The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m.

1. Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held April 19th, 2017

   It was regularly moved and seconded

   THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held April 19th, 2017 be adopted.

   Carried Unanimously
2. **Business Arising**

   No business arising

3. **Staff Update**

   D. Johnson reviewed the status of ongoing development projects.

4. **1730 Chesterfield (Rezoning Application)**

   The site is in Central Lonsdale at the S.E Corner of Chesterfield Avenue and West 18th Street, a block away from Lonsdale Avenue. It is currently occupied by a wood frame 3-storey rental building, of 30 years old, comprising 42 rental suites of 1 and 2 bedrooms. The intended project is an 87-unit rental building, six-storey wood frame over 1 level of underground parking. This project proposes the development and replacement of rental units as a public benefit.

   Staff asked for ADP's input on the following:
   - The proposed site design;
   - The proposed articulation of the building, in particular the stepping back of the upper floors;
   - The design to the main entrance;
   - The application of façade materials;
   - The supporting deck columns at the building's corners; and
   - The proposed landscaping plan.

   Luis/Marcela Zunino, Garcia Zunino Architects Inc., described the project to the Panel:

   - We considered how the new building will interact with existing buildings.
   - Goal is to develop a building with a contemporary style with brick accents, flat roofs and porticos with brick columns.
   - The South and North sides have been set back to reduce the height at the extremes of the building.
   - There is a pathway and an extension of the bicycle lane.
   - Units on the first floor will have access from the street.
   - From Chesterfield to the lane there is a grade difference of 5ft. We eliminated the roof exiting the parking and simplified the garbage container area.
   - Both stairs exiting to parking are covered and protected for security.
   - Regarding the floor plan, we tried to push the building forward to gain more space at Chesterfield and closer to 18th.
   - Materials are non-combustible with accents in brick with timber details at the main entrance.

   Lena Chorobik, Viewpoint Landscape Architects Inc., reviewed the landscape plan:

   - There are existing Evergreen trees around the front now.
   - There is a solid fence along the North side and lane with a hedge behind the fence.
• We cannot save any of the trees; they are too close to the building so we plan to provide new trees.
• We are proposing an urban look with a low brick wall with a fence and clipped hedges behind it giving a sense of privacy and closure.
• Ground units have individual entries with gates and the main entry is at street level no steps or ramps.
• There will be an entry court with a sitting area and small scale trees.
• Private yards have lawns and hedging.
• In regards to the back and front, the difference in elevation is picked up by a perimeter wall of 18 inches and 2.5ft on west corner and gradually gets higher towards North East corner.
• There is a small sitting area and bike racks at the entry to building.
• Planting is small and low maintenance with both native and oriental plants.
• Simple approach.
• Raised planting helps to slow down percolation.
• Common entrances are well lit.
• A new multi-use path is proposed with two layers of trees.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

• Is this a wood frame building? A: Yes.
• You mentioned brick tile on the columns, is that an applied thin tile? A: Yes.
• Is it for columns or walls? A: For columns and first floor.
• Is it shallow? A: Yes.
• Would it be possible to increase glazing on the main floor? A: The idea is to make it totally visible for people being invited to use during the day and promote exercise.
• Is it possible to add a skylight to add natural light on the stairs? A: Yes.
• There’s a lot of bike storage in the parkade, but are the smaller spaces meant for vertical? A: Yes.
• In the landscaping area, is there an opportunity to use bird and butterfly friendly plants? A: A certain percentage of plants are bird and butterfly friendly, we can increase the percentage.
• To staff: Is there a percentage requirement? A: No.
• What about energy performance? A: We are proposing to increase the performance of the building to 10% by increasing the performance of the insulation in the building.
• How will you achieve that? A: We need an energy model first. We completed a consultation and it’s possible to achieve the 10%.
• What material is the boulevard going to be where the trees are? A: Silva cells are shown under the trees. The compartments under the trees help to provide sufficient soil.
• Between bike path and road will it be grass? A: Yes.
• From the curb there is a 1m green zone for trees, 1.5m trough for bikes and a 2m sidewalk. Silva cells will provide storm water management which is why we are not asking for bio soil.
• Will the roof top of the building be useable? A: No, not at this moment.
• Do you have a physical model? A: No but we have a sketch-up.
• Why is the roof non-useable? A: It’s not a requirement.
• Is there a physical or structural restriction to access or use the roof? A: No
• Is bike lane for now or for future? A: The way it is set up, it will be odd for bikes to move around and go through which is why showing as future.
• There are 20 mature trees coming off the site that will be planted off site, does that count? A (staff): We don’t have a replacement requirement for number of trees. We can have a discussion with the applicant.
• Will there be electric plug-ins for e-bikes and e-cars? A: No.
• Is there a public art contribution? A: No.
• In drawing 2.03 where the building encroaches, can you move the building South and West slightly to conform to the setback requirement? A: We have the access to the parking garage by the lane; second we thought it was possible to put it close to the 18th street property line because of the perceived height of the building. The overall project will benefit if we move it closer to the lane.
• In the drawings, the windows are two shades of blue? A: No, only one type of glass
• Which rooms have opening windows? A: Proposing all windows are openable for the exterior windows as it’s more sustainable.
• The lighting bollards on drawing L3 of 3, is that a down component, how tall? A: They are different heights and some are on sidewalk level and some on the planter. They should be below eye level.
• Which way does light shine? A: Down.
• In terms of the neighbourhood it’s quite a variance, any feedback from neighbourhood about the height? A: We are below the height allowed in the area, we are at 16.1 metres and the allowance is up to 19m. There was no opposition from the public that it was too big.
• It seems it’s been stepped in from the back edges, but not middle part at the front of building; can the whole top floor be set back? A: We can’t develop proper units if we cut back the building in the front.
• The pathway along the side of building to South entry, how visible from street? A: It has a low wall on North side with a hedge, low planting on the South, which is quite open from South West side, and no obstructions on the South side. It is completely visible from street level.
• Is there a clear and unobstructed view from people coming out? A: Yes.
• How visible is the entrance and exit from the parking garage in North East corner on 18th? A: The entry in gate is visible, the stairs are not but it’s well lit. The gate will be lockable.
• BC hydro kiosk may block the view, it’s not cramped and it’s well lit
• Have you discussed the hydro box location with BC Hydro? A: Yes, we discussed it with them and we agreed on that location and they are happy with it.
• What climbing vines will be on the wall around the recycling area, are they invasive and how do people access the recycling area? A: The garbage room is in the parking area and is accessible. The lanes that connect to private yards is very narrow so we want them on the walls.
• Are there vines that are not invasive? A: Yes, climbing hydrangea.
• Are you specifying non-invasive? A: Yes.
• On the 6th floor you can’t set building back anymore on the Chesterfield side because the units will be unusable? A: No, it’s hard to get the quality of unit we have now. It would compromise the quality of the interior. There are high costs and structural issues we are trying to avoid being it a rental building.
• With fewer units, would they still be quality units? A: No, if you start moving walls around on the building that high on wood, it becomes uneconomical. If you start stepping back, you look at a different handle as far as structure and liability. To produce those units is a
certain cost. There is a formula between amount of units you have and a return on investment. I cannot make that decision.

- Do you have a 3D model? A: Yes.
- Can you describe what makes this contemporary? A: It has simple lines, local materials. This building has been designed with the interior of the unit in mind. The vertical elements on the West side of building projects shadows in the summer months that protect it from the sun.
- What materials are repurposed or recycled, where are they? A: We don’t have all the finishes yet but it will be in the interior finishes.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Suggestion to look at detailing with this type of material (non-combustible cladding) to step up the aesthetics.
- Brick tile could end up being in same plane as the hardy panel. If you’re looking for a base to stabilize it, I recommend a different look and aesthetic to pronounce the brick.
- In order to get people to use stairs, more natural light will be beneficial.
- On stair 1 there’s an opportunity to add top lighting. A skylight may not be appropriate but maybe a clear ceiling.
- Add some more glass to the amenity room
- To foster more interaction in the entry court, move the bike rack elsewhere and add a second bench.
- Entry canopy is 2 stories high and looks shallow, maybe extend it outwards. Would encroach on the setback. Look at encroachments if it enhances the architecture.
- To create a more urban look, consider moving the building closer to Chesterfield. It’s shy of the setback.
- The space between the building and lane seems cramped. Having more space on the lane side would make better use of patios.
- The façade architecture needs further design development.
- Nice strong, horizontal and vertical facade. Work this more on the base of the unit to solidly plant the building in the space.
- Encourage landscape architecture to use fewer columnar trees as it creates issues for people riding bikes; not a clear trunk space.
- There’s a great amount of public realm. There’s an opportunity to have a beautifully lined street with two rows of trees, one on the off side of the property and on the property line.
- Make the wall near the parkade smaller and more intimate and bring the trees between wall and sidewalk closer.
- I don’t think smaller lawns would be less useable; having more defined spaces would improve the street edge.
- Would like to see some sort of small outdoor amenity for residents. Maybe move the amenity room to the first floor where it can be connected to the outdoor space.
- In the back lane, move the building to the West and increase the space between the lane and patios.
- Dense planting and better screening near the sunken patios for garbage days.
- I agree with setbacks, could be more balanced for units on main level.
- Bonus density has to be earned and it hasn’t been.
- Design development is not there, it’s too monotonous.
- Lost opportunity in railings and detailing. I think it’s very pedestrian.
- Loss opportunity in the roof from livability use. Need a space to gather. Loss of exposure to the mountains. Push client to incorporate these things into it.
- Bike storage, look at 25% to have accessible plug in for e-bikes.
- Look at e-car plug-ins, 1 or 2 for the future.
- Look at application for unsecured car share parking so cars can be left there.
- Public art contribution should be part of this development to improve public realm and celebrate the culture. Could be a bonus to community and development.
- Encouraged to look at the corners and how it relates to the decks. It looks a bit harsh.
- Trouble with the extreme horizontal window treatment. It could be harsh to look at from the inside.
- The roof has real opportunity. Make it more interesting for families and kids. Don’t have to use the whole roof.
- Consider what doors to use on laundry and suites.
- Floorplans should show furniture. Many bedrooms are only 9ft wide. Not much room for beds and dressers.
- Have a connection through the building at some point. Landing spaces on the second floor look identical to the size of suites adjacent to the lobby on back side. Might be feasible to have that as an open space for people to gather and spill out into common area. People might interact more often.
- The way the building is articulated is quite nice from a massing point of view.
- Ensure clear lines of sight in parking and turns in the South West corner.
- Territoriality is well defined.
- Ensure there is an appropriate lighting plan.
- Ensure landscaping doesn’t interfere with the line of sight.
- There is a certain obligation to deliver a higher quality building.
- The materials and the composition of the elevations will benefit from more design development.
- I don’t find the building contemporary.
- There’s nothing in the materials or form of the building that makes it feel local or embedded in the context of North Vancouver.
- The proportions of the brick columns are unsettling because if they were load-bearing brick they wouldn’t work structurally.
- Project needs more design work and development if it’s going to get those variances and rezoning and bonus density being asked for.
- There are better ways to achieve that density to make it appear less massive.

**Presenter’s comments:**

We can look at the roof deck for sure. We hope the roof idea doesn’t become a 7 storey building so we will bring that question forward. It hasn’t been successful in other projects for tenants who live below the roof. It is important that we look at the light in the corridors. The railings came as a request from the owner to be low maintenance. The picket railing was not an architectural statement. We considered having the amenity room as an exterior space but a lot of times these spaces are not maintained and inviting. We thought more of a celebration space but also a work space for those that live there. We will look at setting back the building from Chesterfield. As for material and articulation, there is a lot happening and it could be simplified. It needs to be realistic. Six storey buildings have limitations and costs more money up front.
It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 1730 Chesterfield and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the issues listed below:

- Review the setback issue to help the livability of the lane side patios;
- The facade treatment and the articulation of the façade materials needs further design development;
- Explore different railing as an opportunity to articulate the façade;
- Explore the opportunity of using partial roofscape for public amenity as well as decrease heat island affect;
- Look at the unit floorplans with regards to livability and furniture layout;
- Explore the opportunity for electric outlets in the parking area for both cars and e-bikes;
- Explore possibility of a car share stall or designated spot for signage in front;
- Explore public art contribution for the project;
- Explore setbacks on upper levels;
- Exploration of natural light in stair wells;
- Consideration of increased interior and exterior amenity space; and
- Tree replacement should strive to replicate the character of the existing trees being taken out.

**Carried Unanimously**

5. **150 East 8th Street (Development Permit)**

The development consists of a mix of two-level townhomes and single-level apartments distributed across two six and a half storey buildings over two levels of underground parking. The proposed residential area is 163,972 sq.ft., achieving an FSR of 2.6. Parking includes 236 underground vehicle spaces and a minimum of 2 bicycle spaces per unit.

Staff would be interested in the Panel’s input regarding the following:

- The proposed site design;
- The proposed architecture of the buildings;
- The proposed landscaping plan (including the amenity patios);
- The proposed design of the proposed plaza and public walkway;
- The proposed proximity of the proposed buildings to the existing building on the site to the East; and
- Direction of the public space to the West of the site.

Dale Staples, Integra Architecture, described the project to the Panel:

- The corner of the site is close to Lonsdale in the center of North Vancouver.
- Victoria Park is to the south and the TELUS building is on East side.
- There is an open green space at the intersection of Lonsdale.
- It is an urban site with glimpses of downtown Vancouver.
• It is a mid-rise building.
• There is a grade difference from 11th to 8th street.
• Parking access is limited to the South East side.
• It is a constricted location and we have to provide 30 parking spaces for TELUS.
• We created a wall between 11th and 8th street.
• Looked at creating a pedestrian connection between two buildings.
• Came to a final option to minimize the overlook issues and create a better relationship to the TELUS building.
• There is an amenity space which acts as bridge between the two buildings.
• Along east 8th it is articulated with townhomes and apartments above.
• Contemporary West Coast architecture.
• Looking at introducing water at main entrance and plaza area.
• Building is set back from the corner of the intersection. The fin at the front emphasizes the importance of the space and water feature.
• On 11th street the building is recessed far back to give a courtyard.
• The smaller building has a green wall on the side.
• It is made of wood frame.
• We have considered water management and energy efficiency.
• Mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units.
• The key features are the pedestrian network with sidewalks, a pedestrian pass through site and secondary pass through units on the ground floor.

Michael Patterson, Perry and Associates, reviewed the landscape plan:

• There is a grade change on 11th and 8th street.
• Patios extend out from the ground units.
• Every ground unit has access out to the street.
• Due to the grade changes, some units have accessible access to their patios but most are stair access.
• Sidewalks are pressed up against curbs on both sides of streets.
• We've proposed a larger boulevard, sidewalk and parking bays on both streets.
• There are new street trees and a friendlier pedestrian realm.
• The walkway up to the main entry has a water feature and in the building.
• North side units are provided large patios.
• Near the TELUS building there is a generous open space and room for planting.
• A walkway is provided as well bringing a level of security.
• There is a common walkway as a mid-block connection with access out to the street.
• Lots of open and flexible space for residents to use.
• Proposing a green screen south facing with planting vines to grow up it.
• Planting a number of trees with a layered approach to planting.
• Opportunity for public art and a place for people to stop and sit, play outdoor chess.
• We have an interactive art piece in mind that creates shadows on the side walk.
• Potential for food trucks.
• Retail is around the corner.
Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Is there Harding panel on the surface? A: Harding panel and Harding plank which gives it more texture.
- In detailing, it’s not as forgiving as stucco, how will you express the plainer look? A: Panel has reveals that separates panel joints, it’s not meant to be a smooth surface.
- The copper coloured piece at the end, how does it terminate at the roof scape? A: It will end back onto the building. It won’t engage the whole building.
- Intend to have glazing in stairwells? A: Yes
- Is there a way of connecting the amenity room to the back court yards? A: There is courtyard access to the residential area, there is an indirect connection. You can’t get direct access from the exterior; you have to go back into building.
- What is reason for using wood grain as opposed to flat? A: It has more texture.
- Have you looked at vegetated roofs, especially at the entry? A: No, but it is a good point.
- I noticed there are pop ups on the roof, is it accessible? A: Yes all units on the top floor have stairs with access to roof and covered outdoor space.
- The fin at the end of the building, how will you finish that? How will it get details in the copper? A: Next is the detail, we’re thinking of having it done in horizontal panels but flush element with a corner trim. Using LED lighting at the edge between to panels is being debated.
- In regards to the public art, would the corner of the park be part of it? A: We have a piece of art we would like to work with, we have a unique piece that has the size and scale and presence. Working on a proposal for this. It will have mirror shapes that can be turned by a handle and ravens start flapping their wings.
- Are you considering electricity in bike storage and for e-bikes? A: Yes.
- What is the distance between the two buildings? A: 40ft approx.
- In some of the bedrooms, where the dresser would go? A: Master bedrooms are sized for queen beds, it has good closet space but we agree it is tight.
- Is there a landscape plan for the roof? A: No.
- Do you plan to do a landscape plan? A: There are options for hot tubs and planter elements, privacy screens.
- Looks like building is encroaching on the set back on 11th and 3rd? A: The line is to show what the 20ft line is from the property line to get a sense of what the distance is.
- What are the storm water management and recycling plans? A: Underground storm water retention tank in area below water feature. No plans to reuse outside storm water.
- Describe the experience if you’re a pedestrian that doesn’t live there? A: The midblock connection is to have an informal connection. As a pedestrian, you would have to know that it’s there. It is completely open to the public? A: Yes.
- All the floor units have exits on the street or court yard? A: Yes, off the corridor too.
- Are they going to be identified street side with a unit number? A: Yes.
- Will the courtyard be the same with a unit number? A: No, the town homes are clearly identified on the street.
- In regards to the grade variation do you have a civil engineer on the project? A: Yes, we have Vector Engineering.
- Are you aware this is a subdivision? A: Yes.
- Are you using CLT? A: Yes, it is a floor system.
- Is the CLT panel in-used in the floor assembly? Can you address the acoustic performance? A: There is an acoustic material that allows us to get high sound absorption. We suspend the ceiling below it.
• Has there been more design to the west cul-de-sac? A: Yes.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:
• The fin has to have more detail to it.
• Materially, I’m not convinced Hardy can make it what you want it to look like.
• Using CLT in the fin might be a perfect way to highlight CLT and bring it into structure.
• On issue of hardy panel, a clip system can overtake the planer look.
• To enhance overlook of amenity roof, add a vegetative roof, patterning or river rock.
• Nice to see vertical screening and landscaping in the recycling room.
• I enjoyed exploring the design in response to the challenging site and how the building and landscape work with the change and narrow configuration.
• Liveability of inner corner units in building 1. It will be challenging for people who live there. Maybe the design of the angle can be laxed a bit more.
• Also challenging for livability near the boundary of TELUS, it seems close and will be quite dark.
• Idea of walking under the amenity space is great, this space seemed small.
• Appreciate the push for a corner development; the small parklet with uses is great.
• I question the size of the water feature; it conflicts with the architectural design.
• It would be good to have more seating to interact with water feature, walk past and sit next to it.
• Suggest more programming of outdoor spaces; an amenity patio could use tables and barbecues.
• Appreciate accessible roof with amenity space, maybe add a simple sedum green roof.
• Adjacency to TELUS building needs more work space wise.
• The site is very urban.
• Paying attention to the mid-block connection is the key to this project.
• The back corner is dark, make sure it’s safe.
• The roof plan is great.
• Encouraged to explore the public art part of this, it’s on a very important corner.
• Suggest the stairwell from parkade is in line to where you would walk out to the street.
• The walkway, if it’s open to the public, is a movement predictor. Ensure it is spacious enough with appropriate lighting and sightlines.
• Have to make sure first responders know where they are going in.
• One street address with three separate areas first responders can go to.
• Having an LED on the fin may be obnoxious, it’s not required or desired.

Presenter’s comments:

The detailing for the main fin feature, the wall is 2.5ft thick, it should look pristine. The mid-block connection is tight; we want to improve lighting and visibility. The rooftop amenity needs to have decorative river rock or something green on it. The City Market on 17th has decorative ballast which gives the roof texture; we are looking into something like that. We will explore the CLT, it is an interesting idea.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Permit for 150 East 8th Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:
• Consider the materials used for the fin to maintain the desired colour and texture, paying attention to detailing and construction of this predominant design element;
• Consider enhancing the look of the amenity roof with a vegetative roof, patterning or river rock;
• Explore usability of the recycling and garbage room;
• Review the livability of the inner corner units in Building 1;
• Review the livability of units close to the boundary of the Telus building;
• Consider the size of the inner walk way to be a bit more generous, as well as incorporating proper lighting and sightlines;
• Consider the size of the water feature and its connection with the fin and consider seating to allow for interaction with the water feature;
• Encourage more programming of outdoor spaces;
• Encouraged to further explore the public art aspect of the project; and 
  Consider the various access points for first responders

Carried Unanimously

6. **Other Business**

• Design awards nominations are due by the end of the month.
• Will send what was presented to the panel, the power point and suggestions.

7. **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, June 21\textsuperscript{st}, 2017.

[Signature]

Chair