Director of Community Development and Project Manager of the Library project was introduced and how competing needs had to be addressed at the marketing of the project. These were:

- to sell the site at a price that would fund the library, and
- recognition of the fact that maximizing the financial return to the City, would require a podium development.

When Intracorp decided to reduce the podium they were interested in transferring the density to another site or selling it to a developer. The City then proposed that that Intracorp add two floors to the west tower in return for the reduced density at the podium. The City endorses this proposal.

It was confirmed that the height of the east tower is 180 feet, excluding protrusions, and the west tower, with the two additional floors, will be 178 feet, including protrusions. It was confirmed that the massing model at the display centre shows the two-storey podium.

The Panel was requested to comment on the additional two storeys.

Questions and comments included, but were not limited to:

- Amount of density remaining on this site.
- Amount of sunlight into the courtyard is greatly increased by reducing the height of the podium.
- Greening in this project not impacted by insurance requirements.
- What is the treatment of the east façade of the corner building.
- Water features in public area on the site will have to be maintained by the Strata.
- Project improved by loss of height in podium and increase at the tower and support this if it is within the height limits for the site.
- Support project and like the scale in relation to the location of the site.
- Improved light penetration into the courtyard is positive and improves the project.
- Proportion of the two towers is better than previous scheme.
- Agree that reduced podium is better but variation in tower heights is better at skyline.
- Main concern is shadowing with increased height but courtyard and sidewalk will have less shadow.

Applicant comments:

The Architect thanked the Panel for their comments.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Variance Permit for 158 West 13th Street (Ramsay Worden Architects) and recommends approval of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for a thorough presentation.

Unanimously Carried

Councillor Heywood left the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

5. 249 – 251 West 16th Street - Rezoning

The Development Planner gave an overview of the proposal to build five units on this site. This rezoning was reviewed by APC and approved by Council in 1995 but the project did not proceed.

G. Dumbleton – Architect, M. Ido – Landscape Architect and D. Harper – owner were introduced. G. Dumbleton reviewed the context of the area and the surrounding neighbourhood. The project is designed to provide a variety of units with two three-bedroom units, and three two-bedroom units. The site development was reviewed – street access to each unit from the street, and parking at the lane with direct access to all units except the middle one. Unit layouts were reviewed. The relationship and massing of the proposed development and buildings on either side were reviewed. Colour and sample board with exterior finishes were displayed. Hardi-board will be used at the base, with natural stain shingles above and duroid roofing.

Sustainability features include bicycle storage at the basement, water collection from roofs for irrigation, high efficiency dishwashers and toilets, double glazing, screening at windows, and natural gas boilers for each unit. Depending on cost, low-e glazing may be considered. The interior layouts of the units were explained.

The Landscape Architect explained the site planting. Mounding and fence at street edge address the treatment at other sites on the street. Plantings and trees along the lane address privacy from adjoining site. Water collection being included for irrigation on the site. It was noted that the unopened lane to the south is included as green space since it has been landscaped and has trees.

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

- Location of water reservoir.
- Have shadow analyses been done to determine light into private patios.
- Have limiting distance calculations been undertaken.
- Rationale for the split between units 1 and 2 in the direction of east /west rather than north south.
- Access to the garbage area from the units.
- Opening into the lane may create a conflict with code.
- Is there a security plan for bike storage area.
- Why include patios and fireplaces in roughed-in basement workshop area.
- What assurance can be given that the lower level not be suitable.
- At what level are the trees across the lane.
- Building B – rationale for having smallest building set so far back from the lane.
- Type of insulation to be used.
- How much of the planting is on slab and how much at grade.
- Do rear setback conform with guidelines.
- Provision of drainage at planters.
- Pavers are shown to go to the building edge – how will the edge at the building be detailed.
- How do the gates to the units work.
- How does hedge line relate to adjoining windows and property.

In response to the Panel's request for staff direction on considering relaxations for setback and fsr, the Development Planner advised that, in trying to achieve family housing, staff are considering some relaxations.

The Development Planner explained some of the concerns that Council had with duplexes and suites in the mid-block area and that staff will be coming up with guidelines. The Development Planner advised that guidelines for garden apartment development will be applied and experience indicates that limiting basement plumbing will restrict addition of basement suites in the future.

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

- Would encourage connecting planters with the unit at the open space by middle unit.
- Like the forms and scale of development but have concern with how Unit 2 is divided and believe it would be improved if oriented toward the street.
- Since looking for relaxation of rear setback would suggest to go to 10 feet and have greater separation between Units 2 and 3.
- Broadly support densification of lots previously single family use but have concern with amount of accommodation on the site - desire to have three distinct building forms problematic.
- 15' and 17' between buildings will create poor space.
- Would like to have proper shadow analysis.
- Applicant not confident of limiting distance but looking into confined area.
- If considering relaxations need to be more creative to make courtyards habitable spaces – these are not habitable at present.
- Additional separation would be beneficial.
- Unit 2 is disproportionately small. This is a challenging site but building proportions create more dark space.
- Sustainability statement lacking – deciduous trees need maintenance, low-e windows not definite, gray water for irrigation could be expanded, insulation materials stated are not approved by building code. Would like to see more detail.
- FSR and setback relaxations are reasonable considering mass of surrounding buildings.

Applicant's comments:

- Site is approved for five units and setbacks are outlined in Level 4 Guidelines.
- Breaking up massing to get more light into the units but still have great benefit to having these outdoor spaces.
- Varied sizes of units to address pricing concerns.
- Like pushing out to the green space at the lane but may create concerns from neighbours.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 249 – 251 West 16th Street (Grant Dumbleton Architect) and does not recommend approval of the project pending resolution of the following:

- **Provision of a detailed planometric shadow analysis at 10 a.m., 12 p.m. and 2 p.m. on March 21, June 21, September 21 and December 21;**
- **That the applicant demonstrate that the amount of fenestration on the project can be provided by design construction documentation;**
- **Further resolution of the landscape plan to address circulation and privacy;**
- **Plant material to be sensitive to anticipated views from adjacent development site; and**
- **Security detail for the bike storage area.**

The Panel had discussion around the need for planometric analysis when zoning is already in place. Main concern arises with livability of the space.

The Panel then voted on the motion.

Unanimously Carried

D. Rose declared a conflict of interest because of his professional involvement in the next project and left the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

6. 241 West 5th Street - Rezoning

The Development Planner referred to the presentation at the last ADP meeting. And advised that staff requested that the applicant consider that the massing be addressed and relocated over the garage.

M. Rahbar – Designer, R. Changizi - Design Assistant, and D. Rose – Landscape Architect.

Mr. Rahbar reviewed the design changes that address the Panel's comments at the last meeting.

- Rear unit has been relocated over the garage with roof garden and patio.
- Improved elevation at the lane.
- Increased separation between units.
- Increased deck areas.
- Entries to the three units relocated to the centre walkway to address security.
- Windows along the alley are above eye level.
- Privacy of neighbours
- Rear unit was reduced to meet .6 fsr requirement.

The Landscape Architect reviewed landscape design changes.

- Single entry to unit entries from the street.
- Narrow walkway has been expanded and water feature added.
- Soft landscaping materials at the open parking space at the have been removed.
- Stormwater management addressed.

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

- Full extent of overhang.
- Access to roof garden over garage.

- Page A7 - bathroom has no window
- Page A8 - bathroom has no door or window
- Page A9 - bathroom has no window

D. Rose left the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

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

- Proximity of buildings to each other is a concern with zero light penetration into the site and the units.
- Understand direction and commend design of the garage.
- Commend applicant and recognize designer's introduction to addressing site design and impressed by impassioned desire to push this form of housing as far as possible including interceding with the client and the City to do something different.
- Believe the rear building is hugely improved and classic lane mews building type which works well but having bedrooms at lower floor where people are passing windows may be questionable.
- Back of the site much improved – more comfortable with distance between buildings but share significant concern with proximity of buildings at the front and quality of space between the buildings. This may become an impediment to saleability and livability of the units and believe scheme would be more successful if the front buildings became a semi-detached unit.
- Major concern last time was how space was used and accessed and this has been well addressed.
- Roof on two front buildings creating the problem on this site but planning of the spaces is vastly improved.

Applicant's comments:

Distance between units is 10' feet which is a conventional separation.

Overhangs can be adjusted to allow more light into the units.

Centre walkway at fountain is wider.

This design encourages interaction rather than having a triplex in one building.

Glass roof over entries.

There was discussion of the impact of the roof on light penetration into the site and it was suggested that -

- making 3rd bedroom smaller would break the face of the two buildings.
- modification of the roof would permit more light into the building.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 241 West 15th Street (Vernacular Design) and recommends approval, subject to approval by Development Planner, of the following:

- **Spatial and sectional development of the space between buildings 1 and 2;**

- Further development, taking into account the roof opening, development of the dormers and increased day lighting of the space; and
- Final plan check.

Carried
- 5 For : - 1 opposed

J. Braithwaite left the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

7. Draft Update on ADP Checklist

The Panel received a draft format of a checklist being prepared for completion on the City web site by applicants when making presentations to ADP and APC. The Panel was requested to review the proposed format and forward comments to the Development Planner. This proposal will be reviewed by the APC and staff before it is finalized.

D. Rose returned to the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

Comments:

- Massing models and boards to be prepared to 1/4" scale.
- Consideration of use of electronic models for larger than duplex developments.
- The Panel thanked the Development Planner for preparing this draft document which will assist ADP in reviewing projects.
- Sustainability should be embedded in the checklist document but be identifiable within the checklist.
- Feedback will be sought from ADP, APC and staff before the document is reviewed again by ADP.
- The Panel was asked for feedback on the Duplex checklist.

8. Information

(a) Demolition Waste Recycling Plan

Council resolution received for information of the Panel. City looking for green materials information material.

(b) On the Waterfront – BC Heritage Society

The Panel received the Heritage BC newsletter with programme information on the Society's annual conference being hosted by the City of North Vancouver May 31 – June 3, 2007.

(c) Centennial Celebration Main Events 2007

A programme of the events in the City's Centennial Celebration was distributed.

9. Other Business

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, May 16, 2007

Chair

S:\COMMITTEES\ADP 35302420\MINUTES\2007\2007 04 18 E.doc