THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOURVER

Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel
Held at City Hall, 141 West 14th Street, North Vancouver, B.C.
In Conference Room A on Wednesday, February 17th, 2016

MINUTES

Present:  
J. Boyce  
B. Checkwitch  
K. England  
J. Geluch  
B. Harrison  
P. Maltby  
A. Man-Bourdon  
A. Sehwoerer

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

Guests:  
240-244 West 18th Street  
Sukey Mehat, Bolder Homes  
Thomas Grimwood, Grimwood Deutscher Architects  
Jess Loraas, Grimwood Deutscher Architects  
Brittany Gudewill, Grimwood Deutscher Architects  
Bill Curtis, Bill Curtis & Associates Design Ltd.  
David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Inc.

364-366 West Keith Road  
Behrouz Monadizadeh, Domustix Development Corp.  
Thomas Grimwood, Grimwood Deutscher Architects  
Jess Loraas, Grimwood Deutscher Architects  
Brittany Gudewill, Grimwood Deutscher Architects  
Bill Curtis, Bill Curtis & Associates Design Ltd.  
David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Inc.

Absent:  
K. Bracewell, RCMP  
S. Gushe

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

1. Commission Orientation and Welcome to New Members

D. Johnson took the chair and welcomed the new members to the Panel. The members introduced themselves.
D. Johnson gave members a presentation on the advisory body process and the mandate of the Advisory Design Panel.

2. **Election of Chair and Vice Chair for the period February 2019 to January 2076**

D. Johnson asked for nominations for the position of Chair; Jay Boyce was nominated and accepted the nomination. There being no further nominations, Jay Boyce was elected Chair by acclamation.

D. Johnson asked for nominations for the position of Vice Chair. Bill Harrison was nominated and accepted the nomination. There being no further nominations, Bill Harrison was elected Vice Chair by acclamation.

Jay Boyce took the Chair at 5:44 p.m.

3. **Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held January 20\textsuperscript{th}, 2016**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held January 20th, 2016 be adopted.

*Carried Unanimously*

4. **Business Arising**

None.

5. **Staff Update**

D. Johnson reviewed the status of ongoing development projects.

6. **240-244 West 18\textsuperscript{th} Street (Rezoning Application)**

This is a development application to rezone the lot from Two-Unit Residential to a Comprehensive Development Zone to permit the construction of four units on the single lot.

Staff asked for comments from the Panel on the attached low density duplex built form, the repeated building massing, particularly the exterior staircase access to the rooftop decks and the privacy screen material, the application of materials, the on-site circulation and landscaping, and any other comments the Panel felt was relevant to the application.

Thomas Grimwood, Grimwood Deutscher Architects described the project to the Panel:

- The lot at West 18\textsuperscript{th} Street and Mahon Avenues slopes east to west.
- Four equal units of 1100 sq. ft. are proposed with two facing the street and two at the rear. The units are terraced following the natural slope of the site.
- Each rear unit is offset from the front unit to allow more daylight and give a street presence for the rear units.
- The basements can be accessed from shared exterior space.
- Each unit has patios off the living space and decks off the master bedrooms.
- Roof decks accessed by an exterior stairway are included for extra exterior space.
• There is parking for four vehicles, bike storage and garbage facilities on the lane.
• The top floor projects over the main floor to create a cover for the at-grade patio.
• Front and rear elevations are very transparent to capture views and daylight.
• The exterior stair is intended to animate the front elevation and is partially screened with vegetation to soften the look of the building.
• Windows are sized and located strategically to allow daylight but maintain privacy.
• There will be vertical planting on the roof deck for privacy.
• Materials will include poured form concrete with dark grey framed windows.
• There is a common pathway running north-south through the project.
• Each unit is legible as an independent unit.
• The roofs of the garages are shaped to allow light into the back yard and create privacy.
• The landscape is meant to grow and soften the building through the use of planters at grade and on the roof deck.

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

• The landscape plan is a formal style to reflect the architectural elements.
• Existing trees will be replaced with small trees at the entry and street trees.
• The paving is designed to lead logically to the entries which are visible from the street.
• There are grass areas for each unit.
• The central walkway is planted on both sides with low growing material.
• Access at the rear is closed to help green the lane.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:
• What size are the bedrooms? A: The master is about 16 x 12 feet, the other two about 9.5 by 12 feet.
• How many bikes will the storage hold? A: Ideally 4-6.
• What is the rationale for the roof form of the garage? A: We wanted to respect the lane and minimise the presence on the lane.
• What is the size of the upper patios? A: 4.6 x 10 feet.
• What is the size of the at-grade patios? A: 10 x 10 feet for all units.
• There is just one door to access the patios? A: Yes.
• How do you think your design integrates with adjacent properties? A: The street has a very mixed style and character. It is introducing something fresh. There are not many houses on the street with a gable form.
• Are you storing rainwater? A: We have raised it as a goal. It is difficult to arrange and is probably more of a wish than a real possibility.
• There are planters on the roof; are there sections that are a green roof? A: It is a light extensive planting.
• Have you spoken to the neighbours about the roof decks? A: The Developer Information Session is scheduled for next week.
• Can you talk about the idea of the screen? A: We intend that the walls be softened with natural vegetation.
• There is a fence on the east but nothing on the west side? A: It falls away on the west. There will be something similar.
• To staff: Does the Comprehensive Development Zone cover two duplexes on a duplex lot? Staff: This designation of RT-2 suggests 3-4 units for smaller lots so they meet the guidelines.
• The parking needs six but the proposal is four plus bikes? **Staff:** They are asking for a one stall parking variance.
• Are there light wells missing in the basement plan? **A:** It is intended that every basement has a light well. On the east side it is tight to the property line, there is no space. The project is not symmetrical; it has been shifted to meet the height envelope.
• There is an alcove in the master bedroom; it would be better used in the bedroom. **A:** It is a tight layout and is constrained by the site.
• The buildings are mirrored; it would help to put in the axis on the plans.
• You have two forms which are the same and have repeated them; is there any way to make them communicate with each other? **A:** We tried different orientations; this way the circulation and access points work. The stair and windows are positioned for views.
• Have you addressed the run off from corten? **A:** It will be more of a manufactured product that will not rust.
• The screen is being used on the side walls? **A:** We want a screen that allows transparency, holds up in the weather. It will be a different product than shown.
• Have you looked at the position of the windows on the neighbouring properties? **A:** Yes, we are avoiding overlook into the houses.
• There is a lot of glass on the street? What are you doing for window coverage for privacy? **A:** An internal blind.
• **Staff:** Re the storm water management plan and landscaping plan, I cannot see a rain garden? **A:** The sump should be shown at the north-west corner.
• Are the basements suites? **A:** They will not be suites; they are interconnected internally.
• How will the addresses be visible from the street for first responders at night? **A:** The pathways will be illuminated and each unit will have a house number.
• How will people be sharing garage space? How will neighbours share? **A:** There is adequate space to create four single garages. The slabs are stacked because of the slope.
• What is the variance on the rear yard setback? **Staff:** It is to the upper storey not at the ground.

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

• My concern is that the bike storage will not be enough if families live there.
• I like the design.
• I think that the screen element is great, it is unique. It will have to be done properly. The material needs to be the equivalent of what you have shown us. It can get cheap really fast.
• I like the flat roof. I like that it does not have a peaked roof.
• I like it. It will give the street a refreshed look. It does fit the 18th Street landscape.
• If constructed as shown it will be unique. I would like to see the EnerGuide score up to 84, 85, not 80. I like the application of the material.
• I like the project. It might be interesting to swap the living room and dining room on two plans for more light.
• It is nice to see laundry on the bedroom floor.
• Bedrooms 2 and 3 are small.
• I am really happy to see the roof decks; it makes good use of roofs.
• Privacy will be essential. People who live there will take care of it themselves.
• I appreciate the fact that all four units have street presence.
• The screen element often gets left off due to cost. It would be more effective in a smaller area. It will need to be closer to the ground for the planting.
• I think is very bold. I like it.
• Listen very carefully to the neighbours at the open house re overlook concerns.
• Do you need the pathway to run down the middle and down both sides? You could shorten it and increase the outdoor space.
• It looks awkward walking straight into the dining room in the rear units. Is it possible to add a window in the kitchen?
• You show two raingardens which have wrong plant material i.e. drought tolerant plants.
• Thank you for a good presentation and a fresh contemporary look in the City.
• Entry offset is well done. Onsite circulation is good. Handling density on the site is good.
• Materiality is great but pay attention to weathering.
• The overlook will be fine.
• I support all the variances because it increases liveability.
• Make the bike storage bigger.
• Explore the circulation from the front to the rear. If you are going to have lawn, have artificial.
• Re the materials – there is pre-sealed corten which will not stain

Presenter's comments:
There is a risk to the minimalist approach and we are committed to durable materials. Re the bike storage, the exterior connection to the basement is for additional storage space in the basement.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 240-244 West 18th Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner. The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for the quality of their presentation.

• Look at increasing bike storage for more than six bikes;
• Review the detailing and materiality related to metal screen and exterior cladding materials;
• A review of the privacy considerations for adjacent properties with regard to the overlook from the roof decks;
• A review of the storm water management plan in coordination with the landscape design; and
• A review of the overall site circulation to potentially increase outdoor liveable space.

Carried Unanimously

There was a short break at 7:00 p.m.
The meeting reconvened at 7:10 p.m.

7. **364-366 West Keith (Rezoning Application)**

This Rezoning Application was previously reviewed at the January 20th Design Panel meeting.
Staff asked for comments from the Panel on the applicant’s response to the Panel’s resolution of January 20th.

Thomas Grimwood, Grimwood Deutscher Architects, outlined their response to the resolution:

- The design consists of four equal units in an east-west orientation which are offset to create some articulation.
- The basements are interconnected with the main level and not intended to be suites.
- All units have a private patio and view decks to the west.
- The project has been reinterpreted in a more contemporary aesthetic.
- There has been little change to floor plans.
- The pitch of the gable has been increased to create a more elegant form.
- The traditional "punched" windows have been replaced with a more contemporary expression; they have been increased in size and positioned to maximize daylight penetration. A cornerless window detail has been added to the south west corner.
- The balconies are now cantilevered.
- The bicycle storage box has been treated with natural cedar slats to conceal the bikes while maintaining visibility.
- The garbage and recycling has been relocated to have a direct connection to the lane.
- The material palette has been changed to include natural cedar siding with grey stucco and concrete, and a metal roof.
- Rain protection at the entry has been increased by recessing the floorplan.
- It is too dark to increase the outdoor space to the east so we have kept it to the west side for sun exposure.
- We want to create a rhythm along the west elevation with a New York stoop condition to engage with the bike path.

David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Inc., reviewed the changes to the landscape plan:

- Hardscaping on West Keith Road has been reduced by shortening the patio and putting in a boxwood hedge to enclose the space.
- The design includes more drought tolerant plants but some watering will still be required.
- The swale on Jones Avenue is now more narrow due to the width of the Green Necklace so it has been planted completely with wetland plants. There are bridges across the swale to the main entry of each unit.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Staff: How does the change in the roof pitch affect the height calculations? A: Based on our calculations it works, however, we are not sure whether we calculate from the bottom or top of the five foot retaining wall. We need to clarify with staff.
- Staff: Has the eave line been lowered? A: Yes, to achieve the higher pitch.
- The building form addresses Jones Avenue, not really West Keith Road; is that on purpose? A: We are limited by the front yard setback so our primary move is to orientate the site to the west. We feel it suits the site.
- You have purposefully turned your back to Keith Road which is the dominant street. A: We feel it is a hierarchy. The nature of the site changes when it goes from a single family home to townhouses. On West Keith Road sites have a lot of landscape with the buildings floating beyond. We feel that Jones Avenue is the primary element given the
Green Necklace. Keith Road is a commuter artery with Jones Avenue being more pedestrian.

- What is the wood siding? A: It will be treated cedar.
- How do you think the cedar siding will weather with no overhang? A: We are conscious of that; it is a concern how it is treated.
- Why is there no overhang? A: We are showing a 12 inch overhang; it is a more contemporary building form but we still want to provide some protection.
- How will the decks work? A: There will be a concealed steel frame connected back to the building.
- The east pathway seems to be an internal circulation path? A: Yes; it is gated to prevent public access.
- To Staff: Is there a storm water management plan requirement? Staff: Yes; they have to provide 50% MAR.
- Is the permeable paving connected to the swale? A: Yes.
- To staff: Is the Green Necklace shown correctly? Staff: More or less.
- How do the two covered parking stalls for four units work? A: It is usually designated.
- To Staff: What about carports? A: There are restrictions on lot coverage; covered car ports would fall under lot coverage.
- Is the bike storage open-slatted? A: It is open air with screens on all sides.
- How does the Keith Road façade fit the Keith Road context? A: There are gable forms along Keith Road. We do not have the depth to do more.
- I understand your approach to facing Jones; was there any consideration to giving street presence to Keith Road with two units? A: Two townhomes turned on the site looked awkward with the gable forms. The east west orientation worked more naturally with the geometries of the site and allowed better circulation on the site. So we decided to privilege Jones Avenue.
- To Staff: How can we approve something that is not finished? Staff: That is up to the Panel.
- In the second floor bedrooms the windows look very small; is there a Code issue? Staff: It will have to meet Code.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- I feel strongly that the project should address Keith Road. The four forms work on Jones Avenue but do not work on Keith Road. The Jones aspect is well done. There is a rhythm to Keith that needs to be respected. I do not support either version.
- It is a tricky spot. You are asking for rezoning. It is difficult to put four units on the lot. It is a really important site. The character of the street needs to be respected.
- The wood siding without an overhang will look really bad really soon.
- The balcony design shows very thin steel with no connection at the top. You should consult a structural engineer.
- The presentation was a bit uncoordinated. It was difficult to give a thorough review.
- The grade calculation needs to be worked out before we review the plans. There cannot be too many “maybe’s” in this.
- This is a very prominent corner in North Vancouver; it needs some presence on Keith Road.
- Bike storage could be moved forward so you could create a mirror image on the west side of the garages to the east side; it might serve the units better.
- There is very little amenity space on the site because of the density; use some of the roof as a deck.
• The pathway is awkward; it is a narrow corridor and will need lighting.
• Provide access for garage A to access internally rather than walking all the way round; there is the issue of exiting to the laneway and having to come around.
• Match the two rear gates.
• Use landscaping and trees to structure the space on Keith Road; the entry on Keith feels like a side door. You need to bring some of the form from Jones on to Keith.
• The south elevation seems unbalanced compared to the Jones elevation.
• The design language for the garages does not seem consistent with the building.
• I am concerned with the bike parking; I would not want to leave my bike outside in the rain. I would also be worried about theft.
• Form does not follow function. I am concerned how the buildings will weather with no overhangs.
• I like the idea of the row house concept. You are trying to do too much on the site. I do not know how you should wrap the corner.
• The circulation is confused. I will not support this.
• You need to put as many eyes on the street on Keith as well as on Jones; there are a lot of pedestrians on Keith.
• The bike storage will not be used; it is not secure enough. It just invites theft.
• I do like the gestures to bring in a more contemporary approach.
• There may be a way of contrasting the regularity of the units to give them more of a distinctive character. The design needs more resolution.

Presenter’s comments:
I think Jones is the street that the units should face as it has a much stronger interaction with lesser setbacks and a quieter street. West Keith does not compare to that. I agree that the corner must be addressed more strongly to pay more homage to the corner. After long discussion I think it is more reasonable to have units orienting towards Jones.

There have been concerns about drainage and parking on the site. One idea is to eliminate the garages altogether.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 364-366 West Keith Road and thanks the applicant for the resubmission. The Panel feels that the following concerns have not been adequately resolved or explained and looks forward to further review at a future meeting:

• Resolve bike storage to provide weather protection and ensure better security;
• Resolution of the issues with the exterior materials and the protection and weathering of the exterior cladding;
• Onsite circulation to be refined;
• Onsite parking needs to be reconsidered;
• The potential to increase outdoor living through the inclusion of roof decks;
• Ensure the constructability of the balcony design; and
• Look at landscaping as a way to structure the green area facing West Keith Road as a means to define the entry to the south unit.
• Resolution of the West Keith Road frontage of the south building and its relationship with the Jones Avenue frontage.
The Panel feels strongly that the project should address both West Keith Road and Jones Avenue.

At the next review the presentation needs to show the chosen design scheme and this is to be reflected in the submitted materials.

Carried Unanimously

8. **Other Business**

None.

9. **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, March 16th, 2016.

Chair