

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, February 19th, 2014**

---

**MINUTES**

---

- Present:** B. Allen  
K. Bracewell, R.C.M.P  
H. Besharat  
A. Epp  
B. Harrison  
A. Larigakis  
P. Maltby  
M. Messer  
M. Saii
- Staff:** E. Adin, Deputy Director, Community Development  
C. Perry, Supervisor, Development Servicing  
S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk
- Guests:** **955 Harbourside Drive (Bodwell School Expansion)  
(Rezoning Application)**  
Doug Scott, Scott Architecture  
Rod Maruyama, Maruyama & Associates  
Paul Yuen, founder of Bodwell High School
- Absent:** D. Siegrist  
Councillor Bell
- 

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m.

The outgoing Chair welcomed the new members and relinquished the Chair.

**1. Commission Orientation and Welcome to New Members**

E. Adin took the Chair and welcomed the two new members to the Panel.

S. Kimm-Jones talked to the Panel about quorum requirements, the importance of adopting resolutions, and conflict of interest.

The members introduced themselves.

**2. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for the period February 2014 to January 2015**

It was agreed to elect the Chair and Vice Chair by ballot.

E. Adin asked for nominations for the position of Chair. Several members were nominated but declined. Bill Harrison was nominated and accepted. There being no further nominations, Bill Harrison was elected Chair by acclamation.

E. Adin asked for nominations for the position of Vice Chair. Duane Siegrist, Beryl Allen and Helen Besharat were nominated and accepted these nominations. After the ballots were counted, Helen Besharat was elected Vice Chair.

B. Harrison took the Chair at 5:50 p.m.

**3. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held January 29th, 2014**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held January 29th, 2014 be adopted as amended.

**Carried Unanimously**

**4. Business Arising**

There was a discussion on the review of projects and how to best determine the Panel's support or non-support of a project and the subsequent drafting of the resolution.

**5. Staff Update**

E. Adin reviewed relevant planning development, project and policy items from the February 17th Council meeting.

*There was a short break at 6:10 p.m.  
The meeting reconvened at 6:15 p.m.*

**6. 955 Harbourside Drive – Bodwell School Expansion (Rezoning Application)**

Staff introduced the project which is a proposal for a phased addition to the existing Bodwell School located in the Harbourside Business Park. The proposal is for a total floor area of 2.05 FSR which is in keeping with the floor area permitted for the Harbourside Waterfront properties to the east. The school is part of the Harbourside Business Park which was rezoned in the 1990's to 1.0 FSR. The school was built in 2002 and has built additions and increased the number of students and the number of dormitories in the past, without exceeding the 1.0 FSR of density. Now the applicant is requesting to double the permitted commercial floor space at this location.

The proposal for the easterly addition is for a seven storey addition to the east of the current school, consisting of underground parking with vehicle access from a driveway off Harbourside Drive, an expanded lobby, multi-purpose room, five levels of dormitories above the classrooms and an amenity area on the roof level.

The westerly addition will be constructed on top of the existing gymnasium, with one level of classrooms at the third floor level, four levels of dormitories above the classrooms, and an amenity area at the roof level.

Staff asked for the Panel's comments on the following: the density and height of proposed additions, the contextual fit of the proposed additions with the neighbouring Harbourside Waterfront properties to the east, measures in relation to noise attenuation with regard to the SeaSpan properties to the west and the anticipated increase in the industrial uses in the near proximity and the size and locations of proposed rooftop amenity areas.

A Panel member asked staff whether the increase in density had to be earned. **A:** There is no maximum density in the OCP for Industrial or Commercial Uses; it is considered on a case-by-case basis through rezoning applications. The proposal does not require an OCP amendment. Accessory dormitories are not considered residential.

Is there a concern from the existing tenants to the north? **A:** We have not heard specific concerns but it will come out in the public consultation process.

Paul Yuen, the founder of Bodwell School, explained that the school accommodates international students from 40 different countries. The students come to the school at the age of 13 – 15 years and then often go to Canadian universities; there are about 170 graduates each year. The majority of students have no parents or families living close by. There are a growing number of applications, particularly for onsite dormitory space.

Doug Scott, Scott Architecture, outlined the project to the Panel:

- The site is surrounded by the Spirit Trail and Kings Mill Park.
- A wing with dormitories and cafeterias was added in 2009.
- Bodwell School is proposing the same setback of four feet as Harbourside Drive.
- The parking plan meets the parking requirements with 86 spaces instead of 78 and secure bike parking
- Pushing the building north opens up views to the south.
- The plan adds a new gymnasium, more dormitories, new administration space, a roof top patio looking to the south, and a covered canopy entrance with a plaza out to Harbourside Drive.
- The whole school is connected on the third floor.
- The design steps back at the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> floors.
- There is a small 500 sq. ft. amenity area on the roof top.
- Street parking and trees act as a buffer between the school and the proposed Concert development.
- The design mimics the original building character but is more contemporary.
- There is a three-storey atrium space between the old building and new easterly addition.

Rod Maruyama, Maruyama & Associates Landscape Architects, reviewed the landscape plan:

- They were the landscape architects for the original building.
- The artificial turf will be removed and replaced.
- There are limited soft landscape elements: planters with shrub planting plus along the foundation.
- Existing concrete paving will be reused on the site.

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

- Is there 24/7 staffing on the site for emergency responders? **A:** Yes.

- How many students are there? **A:** There are currently 500 with 260 dorm spaces; space is rented on Dollarton Highway, plus there are some homestay families.
- Did you have an open house for the neighbours? **A:** It is currently very quiet. Students are very occupied inside the school. We have a very good relationship with the neighbours.
- Explain the amenity areas on the roofs. **A:** They are limited in size, about 500 sq. ft. They are not living or classroom space; perhaps a small group could have a bbq.
- The concrete planters are not at grade? **A:** Yes, you have to step up.
- Did you consider incorporating trees not shrubs in the planters? **A:** It is very tight on one side, street trees are there already. We want people to be able to find the entry so brought the canopy out as far as possible and kept it open with low planting.
- Have you studied the streetscape character to the east? What is the rationale of the heavy, raised walkway stones and plants? It is very formal. **A:** We are trying to keep it relatively open; we mean to delineate private and public spaces. Nowadays people think it is public space.
- What is the rationale for locating the entry to the underground parkade so close to the corner? **A:** It is because of the grades.
- What are your sustainability initiatives? **A:** The existing building uses radiant heating, there are sun screens, the existing building is tilt up concrete and uses thermal mass. We will be connecting to LEC.
- Have you done any ASHRAE 2010 analysis? Where are the sunshades? **A:** No. The existing building has steel sun shades with fibreglass grating.
- On level 4 with Phase 4, are there privacy issues between the proposed dormitories and the existing building? **A:** There will probably be blank walls opposite the existing dormitories for privacy and a fire wall.
- What are you doing for storm water management? Can you replace the turf with permeable turf? **A:** It is artificial turf because of the use. We can make it permeable. The patio stones are permeable.
- Is there an opportunity for the roofs to be used for better advantage for recreation space? **A:** We have thought about basketball courts on the roofs.
- Is there consideration of some kind of green wall at the north east corner to break up the mass of the building? **A:** We hope the three storey building will reflect what Concert is doing. We think it will be an institutional client so will be compatible.
- The east corner of the building seems to be the back side of the building; it needs something nicer to have more prominence. **A:** The parking has to be there because the street slopes up.
- Have you considered using green roofs for educational opportunities? **A:** We have considered it but are not sure if that is what we will do.
- Will there be an increase in students? **A:** We have a challenge satisfying different students; the cafeteria is very crowded for supper. We would like it to be more comfortable and offer more food choices. We have 500 students now and may go to 600. We will be bringing more students on to the site with the increase in dormitory space.
- What about noise mitigation strategies; how do you feel about the noise that will happen? **A:** Currently the students do not complain. It has not started at Seaspan. The new expansion will have air conditioning. There have been no complaints in the last ten years. The windows will be double glazed. Phase 3 is the furthest away from Seaspan and will probably be the least affected by Seaspan activities.
- **Staff:** Three points of information: with regard to the community amenity spaces – Concert is committed to urban agriculture for 50% of the roof top. The latest information

from Concert is that they may be creating office space for consulting professionals working under Seaspan although it is not certain. This is the first time there is a request for increased density at Bodwell School.

- **To staff:** Will this go through a Development Permit process? **A:** No, that can only be required through an OCP amendment process; we will secure the design of the last phase in the Zoning Amendment Bylaw so that it will go through an approval process.
- Can you review the passive energy design elements? **A:** At this point there is not much passive design. Shading will cut out the solar gain in the summer, argon filled low e gas glazing. We are not doing anything out of the ordinary.

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

- I like the idea of the two towers; you need to talk to the neighbours to the north.
- I do like the idea of bringing more students to the site; it will make it more lively.
- I like the overall strategy of the H-shaped plan with two taller wings opening the building up to the side. It is a nice entry court on the north. The parking area is a little disappointing; perhaps there should be less parking, less asphalt. It is your street address.
- In terms of contextual fit, I find the four foot setback to the eastern exterior lot line too small and would like the building to move over.
- It seems a little bit car-oriented. You need to think about the pedestrian connection which ends at a car turnaround and develop it, as well as along the north side.
- It is a very solid treatment with the stone and not very welcoming at the streetscape level; it needs windows onto the street, which would make it safer.
- You should look at the north east corner of the building. It is unfriendly at present.
- You should make better use of the roof; it should be programmed, a green roof or a teaching area.
- The parkade is a lost opportunity for storm water management.
- I like the use of the curves within the straight lines; the north east corner feels harsh, abrupt; there is a lot of grey concrete, something needs to be done to warm it up so it is not back alleyish.
- There is very little contextual information; I would like to see one block of elevations facing north. The drawings are not very legible. Look at the two storey podium level.
- I support the height and location of the proposed masses. There is not enough information for Phase 4 with respect to elevations and massing; I am not convinced that it is the right mass. There are privacy issues between the two buildings.
- You should revisit the location of the dormitory stairs so that the students do not rely on elevators. The current design does not encourage the students to use the stairs rather than the elevator. There is no connectivity to the front entry.
- The proposed canopy is the entry to the school, but you do not see the entrance doors from the north east corner. There is no connection from the entry to the sidewalk; you need to improve the entry experience. The canopy is a welcome addition.
- The long stone walls are quite harsh. You need to decide whether to repeat the additions within the same vocabulary or come up with something lighter. I find the existing architecture heavy and imposing.
- We need more detailed information to understand how the water is shed; where are the gutters?
- You need to embrace sustainability; use less mechanical. Sun shades will not do anything on the west façade.
- There is a lot of glazing on the new cafeteria; you need to address solar orientation in your design.

- The elevation is monotonous on four sides; maybe it should be more playful, more young. There is an element of lightness that is lacking.
- Is there a need for connectivity between the two cafeterias. Maybe you could use the outdoors more often for bbqs etc.
- The exit stairs in Phase 4 will have an impact on your elevations.
- This is a great opportunity for the project to engage the students with the streetscape rather than being behind solid walls.
- There are a lot of materials being used; simplification would be good.
- Soffits are important; what are you proposing since they will be visible from the street?
- As this is a school, this is an incredible teaching opportunity. Many new schools integrate off grid technology to teach children energy use. A lot of elements could be incorporated to teach them. The roofs are an opportunity to have a green roof, rainwater collection, solar panels urban agriculture (which could be used in the kitchen). There is an existing large roof. It is an opportunity to capture rainwater, clean it and reuse.
- The whole project seems very sterile when it comes to landscape; incorporating more of it would be good. There should be a green roof on the podium level.
- The interface with the park is very rigid and hard. Perhaps there could be a softer more integrated planted edge to integrate it with the park and shoreline.
- It has its back to everyone.
- You could set back the top floor a little.
- The increase in the residential units increases natural surveillance. You will have to define your territoriality.

**Chair's summary:**

- The massing and character of the building is a bit heavy and could be more playful.
- There are a lot of missed opportunities as to how the school is perceived.
- There is underutilization of the roofs e.g. social gathering, storm water management, urban agriculture, solar energy, educational opportunities, etc.
- There are concerns re the north east corner which needs further design development.
- Passive energy strategies need to be explored and developed further for façade orientation,
- Massing, height, planning is supportable

**Presenter's comments:**

- The setback is taking cue from what Concert is doing. They are proposing a four foot setback from Harbourside Drive so we echoed them.
- They have a system of north south streets.
- **Staff:** Concert require setbacks of at least 7.9 feet from the exterior side lot lines; this is not approved but is in the bylaw going to Public Hearing in April.
- We are thinking of cedar for the soffits.
- The glazing in the cafeteria is identical to the existing cafeteria and it works fine. The school has a large staff and they use operable windows to keep cool. There are garage doors along the front of the cafeteria which can be opened.
- Good comments on the landscape.
- Thank you; the comments are inspiring us to think of the educational effect of the design.
- It was a tough decision not to change the architectural vocabulary. We want to keep the original form so our alumni can remember it.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 955 Harbourside Drive/Bodwell School and, although supporting the site development concept, feels the following have not been adequately resolved:

- In general improve the quality of architecture;
- Consider simplification of the massing and use of materials;
- Resolve privacy issues between the proposed building and existing building;
- Provide further design development on the north-east “entry” corner of the building including the streetscape and semi-private landscaping;
- Provide further design development on the entry canopy and its interface with adjacent materials, existing and new massing;
- Revisit the locations and design of the internal stair wells to encourage their use by students and staff;
- Study roof top educational opportunities for student and staff use;
- Consider developing a storm water management with special consideration of roof top rainwater collection and re-use;
- Establish a sustainability and educational-based strategy appropriate to school use and student experience;
- Reconsider orientation and shading devices on all building elevations including a passive design strategy and an energy efficiency target;
- Revisit the interface with the park to the south;
- Update the setbacks with reference to the Concert Properties zoning amendment bylaw;
- Provide for additional opportunities for visual interaction between interior spaces and the public realm;
- Provide more contextual information; and
- Consider a public art contribution at this location.

**Carried Unanimously**

*The panel had a short break at 8:05 p.m.*

*The Panel reconvened at 8:10 pm.*

## **7. Zoning Bylaw Comprehensive Phase 3 Supporting Green Buildings**

E. Adin reviewed the proposed amendments to the Zoning Bylaw which would support the design and construction of greener buildings in the City of North Vancouver.

A comprehensive review of the Zoning Bylaw by staff has been ongoing since 2010. These proposed amendments are Phase 3 of the four phase process.

The 11 proposed amendments would apply to all new buildings constructed in the City:

- A Gross Floor Area exclusion for exterior wall assemblies that are thicker than six inches;
- Exclusions as allowable side and front yard projections for cantilevered shading devices;
- Height exemptions for green roofs and renewables (including solar thermal collectors, photovoltaic modules and small-scale wind turbines);
- Setback exemptions for green walls and renewables (e.g. PV panels);
- FSR exclusions for passive ventilation features;
- Removal of exemption from floor area and permitted setback projections for bay windows, but they will still be permitted;

- FSR exclusion for green building systems in cellars and basements;
- Exemption for greenhouses up to a certain size in accessory building floor area calculations;
- Exemption for primary staircase if it is situated near the elevator and is designed to be highly visible; or for a secondary staircase;
- Mandatory minimum garbage and recycling space and access requirements for all multiple unit residential buildings;
- Maximum impervious surface limit.

Eight of the 11 proposed amendments are designed to incentivize improved building performance, and two of the 11 are new regulations that will ensure improved building performance.

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

- Is the maximum impervious surface limit relating to storm water management and retention? **A:** If it is not going into a sewer, you can count it. There needs to be further development so we are investigating further.
- Exempting primary staircases near elevators is a great initiative.
- I am concerned about the wording in #7. What is a green building system? **A:** That is a good point. We have not drafted the Zoning Amendment Bylaw yet so we can define what it is in, and what is excluded from consideration. Air-tight mechanical rooms could do more for energy efficiency for smaller buildings.
- Are the amendments for Part 3 or Part 9 buildings? **A:** For all buildings.
- Mandatory minimum garbage space is very important in residential areas. Nowadays developers need to build a recycling closet into the unit. Seattle is making money from their green waste (after six years).
- Can there be encouragement of more landscaping? **A:** we cannot legally require it, but can sometimes through Development Permits. We could improve the definition of maximum impervious surface limit and see what other municipalities have done.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Zoning Bylaw Comprehensive Review Phase 3 Supporting Green Buildings proposed amendments and supports the construction of green buildings and the principles outlined in the report dated January 6<sup>th</sup>, 2014.

The Panel would encourage greater clarification of the term “green building systems” (amendment #7) and further development of the definition for “maximum impervious surface” (amendment #11).

**Carried Unanimously**

## **8. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:35 pm.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014.

---

Chair