

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, March 15, 2006**

MINUTES

- Present:** A. Malczyk – Vice Chair
D. Rose
N. Paul
D. Lee
A. Hii
R. Vesely
P. Winterburn
Councillor B. Fearnley
- Staff:** K. Russell, Development Planner
E. Maillie, Committee Secretary
G. Penway, City Planner
G. Venczel, Development Planner/Urban Designer
C. Perry, Supervisor – Development Servicing
- Guests:** Charles Moorhead - Architect
A. Fekri & P. Khodocrahmi – Developers
- Absent:** S. Friars - Chair
U. Stein
B. Dabiri
-

A quorum being present, the Vice Chair called the meeting to order at 5:10 p.m. and welcomed Pam Winterburn, new member of ADP.

1. Minutes of Meeting of Advisory Design Panel of February 15, 2006

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held February 15, 2006 be adopted.

Unanimously Carried

2. Business arising

None

3.

Staff Update

(a) 970 Marine Drive

This project went to Public Hearing in February and was rejected. A number of area residents expressed strong concerns with the proposal regarding height, density and traffic in the area.

This proposal cannot come back to Council for a year unless the applicant makes substantial changes to the proposal.

(b) 980 Marine Drive - Rezoning

A report is now being prepared and this proposal is anticipated to go to Public Hearing in April. In response to ADP comments, the applicant has enhanced the corner treatments and increased their contribution to the amenity contribution fund. This proposal also includes the sale of City land and it is anticipated that half of the sale proceeds may be allotted to the amenity contribution fund and road areas in the area.

(c) Riparian Regulations

New regulations are being imposed by the Province and, where required, will be carried out through the Development Permit process. The City's Regulation Bylaw is going forward to Public Hearing on March 20th.

(d) Ottawa Gardens

Area residents recently went to Council with a request that the moratorium on triplex development in the area of West Keith and the 200 blocks of West 5th Street and West 6th Street be lifted.

Council decided to lift the moratorium on West Keith and West 5th Street and staff will be preparing guidelines for West 6th Street (Ottawa Gardens) in 2006.

(e) ACDI

A member of ACDI has expressed an interest in attending ADP meetings when projects of interest on disability issues are being reviewed. Staff have advised ACDI that the ADP agenda is available on the City website. Staff will attempt to communicate with the ACDI rep when ADP is considering items that relating to disability issues.

4. Review of Advisory Body Procedures

(a) Council Procedure Bylaw

G. Penway, City Planner, referred to the memo of the City Clerk on procedures for advisory body meetings. The ADP provides input on design to applicants, staff and Council and makes recommendations prior to Council review.

G. Venczel entered the meeting at 5:25 p.m.

Some of the major points addressed at ADP project reviews include lighting plans in landscape, building materials, building design and CPTD.

Meetings of advisory bodies are open to the public but are not the recognized forum for public input. Advisory bodies can pass a resolution allowing a member

of the public to speak but it must be recognized that Council receives community input and makes the decisions from information they receive.

Procedures at advisory body meetings are less structured than at Council but generally follow Roberts Rules of Order. Councillors on advisory bodies act as a liaison between advisory bodies and Council.

(b) Two Evening Workshop – “Meetings & Rules of Order” – April 4 & 6, 2006

Members were encouraged to attend the workshop on “Meetings and Rules of Order” sponsored by the City for advisory body members and staff. This two-evening workshop will be held Tuesday, April 4 and Thursday, April 6 and members were requested to register with the City Clerk’s office.

(c) Conflict of Interest

Members are encouraged to avoid the perception of conflict of interest which may arise when they:

- Own a property being reviewed
- Have a professional relationship with a participant in a project
- Live in or own a property within the notification area of a potential development being reviewed by the Panel.

In these situations, members must declare their conflict and leave the room prior to the discussion period.

G. Penway left the meeting at 5:50 p.m.

5. Sustainable Development Guidelines

The Development Planner introduced G. Venczel, Development Planner / Urban Designer. Ms. Venczel has a background in architecture and design and is presently reviewing the City’s Development Sustainability Guidelines.

Ms. Venczel reviewed a preliminary draft of a ‘Complete Community Checklist’ being developed to facilitate information from the developer to staff, advisory bodies and Council. Suggested additions from the APC were reviewed and ADP was asked for input. Members suggested that a rating process and written statement on sustainability requirements would be useful to applicants.

Staff will be working on this document and a further presentation will be made to the Panel.

G. Venczel left the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

D. Rose declared a conflict of interest arising from his professional involvement with the rezoning application for 215 & 221 East 4th Street and left the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

6. 215 & 221 East 4th Street - Rezoning

D. Rose entered the meeting as a member of the delegation at 6:17 p.m.

The Development Planner gave an overview of the site and proposed development. C. Moorhead – Architect, A. Fekri and P. Khodocrahmi - Developers, and D. Rose - Landscape Architect were introduced.

The Architect reviewed the context of the neighbourhood and surrounding area. It was noted that this is a view sensitive site and the applicant is reviewing a view study with residents. The proposed site layout to accommodate nine units of varying sizes is also being addressed with neighbours in an attempt to minimize the impact on their homes. Existing large trees will be retained and protected during construction.

Design drawings dated March 2006 were reviewed and massing and elevations explained. The lanescape, garage access and garbage location were reviewed and the exterior finishing materials of cedar siding, vinyl window trim, asphalt roof shingles and colours were displayed. Low-e glass will be used.

The Landscape Architect reviewed the landscape plan which includes trees at the boulevard entry from the street and to screen the front patios. A central courtyard is accessible from the street and parking areas at the rear with low plantings within the site to address CPTED issues. The opening to the parking below will be marked by a trellis pyramid with climbing vines. Signage will be located at the street to identify unit entries.

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

- Garbage access;
- Man doors to the lane;
- Accessibility requirements;
- Access from courtyard to rear lane;
- Stormwater management;
- Depth of soil for planters at upper decks;
- Dimensions of courtyard patios for rear units;
- Soil depth for trees;
- Installation of irrigation system;
- Rail at upper deck;
- How safety issues at open pyramid over parking will be addressed; with lighting;
- Fire separation;
- Need for mechanical ventilation at the parkade;
- Canopy detail at north side of the south building;
- Roof of north building different from roof on south building.

D. Rose left the meeting at 7:10 pm.

Comments:

- Engineering may want more trees between sidewalk and road;
- Frame at pyramid needs to be non-climbable;
- Support the building massing, form, and windows;
- Good addition to neighbourhood and provides direction for future projects;
- Commend good architectural response and like building forms achieved;
- Grading within courtyard tight in places;

- Sloping sidewalk on south-west could be difficult in icy conditions;
- Believe north elevation could use more articulation on the façade to fit with the buildings on each side;
- South building less successful and difficult to marry it to the north building;
- Many different proportions and shapes of windows and would benefit from greater coherence;
- Entries to the rear units would benefit from improved identification;
- Unit E juts out and detracts from symmetry of the project;
- Need to have specific detail on elevations and materials;
- May be feasible to improve character at the lane with reduction of parking entries;
- Encourage maximizing soft landscaping for the courtyard as a means of stormwater management and improving general character of the building;
- Large patio areas at sides of the buildings are not usable and may be more beneficial to increase landscape;
- Encourage natural ventilation for garage if possible.

Applicant's comments:

Single entry to garage would improve the lane but may not be able to provide access to units which addresses CPTED. Additional landscaping at lane will be considered and appreciate comments on articulation

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 215 & 221 East 4th Street (Charles Moorhead Architect) and recommends approval of the project subject to the following:

- **Consideration of stairs on the southwest side as opposed to a ramp;**
- **Further consideration of the character of the development along the lane;**
- **Articulation of the façade of the north buildings facing the street;**
- **Stormwater management in the courtyard.**

FURTHER the Panel supports the courtyard pyramid and natural ventilation within the garage.

Unanimously Carried

7. Other Business

None

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, April 19, 2006.

Vice Chair

S:\COMMITTEES\ADP 35302420\MINUTES\2006\2006 03 15.doc