

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, December 12, 2007**

MINUTES

- Present:** D. Lee, Chair
K. Hanvey
N. Paul
R. Spencer
K. Terris
Councillor R. Heywood
- Staff:** G. Venczel, Development Planner
E. Maillie, Committee Secretary
C. Perry, Supervisor, Development Services
- Guests:** D. Sigston – Deputy Director of Corporate Services
A. Tuck - Alpha Neon
C. Mullen - Anthem Properties
F. Rafii – Architect
D. McGarrick - Loblaws
S. Young – Anthem Properties
E. Carlson – Anthem Properties
S. Kerr – Anthem Properties
P. Kreuk – Landscape Architect
- Absent:** A. Hii
D. Rose
A. Macintosh
B. Dabiri
Winerburn-Chilton
-

A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m.

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

There was discussion of the two motions passed on Item 8. of the minutes of November 21, 2007.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held November 21, 2007 be adopted.

Unanimously Carried

2. **Business Arising**

None

3. **Staff Update**

a) **1400 Bewicke Avenue**

This application was defeated at Council December 3rd.

b) **254 West 6th Street – Larson House**

This application for duplex development was approved at Council.

c) **309 E 10th Street, 332 East 11th Street and 335 East 8th Street**

These projects all went forward to Council and were approved.

4. **Implementing a Crime Free Multi-Housing Program in the City of North Vancouver**

D. Sigston – Deputy Director of Corporate Services, was introduced and gave an overview of the proposed crime free multi-housing program which has arisen from a Council report outlining difficulties in the City around West 4th Street. Council has asked that staff prepare a report with recommendations from ADP and SPAC. ADP is being asked principally from a CPTED point. The proposed programme includes training of management in how to look after buildings, and how to secure buildings; the RCMP will assist and work with residents. Actions also include police billing residents for repeated call-outs.

Council will not be able to force building owners to participate in this programme but would like to make it available to those who are interested. Council are looking for input from advisory bodies to may improve the programme and address reinforcement of doors at ground level, underground parking areas, and lighting.

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

- Good lighting is required at ground level.
- Security gates are needed at underground parking.
- Landscaping creates an environment that residents care – but selection of plants is vital to maintain open view into the site.
- This is a social issue as well as design issue.

The Development Planner suggested that ADP could explore creating an Awards Program with City and RCMP recognizing participation of building managers in the program.

Members were asked to email comments to the Committee Secretary for further review at the next meeting, and will be reviewed at the next meeting.

D. Sigston left the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

5. **1995 Lonsdale Avenue – Development Variance Permit: Signage**

The Development Planner reviewed the direction staff has taken in this application process. The signs were installed without a permit and from an urban design

perspective, and the OCP, this is a pedestrian community and signage is expected to address this rather than a car oriented streetscape. Staff recommends that the Fatburger sign on Lonsdale be removed and that the Ricky's sign and Fatburger sign on 19th Street be retained.

A. Tuck, of Alpha Neon, representing the applicant, advised that it is important that Fatburger be clear on the signage. The signage has been prepared in smaller scale in accordance with the City's bylaw, which allows signage on both streets.

It was noted that the initial signage is in violation of the City's Sign Bylaw.

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

- Is there a canopy in front of the building at the corner?
- Is sign on the canopy?
- Is the patio enclosure staying?
- Are sign dimensions exceeding the limits?
- Do any other components need a variance?
- Is there any option of changing the signage in any way?

In response to a question to staff if the patio enclosure will remain, the Development Planner advised that staff would like to have the patio enclosure removed as it's on City property and was approved without the enclosure.

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

- Opportunity that may work from urban design and business standpoint – look into some way to have a sign that wraps the corner.
- Both elevations show canopy as dotted line the other is solid.
- Difficult to supporting a variance. Does not seem to be a particularly social minded business having put up signage and enclosed seating without approval.
- Too much signage into small an area and not integrated in the structure
- Lonsdale is not a neon strip but moving towards more low key and it would be nice to see signage really scaled down.
- Signage can be hung lower at the façade to address pedestrian realm.
- Canopy height precludes that – may be difficult
- Too much signage for this street.
- Cannot support in scale in terms of the visual. Would like to remove FatBurger from the front and have Ricky's sign on the corner
- Signage can be used in the window

This is a retroactive application – the signage is in place and the applicant is not asking for permission but for forgiveness.

Applicant's comments

The applicant stated that discussion has clarified the process needed for this review.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Variance Permit application for signage at 1995 Lonsdale Avenue (Ricky's Fatburger / Alpha Neon Ltd.) and recommends rejection based on the design presented. The Panel identifies the following as major concerns:

- **Large scale of the signage involved and the unresolved relationship between the signs;**
- **Better integration of signage with the existing architecture of the face of the building, particularly the canopy.**

FURTHER, the applicant is encouraged to explore alternative expressions of their logo, e.g. location within window, or, reorientation of signage at corner.

Unanimously Carried

6. 2601 Westview Drive – Development Variance Permit

The Chair referred to the previous presentation in September 2007, and read the resolution passed at that time.

Issues addressed in the review following the ADP's comments include:

- **Pedestrian safety** addressed by
 - Elimination of landscape at front of the store to create 8' wide sidewalk along the façade.
 - Planting two trees in parking lot.
 - Incorporating a raised crosswalk in stamped concrete.
- **Loggias**
 - Have been enclosed
- **Building façade** addressed by
 - Heavy timber elements on façade.
 - Covered walkway at the storefront.
 - Alcoves along the front for display of seasonal items.
 - Colour palette displayed
- **Elevation addressed by**
 - Parapet uses the existing roof.
 - Band of stucco at façade disguises the old roof.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Clarification of material at heavy timber elements.
- Will stucco overclad the existing brick?
- Finish on façade facing highway?
- How will the transition from stucco around to painted brick be done?
- Clarification of exterior materials
 - Horizontal boarding between columns will be cedar.
 - Stone will be split rock.
 - Bases will be cast in place concrete.

- How overlook addresses the Mansard roof.
- Transition between Mansard roof and corner façade?
- Elevations show concrete base to stone pallisters are higher on perspective than elevations. Which is correct?
- Like merchandising at front of the store in niches – what assurance can we get from Safeway that it will actually happen?
- Dotted line in front of the store – what does it represent?
- Maintenance of proposed landscape being added to the parking area – who will maintain?
- Wide sidewalk – is there a 6” curb and pedestrian walkway?
- Are curb letdowns necessary ?
- Difficult to understand how the trolley park areas work.
- Any weather protection for customers at trolley areas?

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

- Happy to see that the architectural style of the building has changed – huge improvement.
- Happy to see sidewalk and designated raised pedestrian areas.
- Don’t understand the mansard roof issue on north elevation.
- Design speaks of a North Shore vernacular and optimistic that it will send a message to the mall owner and existing businesses.
- Believe mansard roof will be resolved.
- Huge improvement over last presentation.
- Understand significant operational site constraints and responded very well to ADP comments.
- Would like the following to be considered as design development occurs –
 - Finish other than stucco for the middle band where Safeway sign is,
 - Like introduction of cedar siding and if properly protected can work well and be nice addition to the façade facing the parking lot.
 - Encourage you to look at expanding horizontal canopies at the pavilions and to extend weather protection, with queuing issue at trolleys.
 - At the south east corner of the building consider adding glazing in small columns even if glazing has to be spandrail glass.
- Overall great improvement especially 8’ sidewalk to address pedestrian safety and would encourage you to work with the land to include display area.
- Plans are difficult to read – larger print required.

Applicant’s comments

Recognize that previous proposal not well received and tried to address concerns of the Panel, especially with the parking lot. Think this is a better project than brought initially.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Variance Permit application for 2601 Westview Drive (Safeway / MQN Architects) and recommends approval subject to approval, by the Development Planner, of the following:

- **Further details confirming satisfactory resolution of the termination of the mansard roof above the adjacent CRU;**
- **Further consideration of additional glazing at the primary façade fronting the parking area;**
- **Consideration of an alternate material in the attic storey between the two pavilions substituting the cedar cladding for the stucco presently shown.**

Unanimously Carried

7. 17th Street / Lonsdale Avenue / Eastern Avenue – Rezoning & OCP Amendment

The Development Planner outlined the area being addressed in the Central Lonsdale Planning Study (CLPS) – Upper Levels Highway, excluding the Western Avenue Planning Study area, south to 8th Street and east to St. George’s Avenue. Issues being addressed in Central Lonsdale include the need for rental housing and consideration of density bonusing and where the density is going to land? CNV has one of the lowest height limits in Metro Vancouver. The Extra Foods site is within the area of the CLPS and this is being considered as a pilot project for Central Lonsdale. Lonsdale and 17th Street has been identified as an important node for the whole Central Lonsdale area.

F. Ducote – Project Consultant, advised that two proposals are being presented for consideration at this time. One is within the height limit and one exceeds the height allowed. At this time, the two options presented deal with massing. Members reviewed the model of the proposal.

C. Mullen - Anthem Properties, F. Rafii – Architect, D. McGarrick - Loblaws – S. Young, E. Carlson and S. Kerr – Anthem Properties and P. Kreuk – Landscape Architect were introduced.

F. Ducote explained the development options for the site in the presentation material dated November 28, 2007 showing the grocery store facing Lonsdale and East17th Street with a tower at the corner of St. George’s Avenue and 17th Street and townhouses to the south on St. George’s. A 10,000 square feet amenity space will be provided in the tower.

F. Rafii explained the site development and noted that a Traffic Study is being undertaken. Proposed vehicle access to the parking area from Lonsdale Avenue is right in / right out, with another access from 17th Street. A green roof will be installed over the grocery store, and roof gardens for townhouse residents will be located at the podium.

It was explained that the grocery store will increase in size to increase the number of products to expand, allow larger aisles and more space for more cashiers. It is recognized this is a price positive store and that affordability is critical in this area.

The applicant advised that this proposal is asking the City to consider an OCP amendment for additional FSR and, in return, the City will get a better tower and more community benefit from amenities to be provided in exchange. The building

will be built to equal LEED Silver and will consider participation in the Lonsdale Energy Programme.

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

- Why is it necessary to expand the store from its current size of 22,000 sq. ft. to 40,000 sq. ft.?
- Can this be compared to other smaller urban stores?
- Have there been discussions on what the possible amenity use might be?
- Are there any opportunities to provide a café ?
- Community amenities propose rental housing but is there any park?
- APC refers to possibility of office space along Lonsdale – is this possible at the 2nd floor?
- Vehicle access at Lonsdale is contentious – how essential is it?
- Has a demand analysis been done on how many people will arrive by foot, transit, car?
- Has there been analysis of how many new customers will be drawn from other areas of the North Shore?

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

- One of the nicest points is how you have surrounded the residential on Eastern. Placing large tower on corner of Eastern and 17th breaks into the low rise character of 17th Street.
- If this is to contribute to the density of the town centre, then the tower should be close to the corner of 17th & Lonsdale and retain low rise development on 17th. Tower in this position is pushing itself into low scale residential area.
- Loblaw's has little presence on Lonsdale.
- Interesting proposal and generally sound. No great concern with the various pieces.
- Like site development and impact of the big box is hidden by CRUs.
- Right location for the tower.
- Believe that the vehicle access crossing Lonsdale is wrong and do not support it.
- Parking is in excess of requirement and should be reduced.
- If two access points are necessary then the second one should be off the lane.
- Vertical circulation to food store - not sure this is the right location.
- Prefer to see more mass and animation on Lonsdale and replace that with finer grain commercial units along 17th Street.
- OCP amendment to be considered based on building slimmer at top and amenity space. This is not enough and difficult to understand how the proposed amenity space could be used.
- Not sure that 40,000 sq. ft. is necessary at the food store and if more ground plane can be changed, then would like to see ground oriented amenity space.
- Extended floor plate of the food store – what kind of exterior amenity space could be offered here? Could there be flex space outdoors to display goods and also provide mid-block open space?
- Considering the addition of FSR and three floors, is the amount of affordable housing being provided in townhouses sufficient?
- Vehicular access off Lonsdale is not a good idea.

- Some public open space amenity needed. This is a large project and site is being filled with the building.
- Massing troublesome.
- Support location of tower – closer to Lonsdale would upset the rhythm
- Encourage alternative solution for vehicle access from Lonsdale.

Applicant's comments

- Access to parking is located off the lane but main concern of traffic consultant is people turning left from 15th into the lane.
- CRUs at Lonsdale and windows at offices above.
- Glazed entry to food store at the corner.
- Will be considering comments on amenity space.

Traffic consultant needs to get the Terms of Reference from the City when they are finalized.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning and OCP amendment application for 17th Street / Lonsdale Avenue / Eastern Avenue (Anthem Properties) and although supporting the site development concept feels that following have not been adequately resolved:

- **Vehicular access to the site, including number and location of crossings;**
- **Proposed amenity space and its disposition within the overall development;**
- **Size of grocery store;**
- **Amount of space available at the ground space for public use and amenity;**
- **Location and disposition of the proposed seasonal centre and vertical circular node; and**
- **The amount of parking should be reconsidered so as not to exceed bylaw requirements.**

Unanimously Carried

8. Other Business

(a) City's Transportation Plan Review

A joint advisory committee meeting will be held Wednesday, January 9, 2008 to receive a presentation on the City's Transportation Plan. Committees will be asked to make their recommendations at the regular meeting after January 9th.

(b) Meeting Calendar - 2008

The Panel received the schedule of ADP meetings in 2008.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, January 16, 2008.

Chair

S:\COMMITTEES\ADP 35302420\MINUTES\2007\2007 12 12.doc