

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, June 15th, 2016**

MINUTES

Present: J. Boyce (Chair)
B. Checkwitch
J. Geluch
S. Gushe
P. Maltby
A. Man-Bourdon

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

Guests: 230 East 8th Street
Steven Petersson, Consulting Community Planner
Rosa Salcido, VividGreen architecture inc.
Arleen Landayan, VividGreen architecture inc.
Clark Kavolinas, C. Kavolinas & Associates Inc.

364 West Keith Road
Tom Grimwood, Grimwood Architecture Inc.
Kara Burman, Grimwood Architecture Inc.
Masoud Siadat, Grimwood Architecture Inc.
David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Inc.
Behrouz Monadzadeh, Owner

Absent: K. Bracewell, RCMP
K. England
B. Harrison
A. Sehwoerer

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:38 p.m.

1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held May 18th, 2016

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held May 18th, 2016 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

2. Staff Update

D. Johnson reviewed the status of ongoing development projects.

3. Business Arising

The revisions to the Submission and Presentation Guidelines and Checklist were discussed; members will review the checklist and bring their comments to the July 20th ADP meeting.

4. 230 East 8th Street (Rezoning Application for Preliminary Review)

This application is being referred to ADP for preliminary comments and feedback. The application will be referred back to ADP following revisions in response to the additional feedback provided by Staff and the public. The site is allowed up to 0.75 FSR according to the Low Form Density Attached Form Guidelines. 4-6 units are recommended for a site of this size in the Official Community Plan.

Staff asked for the Panel's input on the following:

- Number of units, site plan and building orientation considering the site's orientation;
- Landscape design considering the western corner's prominence;
- Architecture considering the neighbouring heritage building and traditionally designed buildings nearby;
- Quality of the private outdoor space;
- Interface between the proposed grades along the rear property line and the lane;
- Preliminary comments on the proposed Energy Efficiency target.

Steven Petersson, Petersson Planning Consulting, gave an overview of the project:

- A well-attended public meeting was held the previous week.
- The project is in a neighbourhood in transition; the whole block is Residential 3 but has mainly single family homes at the present.
- The project provides an opportunity for a sensitive transition from the higher density to the west to the moderate density to the east.
- The development has 30% lot coverage to maximize open space.
- Different setbacks are proposed due to the shape of the lot.
- The applicant is asking for a parking variance of one stall per unit rather than 1.5 stalls per unit.
- The parking spaces are clustered in the north east corner to maximize open space and give a sense of a front lawn.
- Carports rather than garages are proposed which the neighbours prefer as they would be used for cars rather than storage and they reduce the bulk for the neighbours across the lane.
- The units are similar in height to other buildings in the area.
- Units 2-3 will meet EnerGuide 81; Unit 1 will meet EnerGuide 80.
- Adaptable design elements have been added to the main floor, including colour contrast on the nosing of each outside stair, tactile and visual cues on the curb cuts, easy to read address numbers, lighting levels, no polished cement on the building entry flooring and lever door handles.

Rosa Salcido, VividGreen architecture inc., described the project to the Panel:

- The footprint of each unit is about 500 sq. ft. 1200 sq. ft. per unit is quite spacious with good interior layouts.
- There is open space in front of each unit.
- Each unit has a rooftop deck for more open space.
- Metal flashing and metal vertical lines to give individuality for each unit.
- The ground floor is level with the street for access to a flex room with washroom.
- Upper levels are the social portion of the units with bedrooms on the upper floor.
- The shift of the units enhances their privacy.
- There are covered outside areas at the back.

Clark Kavolinas, C. Kavolinas & Associates Inc., reviewed the landscape plan:

- The units fronting East 8th street have formal entries with a box hedge.
- The Hydro kiosk will be screened with a cedar hedge.
- The back patios are softened with maples, soft planting.
- Fencing is used between each unit to give more space and privacy.
- The western corner has a large open space to soften the corner.
- Red flowering dogwoods are in front of the units a double row of trees coupled with the street trees which will be chosen by the City of North Vancouver
- Low bollard type lighting will be used to avoid light spill.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Are there building grades? **A:** Yes, on the full submission.
- How do the residents of the middle unit of the three south-facing units access their unit from the carport? They will have to cross in front of the neighbouring unit? **A:** Yes, there is a stair from the parking to two of the units; the site becomes level towards the east.
- We will have to check to ensure the access will be appropriate
- How much patio space is open to the sky? Are they mostly covered? **A:** There is an overhang but there is quite a lot that is not covered.
- I do not see much yard space in the two northern areas? **A:** They have the most green space in front of them.
- Is there a way of making the transition between the parking and the patios more uniform? Any daylight you can get is useful. **A:** They are at the level of the lane because the carports are all at the same level. It will be about 8-9 steps.
- Where does the garbage and recycling go? **A:** The bins will have to be rolled out for pickup. The garbage companies will do it.
- Will everyone have a roof deck? **A:** It will be a deck with some planting. They are quite far from neighbours so there should be no overlook issues.
- Is there is no cellar space? **A:** No, due to economic reasons.
- Did you consider six units in a row? **A:** Yes, if they were all in a line it would reduce the green area or cut off part of the parking, or lose some of the front setback.
- Did you explore stairs from the parking to the patios of units 2 and 3 for access? **A:** There is direct access into these units.
- Can you clarify the relationship between the units and the back patios; to access you go through the bedroom space? **A:** Yes, it is at ground level.

- The carport has a canopy? The patios are in a hole? **A:** Yes, the parking is raised about half a level.
- Is there rain cover over the front entrances? **A:** The entrance is recessed with a small canopy.
- Is there an operable window on the ground floor? **A:** We will have the regulation operable space for ventilation and fire safety.
- Storage space is three closets? **A:** There will be extra storage for bikes which could be added to the garbage, recycling space. Each unit has its own bike storage.
- Is each unit the same plan? **A:** Yes.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- I think it is an interesting project with interesting articulation. It will fit the neighbourhood quite well.
- I am concerned about the backyard spaces; it might be more usable to have them at the same level as the parking. I am not sure how it will work with the parking.
- There does not appear to be a proper sized master bedroom; an ensuite would be a good selling feature.
- I wonder if the vertical orange element detracts from the architecture. The shape does a wonderful job of saying what the building is; you do not need the vertical line.
- I wonder about the taper in the fin; it looks complicated. There is a lot of articulation going on and the design probably works without it.
- I like the roof amenity space; there is so little on the land.
- The number of units is doable. It is an exciting project.
- I have no issue with six units. I would re-explore the two clusters of three homes. You could improve the EnerGuide rating; you should be aiming higher with a rezoning.
- The back patios are covered and down in a pit; it does not seem great. They might not be used.
- The City could consider a variance on the setback to make the project work.
- I like the design but you should incorporate some form of rain protection at entries and windows.
- It is some very unique and interesting architecture. I like the way the buildings step back. I have a serious problem with town home number 3 and the exposed blank wall fronting East 8th Street; that row has turned away from East 8th Street to front the intersection.
- Next time you present you should have as many sections and elevations as possible.
- I have serious concerns about the usability of the back patios for the eastern units. The design puts a lot of focus on the south patios. Think about how you can make the project more private and screen from the street. The south facing and at grade patios are more successful than on the north side.
- Another section emphasizing the roof top decks would be useful.
- I have some concerns. Six units is too much; I would prefer to see five. Three units facing south and then rotated results in an awkward joining. I would prefer to see the units face the street. The walkway is not a very nice space; open up the passage through the building.
- There are a lot of blank facades on the project.
- The back elevations are very bare. There is no differentiation from the lane. It needs something better in terms of treatment so it looks like a townhouse for the neighbours across the lane.
- The back patios are not a productive space.

- Three closets for storage are not enough. Make five more generous townhouses and give them more space. The plan seems meagre on the inside.
- I think the detailing will be difficult between Hardi panel, wood and stucco to keep it contiguous. Stucco is not good without rain protection.
- A model would help us understand what is going on.
- It is hard to see what is going on in terms of liveability.
- If you are applying for more density you should be doing more than taking one unit and repeating it. There should be more thought and care in response to a tricky site. More finesse is required.
- I have concerns re the lack of overhangs especially on the large south facing windows; it will be hot. I would rather see something that takes the site into account.
- There is almost too much hardscaping at the front; it is like a plaza with green islands and will be an anomaly in the neighbourhood.
- I do not think the architecture is responding to the site conditions.
- The green space at the corner will become a cut through. There is a park just down the street; internalize the green space and give it back to the units.
- I like the modern feel and that you are not trying to be a heritage recreation. The blank facades are a concern especially on the lane as the neighbours have to look at it.
- It is good to come in for a preliminary as it is a key, but difficult site, and requires careful planning, design and consideration of the surrounding context.

Presenter's comments:

Thank you for your comments; the public did not like the rear elevation either. We have some more work to do to resolve the circulation. That is an interesting comment re the park down the street. If it reads as a park we may need to reconsider the large green space. There is more work to be done. We appreciate the feedback.

5. 364 West Keith Road (Rezoning Application)

This is the third time this application has been before the Panel. The applicant has returned with a revised concept based on the previous comments from the Panel.

Staff asked for comments from the Panel on the Site design, including circulation and functionality, the Architectural style in its context; and the landscaping, including the suitability of the proposed planting and choice of planting materials.

Tom Grimwood, Grimwood Architecture Inc., outlined the response to the Panel's previous comments:

- The new design integrates comments from the Panel and neighbours.
- To reduce the massing onsite the garage structure has been removed and changed to at-grade parking with permeable pavers.
- The north duplex has been moved closer to the parking to increase the size of the internal courtyard and allow for increased daylight penetration.
- Garbage facilities have been moved to the interior path.
- Bike storage has been divided into individual storage lockers attached at the rear of each unit; it is a flexible space with room for other items.
- The southern duplex has been turned to address Keith Road and has two entrances off Jones Avenue and two off Keith Road.

- The gable form has been cut back on the rear of each unit to allow for a roof top deck in the interior for privacy and more quiet. The gable form along the public edge of the property. The height is now within the height envelope.
- Architectural elements include a brick base to ground the project with vertical cedar siding and a metal roof. The inclusion of colour adds life to the units.
- Windows are sized and located to take advantage of the views and allow daylight.
- There are five parking stalls.
- The duplexes to the south are smaller to create more usable courtyard space.
- The FSR is slightly reduced to 0.67 FSR with a lot coverage of 0.35%.
- All four units have three bedrooms.
- There will be a request for a single rear yard relaxation.
- Permeability has been increased to improve the site drainage.

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

- The landscaping on West Keith Road has been changed to a more formal arrangement to highlight the entrances off the sidewalk from Keith.
- The swale along Jones Avenue still remains.
- The edge of the parking is softened with a low planting to protect the edge of the building from vehicles.
- The patios are private but not gated. There is a security gate on the east pathway.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Thanks for the presentation.
- What is the fence made of? **A:** It is a painted grey wooden fence on top of a concrete retaining wall.
- Are the panels adjacent to the windows moveable? **A:** Yes, they are shutters on a concealed rail and will address heat gain from the south.
- How is the wood treated? **A:** Four inch stained tongue and groove cedar.
- Are there windows to the basement? **A:** Window wells.
- The interior stairs are back to back? Is there just a vaulted roof on one of the units? Could it be provided to the right one too? **A:** We wanted to make the roof access discrete that is why there are some interesting shapes on the inside.
- How big will the plantings in the swale be when they grow to maturity; will they push out into the bike trail? **A:** They are fairly small and will not intrude.
- Are there vines coming off the roof? **A:** There is a planted area on the outside of the deck rail to create privacy.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- I really like what you have done. It is a huge improvement over the first two schemes.
- It is way better. Thanks for the video. I have seen some issues in construction where the parking pad is tight to the building; consider bringing the concrete wall right up.
- I appreciate you showing the difference between the previous scheme and this one.
- You have done a good job addressing our comments. The small courtyard gives breathing room and increases sociability. The storage lockers for bikes are great. Is there the possibility to put trellis over the parking?

- Thank you very much for substantially improving the project. It will be so much better for the people who are going to live there. I appreciate the effort. Elimination of the garage building has freed up the site.
- I really like the exterior articulation. It is an appropriate modern design with some reference to the buildings in the neighbourhood. It is unique and hits the right note.
- The landscape is beautifully done and immeasurably improved.
- It is a huge improvement and evident how much work has been put into it. Materiality is good. It is much better now that you have turned the structure to face Keith Road. Fantastic project.
- Does the fence does need to be full height all the way up to the street?
- It is nicely done and the use of brick grounds the building. The facing of Jones Avenue and Keith Road is really nice.
- The landscape really complements the architecture.

Presenter's comments:

This is an example where the comments of the Advisory Design Panel added a lot to the project and forced us to resolve some of the issues and make it better. Thank you.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 364 West Keith Road and recommends approval of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for the quality of the proposal and their presentation.

Carried Unanimously

6. 407 West 16th Street (Rezoning Application for Preliminary Review)

The Panel declined to review the rezoning application for 407 West 16th Street as there was no registered landscape architect in the delegation.

7. Other Business

A poll will be sent to members to check for quorum for the July and August meetings.

8. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, June 29th, 2016.

Chair



