In the absence of the chair, and a quorum being present, R. Vesely called the meeting to order at 5:10 p.m.

1. **Staff Update**

   The Development Planner reviewed the status of development projects:
**Moratorium on West 5th / 6th / Keith**
Council adopted a resolution on a moratorium on development in this area in response to their concerns and those of residents around the massing of infill developments, height variances and zoning variances that have been coming forward. No further applications will be processed until Council receive and consider a report from staff.

**Public Hearings**
The following projects will be going forward to Public Hearing in July include:

- Ridgeway Out-of-School Building
- 612 Chesterfield Avenue
- 339 West 14th Street
- 231 West 18th Street

2. **Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel of May 19, 2004**

   It was regularly moved and seconded

   **THAT the Minutes of the Advisory Design Panel held on May 19, 2004 be adopted.**

   Unanimously Carried

3. **Business Arising**

   None

4. **East of Lonsdale Update**

   The Assistant City Planner gave an overview of the planning programme around the East of Lonsdale development, including the community input process and subsequent report to Council.

   K. McKillop declared a conflict of interest because of his professional affiliation with the following project and left the meeting at 5:20 p.m.

5. **The Pier Parcel 3 – OCP Amendment & Rezoning**


   The Assistant City Planner gave an overview of the area of the proposed development and noted that an OCP and zoning amendment and development permit are being requested.

   A public information process has been conducted in the area and participants were invited to respond. It is anticipated that the OCP Amendment Bylaw will go to Council in July and detail zoning and development permit application will be undertaken in
the fall. If Council chooses to proceed with the development, a more detailed presentation of the project will be reviewed by the Panel.

J. Bingham reviewed the detailed revisions made following the previous presentation to the Panel and set out in the development package dated June 10, 2004. Shadow analyses were displayed and the impact of this proposal on views from the building to the north were explained.

The chair read the resolutions passed by the ADP and APC at their reviews in April.

In response to the Panel’s question, the applicant advised that residents between Esplanade and East 3rd and Lonsdale and St. Georges were included in the public information process but only one formal comment was received.

K. McKillop left the meeting at 5:50 p.m.

Comments:

- Extensive analysis undertaken and results convincing
- Support proposed revised massing
- Thorough job on view analysis
- Final drawings may reveal concerns in relationship with adjacent buildings, including the rear on the side next to Parcel 4
- Needs work to lighten the top three storeys of the tower to create transparency in glazing or stepping back
- Higher tower impacts residents to the north
- Support the trade-off in heights
- Support the green roof

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the OCP Amendment for The Pier Parcel 3 (Pinnacle International / Howard Bingham Hill Architects) and recommends approval. The Panel commends the applicant for a thorough presentation.

Unanimously Carried

K. McKillop returned to the ADP meeting at 6:05 p.m.

5. **Block 62 – Rezoning & OCP Amendment**

F. Caouette, Manager – Special Projects, C. Brook – Brook Development Planning, J. Scott - CEI Architecture, G. Harris - Harris Consulting, M. Vaughan – Landscape Architect and Y. Lin Chee – Library representative were introduced to the meeting.

F. Caouette reviewed the process over the last ten years around the library renewal and the decision made to provide a central City library rather than a branch system. The key objectives for the library project delineated by library representatives and Council include:
• up to 35,000 sq. ft. in size
• daycare facility with outside play space on the site
• no upgrades or major changes to City Hall in this development
• provision of adequate open space, plazas, etc.
• on-site parking (120 now – replace all and provide for total 155 )
• library, and possibly other buildings on the site, to be built to LEED standard
• funding for library project to be provided from residential development on site

It was noted that site constraints – the main one being the location of City Hall – in conjunction with economics and community desires all impact on the development, and Council directed that Option B3 of the preliminary plan be explored.

C. Brook reviewed the points confirmed with Council prior to starting on this part of the development process. In reviewing development options, tower proposals that best address the priorities established by Council require OCP amendment for height.

G. Harris advised that a series of public open house sessions and public workshops have been held to get input from community residents. It is anticipated that the Library Steering Committee will submit a report to Council in July and make recommendations for siting of the library and residential development.

J. Scott explained three design options presented in response to Council’s preference for the preliminary Option B3. He also explained the vision of the library team and the desire of Council that the library remain a centre focus in the community. All of the options presented include daycare and outdoor play space. Conceptual drawings of views through the site were also displayed.

The Panel had questions on -

- Public preference on options
- Separation between tower locations in different options
- Location of main entry to library
- Location of parking and drop-off areas
- Number of parking stalls to be retained at 14th Street plaza
- Total density on site
- Size of daycare
- View impacts for residents of tower to the north
- Extent of expansion of library into plaza and impact on outdoor space
- Public access to west of City Hall
- Acquisition of property in north west corner of the site
- Economic viability of options
- Parking access
- Consideration of future expansion of City Hall

The resolution passed by the APC on June 9 was read to the meeting.
Comments

- Each scheme has advantages and disadvantages
- Support Option 2 with library pulled north into the civic plaza combined with Option 3 residential
- Glazing facing west could be problematic
- Interested in public feedback
- APC resolution must be taken seriously but contemporary style of development is endorsed
- Concerns with Option 1 – library removed from Lonsdale and wall along the street edge
- City Hall must be a prominent component on the site and not hidden
- May not be an option to develop City Hall now but it may be an option to emphasize it as a landmark in the future
- Locating library at the west of 14th Street would permit extension of 14th Street Plaza
- Library feature should be strong and transparent
- Option 3 site coverage cannot be comfortably accommodated – final direction needs to be more like Option 1 or 2
- Option 1 would accommodate expansion of City Hall in the future because existing library would be retained
- Need to consider common entry to City Hall and library
- City Hall building is a landmark with value in a modest way and has a potential to become a modern heritage building.
- City Hall needs greater presence and needs to be treated with respect in this development.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the preliminary presentation for Block 62 and thanks the presenters for a thorough presentation. The Panel supports the following features of the schemes reviewed:

- Library building with presence into public plaza on 14th Street
- Landscape areas and minimized site coverage
- Existing City Hall building to be treated in a respectful manner
- Residential towers should be located away from the City Hall building as in Option 1.

Unanimously Carried

K. McKillop & A. Malczyk declared a conflict of interest for professional reasons and left the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

7. 879 Marine Drive – Rezoning & OCP Amendment

K. McKillop and A. Malczyk entered the meeting with the delegation presenting the proposal. P. Busby and B. Waiklin – Architects gave an overview of the site. It was
noted that this presentation was for information only and that the Panel would not make a resolution at this time.

The Architect explained the reduced massing and height of the towers, the main revisions addressed since the previous presentation. Other changes include:

- massing of commercial component along Marine Drive
- 5-storey building along Hanes with single storey CRUs and four floors of residential rental development above
- new access to centre of the site
- reduction of surface parking stalls
- relocation of grocery store and drug store
- reduction of tower heights
- townhouse development over grocery store
- landscaped roof over townhouses and drug store.

It was noted that 2.25 FSR is permitted on the site and the applicant is requesting 2.48 FSR plus exemptions. An OCP amendment will be required to permit tower heights.

Questions:

- Conflict of residential access with access to Capilano Mall on the west
- Reaction of residents of neighbourhood to the north
- Pedestrian oriented expressions through the site
- Access to underground parking
- Consideration of restriction for surface parking
- Residential drop-off areas for the three residential buildings
- Canopy within inner pedestrian area
- Roof top treatments
- Roof top gardens on higher buildings
- Entries into CRUs to open onto Marine

The resolution of the APC following review of the revised proposal was read to the meeting.

K. McKillop and A. Malczyk left the meeting at 8:30 p.m. during the discussion period.

Comments:

- Support project and believe it needs serious consideration
- Would assist in making Capilano Mall more successful
- Support village idea in parking area and most of the components of this project
- Traffic and drop-offs need to be explored
- Look forward to development and architectural details of the project
- Support corner entry at Hanes and Marine
- Commend introduction of underground parking
- Support APC resolution that this site cannot be treated in isolation
- Preference would be that this site be combined with the one to the east
- Support that Marine Drive be revisited from a planning process
• Introduction of high rise towers along Marine would be dangerous precedent for Marine Drive
• Community amenities have not been addressed in this area
• Would revitalize this section of Marine Drive which has been a wasteland
• In terms of broader planning considerations, there may be other issues that need to be addressed
• Proposal in itself with landscaping, green roofs and green space is a commendable project.

The applicants left the meeting.

A. Malczyk and K. McKillop returned to the Panel at 9:10 p.m.

M. Rahbar declared a conflict of interest because of his involvement with the next project and left the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

6. **333 East 8th Street - Rezoning**

F. Farzadi, owner, and M. Rahbar, designer, reviewed the site and context of the area. The applicant proposes to build a duplex in the mid-block area of Central Lonsdale which is a mix of duplex and single family homes. The proposed project reflects the context of the street with exterior finishes of cedar siding with corrugated metal areas. Interior layout was reviewed. The applicant is requesting rezoning of the site with exemption of the FSR for the mechanical area. This area has no windows or doors to the outside.

Questions from the Panel were:

- Exterior colour scheme
- Roofing materials
- Resolution of roof drainage in the valley between the roof peaks
- Landscape detail
- Pedestrian circulation on the site
- Use of corrugated siding with cedar
- Material used for roof valley

Comments and concerns of the Panel were:

• Support the project and modern touch of using corrugated siding
• Suggest that roofing and drainage details at roof valleys be reviewed
• Flat roofs of the dormers need proper protection and drainage
• Support project in general but asymmetry in roof forms jarring
• Pedestrian circulation needs to be developed to provide access to garages
• Surface of walkways needs further consideration
• Fits with neighbouring buildings

It was regularly moved and seconded
The Corporation of the City of North Vancouver
Advisory Design Panel
June 16, 2004

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 333 East 8th Street (Vernacular Design) and commends the applicant for the quality of the proposal. The Panel recommends approval of the project subject to approval by the Development Planner of the following:

- Roofing;
- Hard surface pedestrian access to garages and general accesses on the sites to be addressed;
- Further refinement of the landscape design.

Unanimously Carried

The applicants left the meeting at 9:45 p.m.

M. Rahbar and D. Rose declared a conflict of interest due to professional involvement in the next proposal and left the meeting at 9:50 p.m.

8. 221 / 225 East 17th Street - Rezoning

C. Moorhead, Architect, M. Rahbar, Designer and D. Rose, Landscape Architect were introduced to the meeting and advised that since the last presentation to the Panel, Council received information on the proposed project and directed that it be processed. The applicants have been in communication with neighbours and their responses will be presented at the next presentation to Council.

C. Moorhead – Architect, explained the changes since the previous presentation. These changes include –

- Removal of secondary suites in the middle units
- Exterior design and exterior colour changes
- Reconfiguration of parking spaces
- Landscaping revisions relating to reconfiguration of units and parking at the rear of the units.

The Panel had questions on:

- Fire suppression between the units
- Location of unfinished area on the upper floor
- Adding sprinklers will increase service requirement
- Amount of rough-in for electrical and plumbing to allow later completion of unfinished area
- Necessity of providing a second parking space required for suite

Comments and concerns of the Panel were:

This is a workable solution in this location
Neighbours must be encouraged neighbours to support the project at public hearing
Support the project but it may be more appropriate to have the unfinished area in the basement rather than the upper floor
If garages are not required for centre units it may be better to leave space open
It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 221/225 East 17th Street (Vernacular Design) and recommends approval subject to approval by the Development Planner of:

- Resolution of location of interior unfinished areas.

  Unanimously Carried

9. **Design Awards**

   Deferred to July meeting.

10. **Other Business**

   None

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

The next regular meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 21, 2004.

____________________________________

Chair