

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 19<sup>th</sup>, 2017**

---

**MINUTES**

---

**Present:** B. Checkwitch  
J. Geluch  
B. Harrison  
A. Man-Bourdon  
A. Phillips  
K. Yushmanova

**Staff:** D. Johnson, Development Planner  
S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk  
C. Perry, Supervisor, Development Servicing  
B. Hurley, Planner 1

**Guests:** 230 East 8<sup>th</sup> Street (Rezoning Application)  
Steven Petersson, Petersson Planning Consulting  
Rosa Salcido, Vivid Green Architecture  
David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Ltd.  
Maryam Naseri, Vivid Green Architecture  
Kathleen Heggie, Petersson Planning Consulting  
Farzad Mazarei, Cascadia Green Development  
Warren Dombowski, Cascadia Green Development  
Robert Baillie, Cascadia Green Development  
Alfonso Pezzente, Interested Member of the Public

232-234 West 5<sup>th</sup> Street (Rezoning Application)  
Jordan Kutev, Jordan Kutev Architect Inc  
Vanya Ivanova, Jordan Kutev Architect Inc  
David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Ltd.  
Marco De Cottiis, Owner

**Absent:** K. Bracewell, RCMP  
J-P. Mahe  
P. Maltby  
A. Sehwoerer

---

The meeting was called to order at 5:36 p.m.

1. **Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2017**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2017 be adopted.

**Carried Unanimously**

2. **Business Arising**

D. Johnson outlined the Design Award process and outlined the Terms of Reference. He presented a list of projects completed since the previous Design Awards were presented in March 2015.

There will be further discussion at the May Design Panel meeting.

**Action:** D. Johnson to send presentation to members.

The Chair emphasized the importance of the Terms of Reference of the Design Panel and recommended members review it.

3. **Staff Update**

D. Johnson reviewed the status of ongoing development projects.

4. **230 East 8<sup>th</sup> Street (Rezoning Application) (Second Review)**

This application is seeking to rezone the 9,736 lot from the current RT-1 (Two-Unit Residential 1) Zone to a Comprehensive Development Zone to permit a six unit development, including 4 lock-off units. This site is designated Level 3 (FSR not to exceed 0.75 times the Lot Area) in the Official Community Plan (OCP). The Development Guidelines for Low Density Attached Form Housing recommends densities between 0.6 FSR to 0.75 FSR and four to six units on a site of this size. Nine foot down slope from lane to the street.

Staff asked for ADP's input on the following:

- Number and quality of units, including lock-off and adaptable accessory units;
- Scale, orientation, form, and frontage of the proposed design considering the triangular site;
- Landscape design in terms of quality and transition of shared and private open space proposals;
- Architecture and materials considering the context of neighbouring buildings nearby;
- Responses to the lane frontage and interface, including parking area and North side of units;
- Comment and strategies towards achieving proposed Energy Efficiency target.

S. Petersson, Petersson Planning Consulting, outlined the changes made to the design in response to the comments made at the June 15 2016 Design Panel meeting. There are lock off units in four of the six units, two of which are adaptable.

Rosa Salcido, Vivid Green Architecture, described the project to the Panel:

- There are two separate buildings of three units.
- Materials, colours, and architectural expression have changed to conform more with the existing neighbourhood.
- Four of the units have roof top decks.
- As many windows as possible have been added to avoid blank walls.
- Roof decks have been removed from Units 5 and 6 to mitigate overlook to the neighbouring properties. Balconies have been added to these units. The other roof top decks have been also pulled back from the edge to mitigate overlook.
- Level 1 of each unit can be accessed from the street. Level 2 of each unit is accessed from the lane because it is 9 feet higher than the street.
- There is a cluster of secure bike storage units at the back.
- Stairs against the lane have been removed from the original design and replaced with a slope to allow handicapped access to Units 1 and 2.
- Units 3 and 6 do not have lock-off units to remove density to the east.
- The carport is an open trellis.

David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Ltd., reviewed the landscape plan:

- There is a central pathway through the site between the two buildings. Partway down the stairs at the middle of the site there is an amenity space.
- There is an open area at the western edge of the site with a small community garden with a bench and compost facilities. It is fully accessible.
- Permeable paving, a rain garden and storm water retention tank form part of the storm water management plan.
- Corner bulges have been added to the streetscape.
- The sidewalk meanders gently instead of being straight.

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

- **To staff:** Is there a chance to cover the parking? **Staff:** There are questions of site coverage; it can be looked at.
- Is the extensive offsite works for such a small project affordable? **A:** We thought it would be part of the amenity package offered to the City. Public realm improvements are important.
- The amenity space in the centre is how high? **A:** Three feet.
- How can it be engaging? **A:** We have provided seating. We did have natural play elements. Something could be fitted in
- What is the soffit material? **A:** Wood; we are exploring fibre cement for the cladding.
- The community asked for the roof decks on units 5 and 6 to be removed? **A:** Yes. They have been replaced with large balconies.
- Where is the mechanical located in the units? **A:** Mini split units on the wall, we have provided a 3 x 3 feet space for the hot water tank and laundry.
- Mini split units are operated by an outdoor heat pump, where will they go? **A:** We have discussed common service areas. They will be part of the Building Permit application. We will create common areas for the residents to allow space for common services.
- To achieve EnerGuide 86 what else will you be doing to walls etc.? **A:** There will be improved insulation, water efficient fixtures. We did an EnerGuide assessment on the previous design and it reached EnerGuide 81 before we introduced the mini splits.

- Will the offsite works be maintained by the owner or City? **Staff:** Homeowners are responsible for maintaining the boulevard per the bylaw. The City will maintain the rain garden.
- The community garden is for the residents? **A:** Yes.
- The lock-off units do not seem to have much storage? **A:** Each unit has closets. The lock-off units are like studios; they do not have much storage.
- Is there any chance of putting storage by the bike storage? **A:** We tried to provide patios for each unit; we could use the back patios on Units 5 and 6 for storage but it is a nice feature for those units as they do not have the roof top decks.
- There are significant offsite improvements; is the rain garden a City design? **Staff:** There are guidelines.
- Could you describe the access to the roof **A:** It is a hatch.
- Describe the finishes. **A:** We had explored using real wood but will probably use wood tone fibre cement for easier maintenance. We still want to use real wood in the soffits.
- What is the width of the central stair? **A:** Five feet with railings on each side.
- You still have the parapet on Units 5 and 6; could it be eliminated? **A:** It is a design feature, it is possible. We left it in place for continuity of design.
- The parapets are painted Hardie? **A:** They are the same colour as the trim. The parapets on Units 5 and 6 are part of the stepped design.
- What are the beams in the carport made of? **A:** Treated and stained wood.
- How big is the amenity space; what activities might take place in it? **A:** It is about 10 feet square. We had put in boulders for toddlers; we could put them back with a seat for parents.
- Was the amenity space a requirement? **Staff:** We encourage them; it is not a requirement.
- The lock-off suites have one window? **A:** We have two; there are lower ones.

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

- Thank you. I really like this project. I like the site plan, circulation and the path through the middle. I like the form and character. There is good bike storage. I would encourage power for electric bikes and good ventilation.
- The community garden is great idea on the corner.
- The amenity space is a good idea; I would encourage more design development to attract residents, perhaps a water feature.
- Roof decks are a great addition for liveability.
- Offsite works are very good.
- I like the wood soffits.
- The lock-off units are good.
- Explore with staff some way to put rain protection over the parking e.g. a green roof.
- I would encourage you to put roof decks back on Units 5 and 6; pull them back from the edge with a high screen to address privacy concerns. It would make the units more liveable.
- Paying attention to the details will be very important as it is a very compact building. Make it clean and not busy.
- Great project; there is a shortage of this type in the community. It is good to see ground level lock-off suites.
- Re the heat pumps for six units, this needs to be addressed early in the design process. Where will they go? What will be the noise level? How much space will they take up?

Explore using electric mini splits to get to EnerGuide 86; you may be able to eliminate the heat pumps. Talk to the professionals.

- Roof decks on Units 5 and 6 should be included.
- Check the mechanical space in the units; I cannot see how you are going to fit everything in. There will be some challenges which you should look at now.
- I appreciate the generous south facing patios, rain gardens.
- Look at the amenity space; perhaps move it to the street level and make it larger to be more accessible. Including picnic tables would energize the street edge.
- The community garden could use design development; perhaps have smaller, irregular shaped spots. Great that they are accessible.
- Encourage landscape design to incorporate trees for shading the large south facing paved patios. It can make a big difference.
- Embrace the curve of the sidewalk and emphasize it more with the street trees; make it more intentional.
- I like the project. I really like the use of the lane. It is good that it is opened up with the carport. Good for daylight.
- It is really important that the lower units have natural light. I cannot see windows on the plans for lock-off units.
- I am really glad to see it back. You have made some significant positive design changes. It is an interestingly shaped site; the design maximizes the site coverage. You have eliminated the access issues.
- They are narrow suites and the rooftop decks enhance liveability; you need them on Units 5 and 6.
- The amenity space is small. You could remove it and have a larger planter area. The challenge with it being so small is that all the units have their own patios which are the same size.
- You are doing a lot of work in the public realm; I am surprised to see so much for such a small project.
- A green roof over the carport would be more attractive for the neighbours rather than them having to look at parked cars.
- I appreciate the response to the previous Design Panel comments.
- You are asking a lot of the neighbours for the increased density so perhaps adding back two roof top decks would be too much for them.
- I do not like faux wood Hardie Panel; it looks fake. I understand it is good for maintenance. I think it will date projects. With the large overhangs you could use real wood on the siding; it would improve its appearance and add quality to the design.
- Unprotected wood on the carport will not look good over the time.
- Nice to see it come back and improved.

**Presenter's comments:**

Thank you very much for all the comments. We appreciate you acknowledging how we have improved the project.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 230 East 8<sup>th</sup> Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Power and ventilation in the bike room;
- More design development of the amenity space;
- Potential rain protection for the carport and consideration of an alternate material for the trellis;
- Reconsider reinstating roof top decks on units 5 and 6 respecting overview;
- Closer consideration and inclusion of mechanical spaces;
- Reinvestigation of the use of the mini split units;
- More design development of the community garden;
- Look at the potential for more trees on the south side of the property especially looking at the design relationship between the trees and the sidewalk, and to provide shade on the south side of the building;
- To ensure the lower units have windows to maximize natural light; and
- Potential use of real wood on exterior siding.

The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

**Carried Unanimously**

**5. 232-234 West 5<sup>th</sup> Street (Rezoning Application) (Second Review)**

This application is seeking to rezone this 6,003 square foot (50.02' x 140.04') lot from the current RT-1 (Two-Unit Residential 1) Zone to a Comprehensive Development Zone to permit a three-unit development. The project consists of a two unit building fronting West 5<sup>th</sup> Street with an additional single unit infill building in the rear yard. Four surface vehicle parking stalls are proposed between the rear infill building and the lane. This site is designated Level 3 (FSR not to exceed 0.75 times the Lot Area) in the Official Community Plan (OCP).

Staff would be interested in the Panel's input regarding the following:

- The design and façade of the buildings as they respond to the West 5<sup>th</sup> St.;
- The visibility of entrances and the sense of arrival for all units;
- The design treatment of the infill building's northern lane-facing façade and landscaping;
- Appearance and design of the roof and rooftop decks as well as features mitigating overlook into the neighbouring lots;
- The central courtyard design and treatment of multiple levels;
- Sustainability and energy performance commitments; and
- Livability and CPTED responses in this revised design.

Jordan Kutev, Jordan Kutev Architect Inc, described the response to the resolution made by the Panel at the January 18<sup>th</sup> Design Panel meeting:

- The large tree on the boulevard will be removed and the access to the units has been re-designed.
- The middle patios have been increased in size.
- The bicycle storage has been moved to the basement of the building.
- Perforated trellis replaced the solid wall of the carport for CPTED purposes.
- Basements have been redesigned for the bike storage.
- Windows have been added to the rear units facing the carport, including: bathroom, stairwell and kitchen.
- The roof form has been simplified with the pitched roof being changed to a flat roof to match contemporary expression.

- The roof decks of the rear unit have been relocated and pulled away from the edge to deal with overlook issues.
- The unit entry has been revised.
- Exterior materials are limited to Hardie panels with easy trim reveals and Hardie siding.
- The usable space in the central courtyard has been increased.
- Guard rails and screen walls also relocated removing view obstruction for the neighbours
- Garbage enclosures are now perforated metal rather than solid walls.

David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Ltd., reviewed the landscape plan:

- The biggest change was the reconfiguration of the central area creating usable private space for all units.
- A new lawn area has been added.
- The privacy hedge has been moved from the upper level to the intermediate level against the guard rail.
- Two small trees have been added to the central courtyard.
- There is improved soft landscape in the laneway.
- The existing tree on the boulevard will be replaced by two trees.
- A storm water detention tank has been added to the front landscaping.
- The unit identity has been improved for Unit 3 at the rear.

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

- Is the closed boarded cedar fence on the property line? **A:** Yes.
- Is there a privacy screen between the two front units at the rear? **A:** Yes.
- What are retaining walls made of? **A:** Concrete.
- What is the garbage enclosure made of? **A:** Welded steel wire mesh.
- What is the size of the trees in the lane? **A:** Fairly small maples due to power lines down the lane.
- Are you using an ERV or an HRV? **A:** ERV; HRV could not meet the energy requirements; we used an energy consultant.
- Is there a height restriction on Unit 3? **A:** Yes, we are within the limitations.
- Describe the identity for rear Unit 3;- can it be seen from the street? **A:** Yes, you can see the front door.
- Do you think the lawn between the two units will survive? **A:** Yes, it is 7 x 9 ft. It will have to be a shade tolerant species.
- What is the height of the first wall? **A:** The first wall is 3 feet 6 inches.
- What is the grade change between patios? **A:** 6 feet 6 inches.
- What is the fence material? **A:** Woven steel.
- Will plants grow on it? **A:** There will be a planter box along it.
- Have neighbours seen the fence material? **A:** No.
- The aluminium trim between the Hardie Panels, why is it still in the design? **A:** We think it matches and gives breaks to the larger panels. It presents well with the more contemporary look and will emphasize the neighbouring heritage house.

*C. Perry left the meeting at 7:30 p.m.*

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

- I like the improvements. I am concerned about the details. It is a big improvement for liveability for the rear unit. I would reverse the retaining wall height of the rear patios.
- Look at the lawn areas; explore the idea of no lawn or faux lawn which would work well there. I am worried you will have dead lawn in the middle otherwise.
- The rear unit does not work for me; the roof projection is too high and looks like a dog house. Look at a hatch for access. I do not like the scale; eliminate the room.
- It is a significant improvement from the last design especially at the lane.
- I would encourage larger trees in the front; shorter trees will block the entry. Bigger trees (with at least 6ft clearance at the trunk) will be more welcoming and improve the experience.
- I have concerns over the fencing material and garbage enclosures. I think cedar fencing would be more appropriate. Please include climbing plants for the metal fence if you go ahead with it.
- There should be further design development of the garbage enclosure.
- Perhaps increase the patio area and take out some of the lawn to have more of a break in the height of the retaining walls; perhaps three shorter walls with buffer planting.
- The glass material of the guard rail is consistent with the architectural expression, however, hedging does not look nice against it and the glass is difficult to maintain.
- Increase the native plant count; your list does not match the Sustainability Checklist.
- I have concerns on the fencing and garbage enclosure materials. If it is changed to cedar it does not last long, maybe five years. I appreciate the intention of the metal but thinking about the glass guard rail, think about another metal product. Overall I like the project.
- I appreciate the change in the roof design; it works much better with West Coast Modern.
- I appreciate the rear lane treatment; it will help activate it.
- The roof access structures feel quite large. Concerning the room on the rear unit, the access is bigger than the room.
- The Hardie panel will read as a flat material from the street; consider something with a bit more texture.
- I have concerns with the glass guardrail. It is a nice and clean and is good for sightlines but provide a little more detail at the street level; something more interesting.
- I am confused about the fencing, ensure consistency in how this is presented and is worked out.
- I disagree about the aluminium channel. We are rezoning the property so you have an obligation to create a high quality project. This kind of application is not high quality; there are better systems for a similar flat panel installation. The aluminum trim with metal fence and flat treatment of the facades have a harsh effect on the building. I hope that you agree that the additional work on the design has improved the project. I commend it.
- I agree about the height of the building at the back. We should have an obligation to the neighbours to do something that is not so imposing.

**Presenter's comments:**

Thank you for all the comments. Concerning the mesh when we were doing the model we were looking for a visible, perforated durable material. The cedar fence did not match. The doghouse looks large because the building is very skinny. We are within the maximum allowable height with no view obstructions. We could increase the patio to make it more in proportion to the "doghouse". We are happy to look at the suggested changes to the landscaping.



It was regularly moved and seconded Joe / Brad

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 232-234 West 5<sup>th</sup> Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Take another look at the lawn material in the courtyard e.g. faux lawn.
- Fence material should be reinvestigated and climbing plants should be along the existing fence and garbage enclosure.
- That City staff look at the height and ensure conformance to height restrictions specifically regarding the scale and height of the roof top access to unit 3.
- Larger trees with a min of 6ft clear trunk.
- Increase the native plant count to conform with sustainable guidelines
- Reconsider the guard rail material to be coordinated with the fence material.
- The façade materials could be more textured and look at eliminating the aluminium trim for a more quality look.
- Investigate the retaining wall configuration in relation to the central patios to screen, and soften the separation of the front and rear units.

The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

**Carried Unanimously**

## **6. Other Business**

It was agreed to move discussion of "Project Sustainability Goals" to the May 17<sup>th</sup> agenda.

The Panel noted appreciation for years of service by Susan Kimm-Jones as she retires from the City of North Vancouver and her duties assisting and maintaining the continuing function of the Advisory Design Panel.

## **7. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, May 17<sup>th</sup>, 2017.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair