

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, November 16th, 2011**

MINUTES

- Present:** T. Cailles
K. Kallweit Graham
Y. Khalighi
M. Messer
M. Saii
B. Spencer
- Staff:** B. Westmacott, Planning Technician
C. Perry, Supervisor, Engineering Services
S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk
- Guests:** **244-252 East 5th Street**
Duane Siegrist, Integra Architecture Inc.
David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Ltd.
640 West 15th Street
Merdad Rahbar, Vernacular Design
Gurinder Dilawari,
355 East 12th Street
Karl Wein, Karl Wein and Associates
- Absent:** P. Kennedy
K. Kristensen
S. McFarlane
C. Taylor
Councillor Trentadue
-

A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 5:40 p.m.

1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel October 19th, 2011

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held October 19th, 2011 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

2. Business Arising

None from the October 19th minutes.

3. Staff Update

137 St. David's Avenue: The Public Hearing was on October 17th with Final Adoption on October 24th.

615 Mahon Avenue: This project received First Reading at the October 17th Council meeting and had the Public Hearing on November 14th with Second and Third Readings.

313 East 8th Street: Received First Reading at the October 17th Council meeting and had the Public Hearing on November 14th with Second and Third Readings.

351 East 9th Street: Received First Reading at the October 17th Council meeting and had the Public Hearing on November 14th with Second and Third Readings.

250-252 East 10th Street: Final adoption was on November 14th.

4. 244-252 East 5th Street (Rezoning Application and Heritage Designation Bylaw)

Staff provided background on the project. The rezoning consists of three legal parcels currently occupied by three older homes. The building at 244 East 5th Street has been given a ranking of "A" on the proposed Heritage Register; the remaining two buildings will be demolished. The proposed redevelopment is to relocate the heritage building to the southwest corner of the site and provide two dwelling units in this building. A townhouse development containing 15 dwelling units will be built on the remainder of the site.

Duane Siegrist, Integra Architecture Inc., presented the project to the Panel.

- It is a sloping site from north to south with views to the south. The laneway is dominated by existing garages which are up to 2 ½ stories high.
- Buildings are split and staggered which preserves views for the residents to the north.
- The heritage home will be restored and refurbished, and brought forward so it will not be diminished by the development. It will have a new concrete base.
- The units will have individual access with an "entry node" to the heritage home and garden walk connecting the street to a substantial inner courtyard which has good exposure to sun. There will be a seating area at the entry node with a heritage plaque.
- There are recessed patios on the lane giving units a semi-private space.
- The two lower suites in Building One have direct access through front doors on the street and will be adaptable.
- The design takes a modern approach with traditional elements which mimic the character of the heritage house in a modern form without competing with it.
- The heritage house has green wood lap siding which may be damaged by the move so they will talk to the Heritage Commission about replacing the lower siding with stone.
- The entries have an air of grandeur with stone surrounds and large doors.
- The design uses the stack effect which will draw cold air in from the bottom and vent it out at the top of the dwelling through the pop ups to draw air naturally through the units.

David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Ltd., outlined the landscaping plan.

- The street trees on East 5th Street and existing trees on the site will be retained.

- The entry node will have a structure to tie in with the stone wall. They hope to have stone facing on the base of stairway; the node would be enclosed by a matching stone wall for post boxes, seating etc.
- Permeable paving will be used on the patios and walkways.
- The courtyard has been designed as a flexible space for gathering or children's play; the expectation is that children would use their own toys in the area which would preserve the flexibility of the space on the lawn area. The north side of the courtyard and walkway is higher and will be terraced.
- There are trellises at either end with benches.
- The patios on the lane will be sunken with a terrace and tree planting to soften the lane.
- Mainly native planting will be used, with ornamental species as highlights

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Have you employed a civil engineer to issue the building grades? A: No, but we have used the City formula to calculate the layout.
- Have you calculated the grade of the entry walk? A: Based on the grade from the sidewalk it is under 5%.
- How many of the townhouses are accessible? A: The only truly accessible units are the two in Building One as it is the only one with at-grade access; otherwise we would need to install elevators.
- Describe the roof plan. A: The buildings have flat roofs with roof decks on Building One.
- What is the purpose of the shed roofs coming down into the courtyard? A: They act as a covered entry for the units to the north; there are skirt roofs on Unit B to offer privacy.
- The size of the trees along the front and the courtyard? A: The trees are quite small; the ones closest to Building One are maples and the courtyard trees are going to be Vine or Japanese maples.
- How will the heritage house be used? A: It will be stratified.
- Are the tall windows on the front elevation bay windows? A: They are in the same plane but the materials do change
- The palette of materials? A: Hardi plank, cedar, stone.
- I am concerned about the patios at the back; they seem to be four feet lower than the lane which will make them dark. I do not think they will be used very much. Some of the grasses on the north side are more sun tolerant; some shrubs at the front do better in the shade. A: We could drop the grade of the wall and grade up to the laneway so that it is not a four foot drop. It will be secondary use compared to the patio at the front.
- The wall abutted against the lane will have to come above the lane. Have you considered the lane streetscape? A: There will be a hedge and small trees to soften it.
- Do you need another walkway exit from the central courtyard? A: No, we used the fire fighter travel distance. There is direct access from the back of the units which is not required by code.
- What kind of stone will you use on the heritage building? A: We would like to use something substantial if the Heritage Commission allows us.
- How will the flat roof be treated vis-a-vis pipes etc? A: Vent pipes come up through roofs in general, there are no flues, the south building has the roof deck and pop up skirt shingle roof. The northern building has the largest flat roof.
- Any thoughts of public art? A: The front entry node will be special with heritage plaques; we will have to ask the client.
- Question to staff: what is the heritage ranking of the three current buildings? A: They are saving the best of the three buildings.

- Have you talked to anyone about the Lonsdale Energy Corporation requirement? A: No, we will have to investigate.

Comments of the Panel included but were not limited to:

- I do not like bubble rock.
- I quite like it; the proportions are nice and you are not trying to reinvent the heritage style. I like the side elevations I hope that what I see is what we get.
- I am concerned about the proportion of the very tall stone columns at the entries which might be overwhelming for the courtyard space.
- I applaud you not copying the heritage building. Nowhere in the context material do I see a picture of the 1914 ward residence; I would like to see that building also retained; it is very handsome.
- The streetscape is quite small scale, fine textured.
- There is not a lot of precedent for the use of stone in North Vancouver. If you do use stone, do not use the "glue on" type. I strongly recommend that the use of stone be done in a convincing and proper manner on the heritage house.
- The context plan needs to show the original location of the original building.
- Note to staff: projects need proper roof plans; it is difficult to comprehend what the roof is doing.

Presenters's comments:

- We will take the comments about the type of rock, correlation of plans, stone column height, incorporation of another heritage building and roof plan to the client for his review. We used stone columns to try to give a sense of grandeur. We agree that the roofs have to be done tastefully and will tidy up the roof on the north building; the treatment of the skirt roofs will be important so that it is a nice "ribbon" to look at. On the last heritage building we used granite; we will study it more before going to the Heritage Commission.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application and Heritage Designation for 244-252 East 5th Street and supports the site development concept and massing. The Panel feels the following have not been adequately resolved:

- Coordination of the elevation drawings with the plans in terms of windows etc.;
- Reconsideration of the proportions of the pier columns at the unit entry doors;
- Provision of a material board per ADP guidelines;
- More indication of the three dimensional form, especially of the courtyard;
- Further study of the grading and relationship of the rear patios to the lane;
- Consideration of incorporating the adjacent heritage dwelling at 246-248 East 5th Street in the development;
- The provision of public art.

Carried Unanimously

There was a short break at 7:00 p.m. and the meeting recommenced at 7:10 p.m.

5. 640 West 15th Street (Rezoning and Development Permit)

Staff provided background on the project. The application is to rezone the RS-1 property to a Comprehensive Development zone to allow for a duplex dwelling.

Merdad Rahbar, Vernacular Design, presented the project to the Panel.

- The project needs CD zoning because the lot size doesn't fit RT 1; there are some setback issues.
- Vernacular Design has done two previous projects on West 15th.
- We met with the neighbours with simple design concepts before starting on the project and asked for their preferred option. The design of the house was shaped due to this consultation with the neighbours and is four feet below the allowable envelope at the front and eight feet below the envelope at the back. The neighbours asked for a flat roof.
- One neighbour was concerned about daylight being blocked by a two storey house. The solution was to jog the building and have a setback of 12 feet from the side to allow sun in to the neighbour.
- There is a drop of five feet from the carport to the back yard.
- The design tries to make the rear unit not too subordinate to the front unit.
- There is screening along the west side of the front unit because of path to the back with a gate at the lane to prevent people using the path.
- The rear unit is 1200 sq. ft. on two floors with two bedrooms; the front unit has three bedrooms and is 1500 sq. ft. over two floors.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- What is the variance? A: We are proposing 18 feet to the front entrance door instead of 25 feet.
- The type of roof? A: The sloped roof will be asphalt shingles with torchon on the flat roof.
- Does the site slope north to south? A: Yes, about 10 feet from the lane to the street; it drops five feet at the back then gradually to the street.
- How wide are the side yards? A: Five feet on the east side; 12 feet on the west side.
- Three parking spaces? A: Two enclosed and one carport.
- The entrance to the rear unit? A: It is a sidewalk to the west with a wrought iron gate.
- How do the windows calculate into the limiting distance? A: We have done similar ones and had to use a sprinkler system. The triangle is the design solution to allow more natural light.
- The east side seems to be forgotten? A: It will be sod.
- The point at the entrance of the rear building breaks up the patio. A: We wanted to shift it to the west to create an identity for the rear unit.
- What is the width of the walk? A: It is three feet.
- The carport at the back is at a different elevation; it seems odd that it goes up in the middle. A: There is a hump in the lane.
- The front planting has a hedge all the way around, how do you get in to cut the grass? The bamboo will grow to 10 feet. A: The hedge is low boxwood, you would have to lift the lawnmower over.
- Would you consider putting the entrance walk on the east side to make more space on the west side? A: The entrance to the rear building would not be very interesting; the triangle has the southern exposure and view. Hence the location of the master bedroom.
- Does the basement have any windows? A: There are light wells.

- How many feet from the triangle to the hedge? A: The two foot planting strip touches the tip of the triangle.

Y. Khalighi left the meeting at 7:45 pm.

- Drawing A0.5 seems to show an eave which conflicts with the window? A: The eave will be shrunk to two feet from three feet. There will be a canopy over the front door.
- There seems to be an overlapping roof on the garage? A: It will be resolved.
- Is it a carport or car pad? A: It is a carport with crushed gravel.

Comments of the Panel included but were not limited to:

- I am impressed by your approach on dealing with the neighbours.
- I do not think the east side will be sunny enough for sod.
- The pathway on the west will be tight.
- I am concerned that it looks like it's been designed by committee and needs a more holistic view of the site.
- I can see nice things happening in the west and south elevation which are not carried through in the form.
- Use the sloped angle roof to get light into the back unit. I do not think the triangle is working very well. I am concerned about the lack of light to the basement.
- The posts in the carport are not shown so I am not sure about the manoeuvrability into it.
- The east side yard seems to be a big area that is underused; perhaps you should move the building to gain more habitable space on the southwest side.
- I have some problems with the upstairs plan; I would not put the closet in a prime sun and view spot, perhaps you could flip the bathroom and closet.
- It would be useful to see grades on the adjacent properties; it is hard to see how tall the retaining wall on the east property line is. Do the stairs follow the natural grade?
- The front landscape would be useful if the grass was more accessible from the walkway and the front patio; it would be great to open it up.
- Could the garage and carport be moved further west to give more manoeuvrability in the carport?
- It would be better to have an exterior entrance to the basements.
- I am not quite as worried with the overall architectural expression; it is a refreshing change from some of the projects. Five feet is too close for the rear unit; it would benefit by moving it further east. The space on the east is not useful for any purpose. Give more patio space on the west side.
- I am less concerned about the closet; I thought the basic planning was quite neat.

Presenter's comments:

- I am surprised to hear comments re the neighbours as we have a reputation for doing one of the best neighbourhood consultations. We design with the site, context and ask neighbours to help us design. Architectural language is a matter of taste.
- We will definitely look at the east side setback; the two feet came from Planning Department's request to give more identity to the rear unit.
- I agree with you about the carport but we did set back the posts, there is an eight foot clearance from the posts; maybe we can reposition the door by a foot to increase the width of the carport.
- I agree with your comments on the front landscape, we will reorganize the shrubs to allow accessibility
- The upstairs plan probably will not change.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application and Development Permit for 640 West 15th Street and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the following issues:

- Exploration of the materials and forms to better reflect the potential of the exterior elevations;
- Consideration of ways to provide light to the basements;
- Better use of the site by shifting the rear unit to the east, allowing a more generous accommodation of patios, screen planting and access, on the west side of the unit;
- A materials board should be submitted per ADP guidelines;
- Consideration of the use of clerestory windows in the shed roof element rather than skylights;
- More grade information on adjacent properties.

Carried Unanimously

There was a discussion on elevations especially the south elevation.

6. 355 East 12th Street (Rezoning Application)

Staff provided background on the project which was previously reviewed at the September meeting of the Advisory Design Panel. Staff wanted ADP's input on the entrance to rear unit, reducing the width of the front unit, whether the exterior stairway to the back unit should be integrated with sunken patio at the rear, the application of stone veneer. Because it is a corner lot a 15 foot x 15 foot corner cut is required which will eliminate one parking stall leaving three stalls.

Karl Wein, Karl Wein and Associates, outlined the changes made to the design in response to ADP's comments from the September 21st meeting:

- The deck was removed from the second floor and the windows are more coordinated.
- The retaining walls were stepped back on both ends to get more light into the basement.
- Fencing was eliminated to open up the area.
- There is more relationship between the interior and exterior space; the grade is now the same and the raised deck with railings has been eliminated to give a more useable space.
- Some of the planting has been eliminated to open up the space.
- Fencing on the lane has been reduced in height and a trellis added to the top.
- The porch area on the rear unit has been revised to make it more dominant from the street.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Is there any reason that the front entry needs to be one side? A: The door is to one side because there is a closet next to it; we could put a side light by the door to balance it.
- When you enter the main floor of Unit A, what do you see? A: You can see down and up to the landing.
- Have you explored putting the stair against the back wall by the pantry? A: It allows access to the kitchen and gives the powder room a private entrance.
- How will the stone work with the window well?

- You cannot get from the front yard to the back yard? A: The stair well to the cellar limits the access to the rear yard.
- Why not stairs in the sunken patio? A: We wanted them to be separate.
- I cannot see the rationale for the mullions in the windows. A: We tried to make them all the same style.
- Are the basement windows regular windows? Why wouldn't you have a higher, wider window so the wells would not have to go down so far? A: For fire safety to allow exiting.

Comments of the Panel included but were not limited to:

- I like it.
- I can see how the front has been simplified; it could be simplified more, you do not need divided lights there.
- The proportions of the division of the window panes on the top floor and those over the living room side do not seem right; they should be repeated, front and back.
- It is not quite symmetrical and should be rationalized. The bay windows do not relate to the side walls the same way.
- I feel uncomfortable with the planning especially being confronted with a landing as soon as one enters Unit A. It is a very tight floor plan; you should tuck the stairs further back to get more living space. Unit B does not work well with the kitchen.
- I like the side roof and do not have a problem with the side entry as there is a lovely country lane next to it.
- Limit the use of paste on stone and do not have a patch that stops arbitrarily.
- The front elevation needs work; the left mini bay on the second bedroom is not needed.
- Regarding the access to the basement, it would make sense to go down stairs to the patio to go into the house. It seems perverse to have the stairs on the side.
- Sunken patios and the retaining wall system would have been useful to see.
- The sections are confusing and should be simplified. We need the basic design form of the building.

Presenter's comments:

- None.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application and for 355 East 12th Street and recommends approval subject to the approval, by the Development Planner, of the following:

- Re-examination of the front elevation to create a more positive facade by addressing the symmetrical/asymmetrical options available, with a view to emphasising one or the other;
- Reconsideration and simplification of the basement access by combining the access stairs with the sunken patios;
- Simplification of the fenestration of the building so that the windows are more visually consistent;
- Reconsideration of the location of the interior stairs to open up living spaces;
- Simplification of the exterior materials by considering eliminating the applied stonework.

Carried Unanimously

7. Other Business

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, December 14th, 2011.

Chair

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of several loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right, positioned above a horizontal line.